

**East African Scholars Journal of Economics, Business and Management**

(An Open Access, International, Indexed, Peer-Reviewed Journal)

A Publication of East African Scholars Publisher, Kenya

[www.easpublisher.com](http://www.easpublisher.com)

Original Research Article

**Awareness and Use of Social Media among Urban Poultry Farmers in Ikorodu LGA, Lagos State, Nigeria**

C. O. Edeogbon, F. E. Esene

Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Services, University of Benin, Edo State, Nigeria

\*Corresponding Author

C. O. Edeogbon

Email: [clara.edeogbon@uniben.edu](mailto:clara.edeogbon@uniben.edu)

Article History

Received: 10.09.2018 | Accepted: 20.09.2018 | Published: 30.09.2018 | DOI: 10.36349/easjebm.2018.v01i01.005

**Abstract:** This study examined the awareness and use of social media by urban poultry farmers in Ikorodu LGA, Lagos State, Nigeria. The simple random sampling technique was used to select communities in Ikorodu LGA that had high predominance of poultry farmers. Questionnaire was the main instrument used for data collection, with a target audience of 120 poultry farmers. The data analysis technique used for the objectives were simple descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, mean statistics and standard deviation while the hypotheses were tested using the logit regression. The findings revealed that majority (73.3%) of the respondents were males and married (65%) with mean age as 38. Only 1.7% of the respondents had no formal education and majority (66.7%) of the respondents were in poultry association of Nigeria while 55.8% of the respondents used hired labour. The respondents were mostly aware of Facebook (88.3%), WhatsApp (74.2%), Google (78.3%), YouTube (74%) and BBM (72%). The major constraints were erratic power supply ( $\bar{x}$ = 3.18), high consumption of megabyte ( $\bar{x}$ = 3.16) and poor Internet network ( $\bar{x}$ = 3.01). The results of the hypotheses testing showed that marital status (Wald= 4.41) was significant to the respondents awareness of social media at 1% and education (Wald= 1.32) was significant at 5%. Type of labour ( $\bar{x}$ = 5.02) and source of capital ( $\bar{x}$ = 8.32) were significant to the respondents' use of social media at 1%. This study shows that most of the poultry farmers were aware of social media but could not adequately use them due to different constraints. Therefore network providers should make network readily available in order for farmers to have access to information with regards to poultry farming and through the help of government reduce the cost of data purchase.

**Keywords:** Awareness, Use, Social Media, Urban Poultry Farmers

**INTRODUCTION**

A major task in agricultural development is the transfer of improved technologies to farmers. Although, agricultural extension agents have been disseminating information through the use of communication methods such as farm and home visits, the use of contact farmers, mass media and so on, these methods are now limited and therefore calls for the use of new emerging information and communication technologies by agricultural information providers for the benefit of farmers (Olaniyi, 2013).

Social media refers to the internet-based digital tools for sharing and discussing information among people. It refers to the user generated information, opinion, video, audio, and multimedia that is shared and discussed over digital networks (Andres and Woodard, 2013). The various platforms include; Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram, Google, WhatsApp, Blog, LinkedIn etc. Facebook is the most popular social networking site used among agricultural organizations

because it is well known among the target audience and has received the most scholarly attention (Tweeten, 2014).

According to Abiola and Edeogbon (2014) urban poultry production can be defined as the rearing of domesticated birds such as chicken, turkey, guinea fowl, pigeon and other game birds in urban areas. In Nigeria, pigeon, ducks, ostriches, guinea fowl and turkey are also widely kept, however, chickens are by far the most common. Poultry farming is an integral component of livelihood for both rural and urban middle income earners around the world, providing a source of income and nutrition to the populace. According to Ojo (2003), poultry are good converters of feed into useable protein in form meat and eggs. Moreover, FAO (2010) reported that poultry meat represents about 33% of the total global meat production and acknowledged that the provision of animal proteins in the form of eggs and meat for household consumption is the most important reason for

Copyright © 2018 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

keeping poultry. It is also one of the most popular fast growing livestock enterprises worldwide, due to its low capital and space requirements (Umerah, 2012).

