ARABLE CROP FARMERS' ACCESS TO RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE IN IREPODUN LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, KWARA STATE, NIGERIA

AJALA, A.O., OGUNJIMI, S.I., ALABI, O.O., ADEWUMI, O.T. AND OLATUNJI, E.A.

Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Federal University, Oye Ekiti

Email: abiodun.ajala@fuoye.edu.ng +2347068617924

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the accessibility to rural infrastructure among arable crop farmers in Irepodun Local Government Area, Kwara State. Specifically, the study determined the level of availability and accessibility of rural infrastructure in the study area and identified the constraints to them. A multistage sampling technique was used to select 120 arable crop farmers from six (6) rural communities of the LGA. Data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The results show that the mean age of the farmers was 49±11.91 years. The result depicts a male dominance (61.7%) in arable crops farming while 38.3% of the farmers were females in the study area. The majority (91.7%) of the arable crop farmers were married with a mean family size of about 6 persons while a good majority (73.4%) of the respondents were literate. 100% of the respondents engaged in mixed cropping systems with a mean farm size of 4.023. Age (r=0.587), household size (r=0.496), and years of farming experience, (r=0.340) had a significant relationship with access to rural infrastructure at 0.05 level of significance. It is concluded that rural infrastructures are moderately available and accessible and are in moderately good working conditions but not enough to create an enabling environment for increased productivity. It is recommended that concerted efforts should be made by rural development stakeholders (government, NGOs, and the private sector) to improve the provision, maintenance, and sustenance of the infrastructures for a sustainable rural livelihood.

Keywords: ***Arable crops, farmers, rural, infrastructure, and accessibility***.

INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is an act of soil cultivation, rearing of animals, and forestry for food supply and raw materials to industries for human satisfaction and poverty eradication (National Geographic Society, 2023). The agricultural sector remains a critical sector to the economic growth of the Nigerian economy. It depends on infrastructure such as good roads, safe drinking water, adequate power supply, a market network, modern communication services, and facilities for processing and storing farm harvests. However inadequate and unreliable infrastructure services are a regular feature in rural communities in Africa. Nigeria is no different. Its rural population faces a range of difficulties that hinder agricultural productivity. They include environmental hazards, technological constraints, rising production costs, inadequate agricultural incentives, and a lack of sustainable rural development programs (The Conversation Africa, Inc. 2021)

There is no doubt however, that one of the greatest problems confronting farmers and rural communities involves the absence of and or inadequacy of rural infrastructures such as rural feeder roads, irrigation, storage facilities, and processing facilities among others. The development of rural infrastructure is highly central to the transformation of rural areas of Nigeria yet attention in that direction seems unproductive. It must be noted, however,

that as long as the rural areas and dwellers are neglected in terms of rural facilities, agricultural productivity will remain crippled. This is because the development and transformation of the rural sector translates directly to the development of agriculture. Infrastructure is the general term for the basic physical systems of a business, region, or nation. Examples of infrastructure include transportation systems, communication networks, sewage, water, and electric systems. These systems tend to be capital-intensive and high-cost investments and are vital to a country's economic development and prosperity.

According to Olowu (1986) as cited by Adenipekun (2013), infrastructure is regarded as the basic underlying structures upon which other super-structures are built, that is, economic and institutional infrastructures and are basically in the rural context to perform both economic and social functions. Infrastructure according to Olaseni and Alade (2012) is an umbrella term for many activities usually referred to as "social overhead capital" by development economists. According to Nick (2019), rural infrastructure includes an array of community infrastructure (from health care, through affordable housing, to local transport, public and private,) whilst social infrastructures are those that provide the community with soft support (community groups and local networks).

Rural infrastructure is associated with rural environments and is grouped into three categories – economic, social, and institutional infrastructures (Guru, 2015). Economic infrastructure constitutes "the preconditions for industrialization" such as roads, markets, rural agro-based industries; farm input supplies, electricity, telecommunications, water supply, sanitation and sewage, solid waste collection, and disposal. Others include postal services, dams, and canal works for irrigation and drainage, etc. According to Guru (2015), social infrastructure has to do with education, health, and housing amenities while the financial includes banking marketing and credit institutions.