Social media has become a powerful tool that connects millions of people globally from the comfort of their homes. Therefore the use of social media by urban poultry farmers in poultry production is an important issue in this part of the world as social media creates a platform that enable farmers maintain relationships with extension agents and other farmers who they can share their experience and expertise with.

The general objective of this study was to assess the level of awareness and use of social media by poultry farmers in Ikorodu Local Government Area, Lagos State. However the specific objectives of this study were to;

1. examine the socio-economic characteristics of urban poultry farmers in the study area;
2. identify the various forms of social media and the level of awareness of urban poultry farmers in the study area;
3. and identify the constraints to effective usage of social media information by urban poultry farmers in poultry production.

#### **Hypotheses**

The hypotheses of this study were stated in the following null form.

- I. There is no significant relationship between the socio economic characteristics of urban poultry farmers and their level of awareness of social media.
- II. There is no significant relationship between the socio-economic characteristics of urban poultry farmers and their use of social media for poultry production.

#### **METHODOLOGY**

The research work was conducted in Ikorodu, Lagos State, Nigeria. Ikorodu LGA was chosen as the study area being the overall second largest LGA in the State (LSBD, 2012). The LGA, with a land mass of about 161.95 km<sup>2</sup>, covering 22 kilometers on longitude 20° 53' E and 29° 14' E as well as latitude 60° 24' N and 60° 1' N (LSBD, 2012). Four communities were purposively selected in the study area namely, Odogunyan, Lasunwon, Eyita and Parafabecause of the predominance of poultry farmers in these areas. Thirty five poultry farmers were randomly selected using the simple random method to give a total of 140 respondents for the study. Although, a total of 140

questionnaires were printed for sampling, only 120 were worthy of analysis. The analyses of the results was therefore structured to 30 poultry farmer from each of the previously selected communities in Ikorodu LGA. Data were collected with the aid of well-structured questionnaire. Data were analyzed using simple descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, mean statistics and standard deviation to capture the objectives. Logit and multiple regressions were used to test hypothesis.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

##### *Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents*

Table 1 shows the sex distribution of the respondents. The result shows that males, representing 73.3% of the respondents, pre-dominated urban poultry farming in the study area. The predominance of males implies that poultry production is tasking and energy consuming (Adesiyon, 2014). This result agrees with a recent study by Nwagwugwu and Lemea (2016) in Rivers State, which revealed that males (72.5%) significantly pre-dominated urban poultry production. It also shows that majority of the respondents (65.8%) were within the age bracket of 21 to 40 years and the mean age was 38. This indicates that most of the poultry farmers sampled are in their productive age and this is expected to have a positive influence on their level of use of social media as related to poultry production. Sixty five percent (65%) of the respondents were married, majority of the respondents (81.7%) had tertiary education, implying that urban farmers in the study area are well educated and the mean household size was 5 persons. This implies that most urban poultry farmers have medium household size which is economically advantageous in this period of recession. The mean of years spent by the respondents in the residence was 24 years while about 66.7% were in Poultry Association of Nigeria, this implies that the association were of benefit to the poultry farmers. However this findings disagree with the result of Oladeji (2011) in Oyo State which revealed that majority (83.3%) of the respondents were not in any social organization. 55.8% of the poultry farmers use hired labour, this implies that most poultry farmers in the study area do not rely on their family labour in other to avoid bias in decision making and achieve better efficiency, 75.8% of the respondents source their capital from their personal savings and 90.8% of the respondents frequently or sometimes got visits from extension agents, this implies that extension agents are active in the study area and consistently visited the farmers which is a welcome development in urban agriculture.

**Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Std. Dev
<b>Sex</b>				
Male	88	73.3		
Female	32	26.7		
<b>Age (Years)</b>				
0-20 yrs	2	1.7		
21-40 yrs	79	65.8	37.61	9.2
41-60 yrs	36	30		
61-80 yrs	3	2.5		
<b>Marital Status</b>				
Married	78	65		
Single	34	28.3		
Widowed	8	6.7		
<b>Educational Qualification</b>				
Non-Formal	2	1.7		
Primary	1	0.8		
Secondary	19	15.8		
NCE/OND	15	12.5		
HND/B.Sc	81	67.5		
M.Sc	2	1.7		
<b>Area of discipline</b>				
Agriculture related	61	50.8		
Non-agric. Related	59	49.2		
<b>Household size</b>				
NR	4	3.3		
0-5 people	63	52.5	5.45	2.1
6-10 people	49	40.8		
11-15 people	4	3.3		
<b>Length of residence (years)</b>				
1-10 years	20	16.7		
11-20 years	32	26.7		
21-30 years	32	26.7	23.7	11.9
31-40 years	22	18.3		
41-50 years	14	11.7		
Thrift Association	4	3.3		
Poultry Association of Nigeria	80	66.7		
Others	1	0.8		
<b>Type of labour</b>				
NR	7	5.8		
Family	10	8.3		
Hired	67	55.8		
Both	36	30		
<b>Source of capital</b>				
NR	5	4.2		
Personal savings	58	48.3		
Family and Friends	33	27.5		
Commercial Bank	14	11.7		
Cooperatives	8	6.7		
Thrift Contributions	1	0.8		
Microcredit Institutions	1	0.8		
<b>Visits from Extension agents</b>				
Frequently	46	38.3		
Sometimes	63	52.5		
Rarely	7	5.8		
Never	4	3.3		

**Source: Field survey, 2017.**

**NR= No Response**

#### *Respondents' Level of Awareness of Social Media*

As shown in Table 2, the pooled results show that almost all the respondents are aware of Facebook (88.3%), Google (78.3%), WhatsApp (74.2%),

YouTube (74%), and BBM (60%). This implies that the respondents are very conversant with these particular forms of social media. This findings is in line with Garaku (2009) who says Facebook is the most popular

SMS and had over 400million active users in 2010; hence, the social media is gaining more popularity for communication and dissemination of information. This is also an indication that most (81.7%) of the poultry farmers as in Table 4.1 are highly literate and educated. Also this can be due to the functions it performs and because they are cheaper to access. The standard deviation (SD =0.29), (SD =0.48), (SD =0.44), (SD

=0.59), (SD =0.62) all have a dispersion of  $2.55 \pm 0.29$ ,  $2.13 \pm 0.48$ ,  $2.17 \pm 0.44$ ,  $2.01 \pm 0.59$ ,  $2.00 \pm 0.62$  respectively; all deviates from the mean except Facebook which does not deviate from the mean, showing that the significance of Facebook is very strong across all the population and the respondents are highly aware of Facebook compared to the other SMS.

**Table 2: Respondents' level of awareness of social media**

Variable	Awareness		Level of awareness	
	F n=120	%	Mean	Std. Dev
Facebook	106	88.3	2.55*	0.29
Instagram	67	55.8	1.98	0.64
Twitter	69	57.5	1.98	0.64
Youtube	74	61.7	2.01*	0.59
Skype	52	43.3	1.82	0.67
WhatsApp	89	74.2	2.17*	0.44
Linkedin	31	25.8	1.65	0.74
Pinterest	17	14.2	1.59	0.77
BBM	72	60.0	2.00*	0.62
Slideshare	23	19.2	1.61	0.77
Blogger	30	25.0	0.67	0.74
Snapchat	38	31.7	1.76	0.71
Google	94	78.3	2.13*	0.48
Academia	16	13.3	1.61	0.78

Source: Field survey, 2017.

Multiple Responses

\*Mean  $\geq 2.0$  = High level of awareness

#### *Constraints to the Effective Usage of Social Media by Respondents*

The results on Table 3 shows that the very serious constraints of the respondents were erratic power supply ( $\bar{x}$ = 3.18), high consumption of megabyte ( $\bar{x}$ = 3.16), poor internet network ( $\bar{x}$ = 3.01), high cost of data purchase ( $\bar{x}$ = 2.96), poor access to internet ( $\bar{x}$ = 89), lack of training on the usage of social media ( $\bar{x}$ = 2.78), lack of privacy ( $\bar{x}$ = 2.70) and high cost of mobile phones and computers ( $\bar{x}$ = 2.58) respectively. This is in line with Greenberg (2005) who claimed high cost of gadgets and lack of skills are the major barriers to the use of internet based communication. It is also agrees with Sokoya *et al* (2012) who claimed that poor quality of available ICTs, erratic electricity, poor