In other words, infrastructural facilities are elements in the package of basic needs, which a community would like to procure for better living. It is perceived that the adequate provision of these types of infrastructures will enhance the introduction and adoption of innovations offered by institutional infrastructure. However, concerted efforts have been made to ensure the provision of rural infrastructure through the rural development approach by the provision of rural infrastructures. Notable among them was the establishment of the Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure in 1986 whose functions included: to identify, involve and support viable local community organisations in the effective mobilization of the rural population for sustained rural developmental activities, bearing in mind the need for promoting greater community participation and economic self-reliance of the rural community; to formulate and support a national rural feeder-road network programme involving construction, rehabilitation, improvement and maintenance especially in relation to the nation's food self-sufficiency programme as well as general rural development; to support the development of information gathering in agriculture and rural development, rural infrastructures, agronomy, agricultural extension, including the continuous generation of basic data on rural infrastructures in each of the local government areas of Nigeria among others (Food and Agricultural Organization, 2023). However, Uno (2019) affirmed that several methods of effecting rural development that have been applied in the Nigerian context

had little or no major impact on addressing the rural infrastructure deficit and reversing the rural squalor common in the country. The importance of small-scale, conventional arable crop farmers cannot be overemphasized. They are responsible for the production of the bulk of food consumed by the citizenry of the nation. They are characterized by the smallness of acreage holdings (Olaniyi & Ogunkunle, 2018) and predominantly practice mixed cropping (Ayodele & Akindele, 2018). Akinwalere (2017), reported a mean farm size of 2.7 hectares for farmers in Southwest, Nigeria, which is an indication that the majority of them were on small–scale holdings. According to Akintonde *et al.* (2022) maize, cassava, and leafy vegetables are the major crops planted by the farmers; inadequate finance and land were the highest-ranked challenges encountered.

Despite the smallness of their holdings, the small-scale arable crop farmers who make up the bulk of Nigeria's agricultural contributors are the country's best chance of attaining sustainable agriculture (Sabo *et al.*, 2017). Therefore, the needed attention must be given to them in terms of improved technologies and the provision of basic rural infrastructures to provide an enabling environment for enhanced productivity. As a result of an increase in population, there is limited access to services such as schools and health centers, and about half of the population lacks access to safe drinking water. Successive Nigerian governments have shown clear urban bias in the provision of social and economic amenities (Eteng, 2005). While the urban poor live in physical congestions or slums, the rural and disadvantaged poor live in deprivation, exclusion, and vulnerability. Their houses seldom ever have running water and electricity and they live in extreme survival crises during rains, sun, wind, storms, hurricanes and harmattan, blizzards, and drought. The villages where infrastructures like schools and hospitals have earlier been provided have witnessed the shutdown of such facilities due to a lack of threshold population. In light of the foregoing, this study evaluated the level of availability and accessibility of rural infrastructure; assessed the working conditions of the infrastructure, and identified the constraints to their accessibility.

Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between the socio-economic characteristics of arable crop farmers and their access to rural infrastructure.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in the Irepodun Local Government Area of Kwara state. Its headquarters is in Omu-Aran. The local government is located at 8.5381^{o} N, 5.1431^{o}E (Wikipedia. 2022). The study adopted a two-stage multi-stage sampling procedure for the selection of respondents. The first stage involved a purposive selection of six (6) rural communities from the LGA based on their level of rurality. The second stage involved random selection of twenty (20) arable crop farmers from the rural communities to make up 120 sample size respondents. This research made use of primary sources of data. The primary data were elicited from the respondents by using an interview schedule and structured questionnaire which were administered to the arable crop farmers in the study area. In collecting such data, arable crop farmers were asked relevant questions pertaining to their access to rural infrastructure. This included information such as the types and number of identifiable rural infrastructure availability, the working conditions of the infrastructures, affordability or whether it is free, and their accessibility.

The dependent variable of this study is the accessibility of arable crop farmers to rural infrastructure. The respondents were given a

list of rural infrastructure such as good roads, markets, schools, etc., and they were measured on a 5-point rating scale thus: highly accessible,5 Accessible 4, partially accessible, 3 Rarely accessible 2, and not accessible, 1 to know the level of respondent's access to rural infrastructure. These values were added and divided by 5 to obtain 3.0, which will be regarded as the mean. The same rating goes for the following: availability: highly available, 5; available, 4; partially available, 3; rarely available, 2 and not at all available, 1. Constraints: highly severe, 5; severe, 4; partially severe, 3; rarely accessible, 2 and not at all severe 1. Analytical tools such as descriptive and inferential statistics were used for this study; these include frequency distribution, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. Also, the correlation coefficient and chi-square were used to analyze the hypothesis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-economic characteristics of arable crop farmers

The socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents are presented in Table 1. The mean age of the arable crop farmers was 49±13.5 years. According to Asiabaka, (2020), people in this age bracket are active and they can motivate, innovate, and adaptive agricultural innovations.

The majority (91.7%) of the respondents were married, this implies that married households tend to be more involved in arable crop farming because they have more responsibilities, and usually a sizeable number of households tend to render assistance on the farm in the form of family labor. A little above average (54.2%) of the respondents had family sizes ranging from 6-10 heads per family, this implies that arable crop farmers use lesser hired labor due to family labour available to them. Results showed that the majority (61.7%) were males which implies that arable crop farming is more tasking and energy-consuming. Male dominancy is expected in agriculture due to the great energy demand of farming activities and the high level of unemployment, this is in alignment with the report of Akinwalere, (2017) and Asadu *et al.,* (2018). The study further revealed that the most (55.8%) practised religion is Islam.

An average (50%) of the respondents had secondary education, 26.7% had non-formal education, while 16.7% and 6.7% had primary and tertiary education respectively making the literacy level to be about 73 percent. The level of education attained by a farmer enhances his capacity to understand and evaluate new production technologies and by implication increases his farm productivity (Ezeh, *et al*, 2012). The mean and standard deviation of years of farming experience was 20.42±9.59years. It is generally expected that productivity increases with years of experience (Umar, 2013). Farmers master the techniques of farming and avoid previous errors. Experienced arable crop farmers are expected to make better decisions to enhance productivity and income because it is expected that experience in arable crop farming usually determines the effectiveness of farmers' decisions with respect to input combinations or resource allocation. The longer the years of farming experience, the more the knowledge acquired, and the more efficient the farmer is expected to be (Ezeh, *et al*., 2012).

The mean farm size was 7.65 hectares. A majority (98.30%) of the arable crop farmers had between 1-15 hectares of arable crop farms, while 0.80% had between 16-30 hectares, and 0.80% had between 31 hectares and above. The dominance of small scale of most arable crop farmers is attributed to the high cost required to operate a large-scale arable crop farming enterprise and inadequate capital, farm

machinery, etc., faced by the arable crop farmers. Akinwalere, (2017), reported a mean farm size of 2.7 hectares for farmers in Southwest, Nigeria, which is an indication that the majority of the farmers were small-scale farmers. The analysis indicated that the majority (78.3%) of the respondents were not engaged in other activities because arable crop farming is their major occupation, while 21.7 per cent were engaged in other forms of activities which range from trading, beans cake making, photography, hotel manager, food vendor, bike riding and so on. This can be attributed to the fact that the majority of rural dwellers engage in farming activities as their major occupation and source of income.

Availability of Rural Infrastructure

The analysis of the available rural infrastructures in the study area is presented in Table 2 below. The most available rural infrastructure is the institutional facilities (91.67%) which include cooperative societies and farmer's union/group. However, following this is the rural health facilities with 83.33% availability. Health facilities such as Hospitals, Dispensaries, maternities, and health centers were identified as available by the respondents. Furthermore, the majority (77.50%) of the rural utilities such as electricity and water supplies were also identified as available in the study area. Contrary to this, only 5% of irrigation, flood control, and water resources development facilities were identified as the least available rural infrastructure in the study area. Such facilities include a Dam, Irrigation and Water facilities, Drainage system, soil conservation facilities, and farm electrification. Next to this, is the Agricultural extension training facilities such as marketing, crop and animal protection services, veterinary facilities, and input and hiring facilities, which were only 12.08% available. Moreover, it should be noted that 50% of the storage facilities were identified as available. Such storage facilities include silos, warehouses, cribs, and open-air facilities. Nwande and Olorunfemi (2021) affirmed that the dearth of infrastructure and the inadequacy of funds for its development are major challenges to the government.