connectivity and high data consumption tariffs are some of the problems faced with the use of ICTs. However, the standard deviation value (SD =1.32) for erratic power supply, (SD =1.44) for high cost of megabyte, (SD =1.33) for poor internet network, (SD =1.49) for high cost of data purchase, (SD =1.58) for lack of training on the usage of social media, (SD =1.14) for poor access to internet, (SD =1.12) for lack of privacy, (SD =1.43) for high cost of mobile phones and computers, with a dispersion of  $3.18 \pm 1.32$ ,  $3.16 \pm 1.44$ ,  $3.01 \pm 1.33$ ,  $2.96 \pm 1.49$ ,  $2.89 \pm 1.58$ ,  $2.78 \pm 1.14$ ,  $2.70 \pm 1.12$ ,  $2.58 \pm 1.43$  respectively, showing that they all deviate from the mean which implies that the constraints are not very serious across all the respondents.

**Table 3: Constraints to the effective usage of social media by respondents**

Constraints	Mean	Std. Dev
Low level of competence in social media usage	2.43	1.48
Lack of training on the usage of social media	2.78*	1.58
High cost of mobile phones and computers	2.58*	1.43
Poor internet network	3.01*	1.33
High cost of data purchase	2.96*	1.49
High consumption of megabyte	3.16*	1.44
Erratic power supply	3.18*	1.32
Lack of privacy	2.70*	1.12
Poor access to internet	2.89*	1.14
Illiteracy	2.05	1.28

Source: Field survey, 2017.

\*Mean  $\geq 2.5$  = Serious constraints

**Hypothesis 1:**

Data in Table 4 show that sex (Wald= 2.22), education (Wald= 1.32), personal source of capital (Wald = 1.68) were the socio-economic characteristics that had significant relationship to the level of awareness of social media among the respondents at 5% level of significance. This implies that the male respondents are more aware of social media compared to the female respondents. This could be because of the gender divide factor in Africa which makes men gain more access to technology than the females (Katungi, 2006; Wyche and Steinfield, 2015). It also implies that the more educated poultry farmers have a higher awareness of social media more than the non-educated poultry farmers which could be as a result of the

trainings they had undergone. This result also implies that respondents who sourced their capital from personal savings have a higher awareness of social media. The results also show that marital status (Wald= 4.41) and money lender as a source of capital (Wald = 6.73) are positively significant to the level of awareness of social media among the respondents at 1% level of significance. This implies that most married poultry farmers are more aware of social media than the unmarried poultry farmers. The result also implies that poultry farmers that source their capital from money lenders have very high awareness of social media. This could be attributed to the fact that they already have stipulated periods to pay back the money which usually has high interest rate.

**Table 4: Relationship between respondents' socio-economic characteristics and their level of awareness of social Media**

	B	S.E.	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Sex	1.243	0.559	2.22*	0.03	0.29
Age	-0.433	0.518	0.84	0.40	0.65
Marital status	3.622	0.82	4.41**	0.01	3.82
Education	1.951	1.477	1.32*	0.05	0.14
<b>Source of capital</b>					
Personal Savings	1.48	0.88	1.68*	0.05	0.63
Family & Friends	-1.05	2.80	0.38	0.84	0.44
Money lender	1.019	0.393	6.73**	0.01	2.77
Thrift	0.184	0.201	0.84	0.36	1.20
<b>Constant</b>	2.568	0.32	8.03**	0.01	30.70

Source: Field survey, 2017

R Square= 0.591ss

\*\*Significant at 1%

\*Significant at 5%

**Hypothesis 2:** Relationship between the Institutional Characteristics of Urban Poultry Farmers and Their Use of Social Media for Poultry Production.