Level of Availability of Rural Infrastructure

The analysis of the level of availability of rural infrastructures in the study area is presented in Table 3 below, The result from the analysis shows the level of availability of the rural infrastructure in the study area. Transportation facilities such as federal roads, state roads, local government roads, footpaths, and bridges ranked the highest with a mean value of 7.92. next to this is the health facilities which ranked second with a mean value of 4.73 while postal and telecommunication facilities ranked third; such health facilities include hospitals, dispensaries, maternities, and health centers; and postal and telecommunication facilities include post office, telephone, and network services. Furthermore, the level of availability of rural utilities such as electricity and water supply is low with a mean value of 1.98 while irrigation, and flood control facilities ranked the lowest with a mean value of 0.13 as compared to the highest available facility of 7.92 (transportation facilities). Idoko (2018) affirmed a positive or direct relationship between rural transformation and agricultural activities and a positive or direct relationship between rural transformation and small business development.

Table 1: Socio-Economic Characteristics of Arable Crop Farmers

Variables	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	S.D
Age				
1-30	13	10.80		
31-60	75	62.50	49 years	13.59
61 and above	32	26.70		
Marital Status				
Single	7	5.80		
Married	110	91.70		
Widowed	3	2.50		
Household Size				
1-5	50	41.70		
6-10	65	54.20	6.06	2.76
11 and above	5	4.20		
Gender				
Male	74	61.70		
Female	46	38.30		
Religion				
Islam	67	55.80		
Christianity	52	43.30		
Others	1	0.80		
Educational Level				
Non formal education	32	26.70		
Primary education	20	16.70		
Secondary education	60	50.00		
Tertiary education	8	6.70		
Years of farming experience				
1-15	24	20.00		
16-30	44	36.70	20.42	9.59
31-45	46	38.30		
46 and above	5	5.00		
Farm Size (Ha)				
1-15	118	98.30	7.65	
16-30	1	0.80		
31 and above	1	0.80		
Major Activities				
Arable crops farming	94	78.30		
Other activities	26	21.70		

Source: Field Survey, 2022

Table 2: Percentage Distribution of Rural Infrastructure Availability.

Rural infrastructural facilities	%Availability	Rank
Institutional Facilities	91.67	1st
Health Facilities	83.33	2nd
Rural Utilities	77.50	3rd
Food Processing Facilities	66.67	4th
Postal and Telecommunication	62.50	5th
Storage Facilities	50.00	6th
Transportation Facilities	49.79	7th
Educational Facilities	33.33	8th
Agricultural Research Facilities	22.22	9th
Financial Facilities	16.67	10th
Agricultural Extension Training Facilities	12.08	11th
Irrigation, Flood Control Facilities	5.00	12th

Source: Field survey, 2022

*Multiple responses

Table. 3: Level of Availability of Rural Infrastructure.

Rural infrastructure	Mean	Rank	Decision
Transportation facilities	7.92	1st	High
Health facilities	4.73	2nd	High
Postal and telecommunication	4.44	3rd	High
Educational facilities	4.00	4th	High
Food processing facilities	3.95	5th	High
Storage facilities	3.70	6th	High
Institutional facilities	3.33	7th	High
Rural utilities	1.98	8th	Low
Financial facilities	1.23	9th	Low
Agricultural research facilities	1.17	10th	Low
Agricultural extension training facilities	0.89	11th	Low
Irrigation, flood control facilities	0.13	12th	Low
Grand mean	3.12		

Source: Field survey, 2022

Working Conditions of the Rural Infrastructure

The analysis of the working conditions of the rural infrastructures in the study area is presented in Table 4 below. The results show that Transportation facilities, health facilities, postal and telecommunication, and educational facilities had the highest ranking with mean values of 6.71, 4.35, 4.31, and 4.00 respectively. Such facilities include; federal, state, and local government roads, footpaths, bridges, hospitals, dispensaries, maternities and medical centers, post offices, telephone and network services, and primary and secondary schools among others. Moreover, the least facilities with good working conditions were rural utilities, agricultural research facilities, financial institutions, agricultural extension and training facilities, and irrigation, flood control, and water resources with mean values of 1.84, 1.17, 0.89, 0.70, and 0.43

respectively. Examples of such facilities include; electricity, water supply, research sub-stations, experimental farms, demonstration plots, credit societies, banks, saving/microfinance banks, input and hiring facilities, crop and animal protection services, irrigation and watering facilities, drainage, etc. Furthermore, facilities such as food processing facilities, storage facilities, and rural institutional infrastructures are in moderate working condition with mean values of 3.88, 3.50, and 3.33 respectively. Such facilities are machinery, equipment, building (e.g., Garri and Rice), silo, warehouses, cribs, open-air facilities, cooperative societies, and farmers' unions/groups. The Conversation Africa, Inc. (2021) reported that in a study conducted in Ogun State, the participants indicated that the majority of the roads linking their farms to the city were in a state of disrepair. Health centers were no longer functioning due to poor funding by the government and inadequate medical personnel. Potable water, electricity supply, and storage facilities were also identified as inadequate. And most of the smallholder farmers said they didn't receive adequate agricultural extension services.

Table 4: Working Condition of the Rural Infrastructure

Rural infrastructure	Mean	Rank	Decision
Transportation facilities	6.71	1st	High
Health facilities	4.35	2nd	High
Postal and telecommunication	4.31	3rd	High
Educational facilities	4.00	4th	High
Food processing facilities	3.88	5th	High
Storage facilities	3.50	6th	High
Institutional facilities	3.33	7th	High
Rural utilities	1.84	8th	Low
Agricultural research facilities	1.17	9th	Low
Financial facilities	0.89	10th	Low
Agricultural extension training facilities	0.70	11th	Low
Irrigation, flood control facilities	0.43	12th	Low
Grand mean	2.92		

Source: Field survey, 2022

Accessibility of Arable Crop Farmers to Rural Infrastructure

The analysis of the level of accessibility of rural infrastructures in the study area by the arable crop farmers is presented in Table 5, The result from the analysis shows that transportation facilities such as federal, state, and local government roads, footpaths, bridges, are the most accessible rural infrastructure by the arable crop farmers with a mean of 5.98. This implies that they have access to transportation facilities which gives them easy movement from their various houses to their farms to carry out their daily activities. However, health facilities (4.38) such as hospitals, maternity, and dispensaries, ranked second among the rural infrastructure they have access to; this simply implies that they are able to make use of the healthcare facilities available to them when the need arises. More and more, postal and telecommunication facilities (4.22), such as post offices, telephone, and network services are also highly accessible by the arable crop farmers. This indicates a high level of communication in the study area which can be explored by the extension agents in communicating with the arable

crop farmers in order to create awareness and as well as train them about innovations in Agriculture. Furthermore, educational facilities such as primary and secondary schools ranked 4th (3.83) as the most accessible rural infrastructure by the arable crop farmers. This implies that they have access to basic education and they can as well send their children to schools, there won't be any need for rural-urban migration before their children are able to get basic primary and secondary education. Food processing facilities and storage facilities ranked 5th and 6th (3.69 and 3.35 respectively) on their level of accessibility by the arable crop farmers.

On the contrary, Agricultural extension training facilities such as marketing, input, and hiring facilities were the least accessible rural infrastructure (0.52) by the arable crop farmers. This is due to the inadequate availability of such facilities in the study area, and where they are available, they are not in good working conditions and thereby least accessible to the arable crop farmers. Moreover, irrigation, flood control facilities, financial facilities, Agricultural research facilities, and rural utilities ranked 11th, 10th, 9th, and 8th respectively, and these facilities were least accessible to arable crop farmers in that order. Such facilities include; a drainage system, irrigation and watering system, savings/microfinance bank, demonstration plots, experimental farms, and electricity and water supplies. Oyedepo (2012) reported that 60-70 percent of the Nigerian population does not have access to electricity while (2011) reported 70 percent

Table 5: Accessibility of Arable Crop Farmers to Rural Infrastructure

Rural infrastructure	Mean	Rank	Decision
Transportation facilities	5.98	1st	High
Health facilities	4.38	2nd	High
Postal and telecommunication	4.22	3rd	High
Educational facilities	3.83	4th	High
Food processing facilities	3.69	5th	High
Storage facilities	3.35	6th	High
Rural institutional facilities	3.17	7th	High
Rural utilities	1.59	8th	Low
Agricultural research facilities	1.17	9th	Low
Financial facilities	1.00	10th	Low
Irrigation, flood control facilities	0.53	11th	Low
Agricultural extension training facilities	0.52	12th	Low
Grand mean	2.79		

Source: Field survey, 2022

Constraints to the Accessibility of Rural Infrastructure in the Study Area

The analysis of the constraints to the accessibility of rural infrastructure by the arable crop farmers in the study area is presented in Table 6 below, The result from the analysis presented in Table 6 below showed that; factors such as lack/irregular power supply, cost/inadequate finance, theft, poor maintenance of the infrastructures, inadequate spare parts, distance, poor conditions of the infrastructure, partially functioning facilities, and insufficient information about the use of the infrastructure recorded high level of severity as a factor that limit their access to the rural infrastructures. However, factors such as lack of cooperation among communities,

low technical know-how, age and health of arable crop farmers, gender discrimination, cultural beliefs, and disabilities ranked low as some of the factors that limit their access to the available infrastructures. Ohajianya, et al., (2014) reported that erratic power supply is believed to be the bane of economic and industrial development in Nigeria.

Table 6: Constraints to the Accessibility of Rural Infrastructure

Constraints	Mean	Rank	Decision
Lack/irregular power supply	3.58	1st	High
Cost / inadequate finance	3.24	2nd	High
Theft	3.22	3rd	High
Poor maintenance of the infrastructures.	2.89	4th	High
Inadequate / availability of spare parts	2.82	5th	High
Distance	2.79	6th	High
Poor condition of the infrastructure	2.68	7th	High
Partially functioning facilities	2.60	8th	High
Insufficient information about the use of the infrastructure	2.60	9th	High
Lack of cooperation among communities	2.32	10th	Low
Low technical know-how to operate the infrastructures	2.17	11th	Low
Age	2.04	12th	Low
Health	1.96	13th	Low
Gender discrimination	1.88	14th	Low
Cultural believe	1.88	15th	Low
Disabilities	1.40	16th	Low
Grand mean	2.50		

Source: Field survey, 2022

Test of hypothesis

As shown in Tables 7 and 8, Age (r=0.587), household size (r=0.496), and years of farming experience, (r=0.340) had a significant relationship with access to rural infrastructure at 0.05 level of significance. Also, there is a significant association between religion, marital status, educational level and access to rural infrastructure. The significant relationship between the age of the arable crop farmers and their access to rural infrastructure may be as a result of knowledge of the availability. However, the significant relationship between the household size and their access implies that the higher the household size, the higher their access to rural infrastructure. Furthermore, the higher the years of farming experience, the higher their access to rural infrastructure. The longer the years of farming experience, the more the knowledge acquired, the more efficient the farmer is expected to be (Ezeh *et al.*, 2012). This may be due to the experience and knowledge about the availability and usage of those rural infrastructures over the years. Religion may encourage the use of the available rural infrastructure by the arable crop farmers, while their marital status indicates more responsibilities of the arable crop farmers which will in turn require more use of the available rural infrastructure. Obayelu, *et al* (2014) reported that farm size, years of farming experience and infrastructural development index (INF) were statistically

significant with negative influence on productivity of cassava-based farmers.

Table 7.1: Correction analysis

Variables	Correlation (R)	Decision
Age	0.587	S
Household size	0.496	S
Years of farming	0.340	S
Farm size	0.012	NS

Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 7.2: Chi-square analysis

Variables	Chi-Square	Df	Asymp. Sig.	Decision
Sex	6.533a	1	0.011	NS
Religion	59.850b	2	0.000	S
Marital status	183.950b	2	0.000	S
Educational level	49.600c	3	0.000	S

0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 40.0.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is concluded that rural infrastructures are moderately available and accessible and are in moderately good working conditions but not enough to create an enabling environment for increased productivity. The study concluded that institutional facilities such as health facilities such as hospitals, dispensaries, maternities, and schools, transportation facilities were moderately available and accessible while agricultural enhancing infrastructures such as storage, Agricultural extension training facilities, processing, credit facilities, mechanization, facilities such as irrigation, flood control, and water resources were the least available and accessible. It is recommended that concerted efforts should be made by rural development stakeholders (government, NGOs, and the private sector) to improve the provision, maintenance, and sustenance of the infrastructures for a sustainable rural livelihood. Also, a bottom-up approach to development and the restructuring of the third tier of governance, the Local Government system, will provide a plausible vent for a quick and even development of rural areas in Nigeria. Lastly, arable crop farmers should team up to engage in community self-help programs/projects by contributing funds to provide non-available infrastructures, or by seeking the help of the government to support their efforts.

REFERENCES

Adenipekun, M.T (2013), Sustainable rural infrastructural development in Nigeria within the context of Vision 20:2020. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*. 2(1). 254-269

Asiabaka C.C. (2020). *Agricultural extension. A handbook for development practitioners.* Omoku Press Rivers State, Nigeria. Molsystem United Services, 53-56.

Akinwalere, B. O. (2017). Determinants of Adoption of Agroforestry Practices Among Farmers in Southwest

Nigeria. *Applied Tropical Agriculture Journal*, 22:(2), 67-72.

Asadu, A. N., Ikechukwu, O.R. and Dimelu, M. (2018). The Climate Change Information Source and Indigenous Adaptation Strategies of Cucumber Farmers in Enugu State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*. 22, (2) 126–146.

Akintonde, J., Ajayi, A. ., Dlamini, M. ., & Dlamini, M. . (2022). Technologies needs of arable crop farmers of Oyo and Ekiti States of South-Western, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Rural Development Studies*, *9*(3), 17–29. https://doi.org/10.37745/ijaerds.15/vol9n31729

Ayodele, O. V., & Akindele, M. O. (2018). Extension activities for arable crops production in Akure south local government area, Ondo state, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, *22*(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.4314/jae.v22i1.1S

Eteng, F.O. (2005). Rural development in Nigeria: Problems and remedies. Sophia: *An African Journal of Philosophy*, 8(1), 65-7

Ezeh, C. I., Anyiro, C. O., & Chukwu, J. A. (2012). Technical efficiency in poultry broiler production in Umuahia capital territory of Abia State, Nigeria. Greener Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 2(1):001-007.

Food and Agricultural Organization, (2023) Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructures Act. FAOLEX Database. fao.org

Idoko, P. (2018)Effect of Infrastructure on rural transformation of Gboko Local Government Area of Benue State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Contemporary Research and Review. Vol.9, Issue 2* www.ijcrr.info. ttps://doi.org/10.15520/ijcrr.v9i12.633

National Geographic Society (2023) The Art and Science of Agriculture. https://education.nationalgeographic.org/resource/agriculture

Nick, G. (2019) "Rural Infrastructure" (in) Routledge Companion to Rural Planning. Routledge Publishers. DOI: 10.4324/9781315102375-37

Nwande, M.C. and Olorunfemi, G.C.(2021) The Operation and Maintenance of Rural Infrastructure for Development in Nigeria - The Policy Options. *International Journal of Innovative Development and Policy Studies* 9(4):90-101 www.seahipaj.org

Olaniyi, O. A., & Ogunkunle, T. (2018). Agricultural and nutritional information needs of arable crop farmers in Ondo State Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, *22*(3), 9- 21. https://doi.org/10.4314/jae.v22i3.2

Obayelu, A. E., Olarewaju, T. and Oyelami, N. (2014) Effect of rural infrastructure on profitability and productivity of cassava-based farms in Odogbolu local government area, Ogun state, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Sciences* Belgrade 59(2):187-200 DOI: 10.2298/JAS1402187O

Ohajianya, A. C., Abumere, O. E. Owate, I. O. Osarolube, E. (2014) Erratic Power Supply In Nigeria: Causes And Solutions. *International Journal of Engineering Science Invention.*

]\ISSN (Online): 2319 – 6734, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 6726. www.ijesi.org, 3(7): 51-55

Olowu, D. (1986), Institutional Approach to Rural Infrastructure Development in Nigeria, *The Quarterly Journal of Administration*, XX(3&4). 153-8.

Olaseni, M. and Alade, W. (2012), Vision 20:2020 and the Challenges of Infrastructural Development in Nigeria, *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 5 (2). 63-66.

Oyedepo, S. O. (2012).Energy and sustainable development in Nigeria: the way forward. *Energy, Sustainability, and Society.* 2:15(2012). https://www.energsustainsoc.com/content/2/1/15

Sabo, J. L. Ruhi, A. Holtgrieve, G. W. Elliott, V. Arias, M. E. Peng Bun Ngor, T. Räsänen, A. Nam , So (2017). Designing river flows to improve food security futures in the Lower Mekong Basin, *Research in Science journals*, 358-1053.

The Conversation Africa, Inc. (2021): Poor rural infrastructure holds back food production by small Nigerian farmers. Published: February 23, 2021

Uno, I. A. (2019): Rural Development Theorising: Reinventing a Model of Financing Basic Rural Infrastructure in Nigeria**.** *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 6(2), 167-189.

Umar, M. (2013). Economic Analysis of Poultry-Egg Production in Bauchi Local Government Area, Bauchi State, Nigeria. *An Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis*, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Faculty of Agriculture, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.

Wikipedia (2022). Irepodun, Kwara State. http://En.m.wikipedia.org