Table 5 shows that type of labour ( $\bar{x}$ = 5.02) and source of capital ( $\bar{x}$ = 8.32) are positively significant to the use of social media at 1%. This implies that poultry farmers that utilize hired labour have more use of social media compared to poultry farmers that utilize

family labour. This could be attributed to the fact that in recent times labour are mostly hired through social media like Google and LinkedIn (Ezumah, 2013). It also implies that poultry farmers that source their capital from personal savings utilize social media more than poultry farmers that do not source their capital from their personal savings.

**Table 4.7.3: Relationship between the institutional characteristics of urban poultry farmers and their use of social media for poultry production.**

Variable	Coeff.	Std. Error	Z	P> z
Type of Labour	0.4464	0.0897	5.02**	0.01
Source of Capital	0.6929	0.8326	8.32**	0.01
Frequency of extension visits	0.1780	0.5279	0.34	0.73
Constant	0.2414	1.5862	0.15	0.88

Source: Field survey, 2017

\* Significant at 5%

\*\* Significant at 1%

Number of observation = 85

R<sup>2</sup> = 0.2141

**CONCLUSION**

From findings, this study concludes that most of the poultry farmers were aware of social media but

could not adequately use them due to different constraints.



## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Network providers should improve on their modes of operation and ensure that network is readily available in order for farmers to have access to information with regards to poultry farming and through the help of government reduce the cost of data purchase.
2. Government and donor agencies should help subsidize gadgets such as mobile phones and computers to make it readily available to poultry farmers as cost of gadgets was a major constraint that the poultry farmers faced.

## REFERENCES

1. Abiola, M.O., Edeoghon, C.O (2014). Information Needs of Urban Poultry Producers in Owerri North Local Government Area of Imo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Innovations and Research*. 2, 6: 882-886
2. Adesiyun, O. I. (2014). Technical Efficiency of Poultry Production in Afijio Local Government of Oyo State, Nigeria. *ISSN 2225-0565, Vol. 4(20)*, pg. 74-79.
3. Andres, D., & Woodard, J. (2013). Social Media Handbook for Agricultural Development Practitioners. USAID and FHI 360.
4. Ezumah, B.A. (2013). College Students' Use of Social Media: Site Preferences, Uses and Gratifications Theory Revisited, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, vol. 4(5), 27-34.
5. Food and Agricultural Organization (2003). Statistical Data Base of Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nation, Rome, Italy. Retrieved 3<sup>rd</sup> of November 2016 from <http://faosta.fao.org>.
6. Garuku, M. (2009) "Inventory of Innovative Farmer Advisory Services Using ICTs." *Prepared for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA)*
7. Greenberg, A. (2005): ICTs for Poverty Alleviation: Basic tool and Enabling sector. Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA). Available (on-line) <http://www.sida.se/publication>. Accessed 4/08/2017.
8. Katungi, E. (2006). Gender, Social Capital and Information Exchange in Rural Uganda IFPRI and Melinda Smale, IFPRI (International Food Policy Research Institute) CAPR Working Paper No. 59, University of Pretoria, Uganda.
9. Lagos State Business Directory (2012). Information Supplied by Ministry of Commerce and Industry. LSBDD, Ikeja, Lagos State. [www.lagostate.gov.ng](http://www.lagostate.gov.ng)
10. Nwaogwugwu, O. N. & Lemea, C. T. (2016) Awareness of Poultry Farming Policies among Poultry Farmers in Peri-Urban Area of Gokana Local Government Area, Rivers State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Agriculture, Food and Environment*. Vol. 12(2), pg. 176-180
11. Ojo S. O. (2003). Productivity and technical efficiency of poultry egg production in Nigeria. *International Journal of Poultry Science*, vol. 2 (6) pp, 459-464
12. Oladeji, J. O. (2011) Sources and utilization of poultry production information among poultry farmers in Oyo State. *International Journal of Livestock Production*, 2 (2), 011-016
13. Olaniyi, O. A. (2013). Assesment on Utilization of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) Among Poultry Farmers in Nigeria: An Emerging Challenge. *Transitional Journal of Science and Technology June 2013 edition*, 3, 6:29-43.
14. Sokoya, A. A., Onifade F.N., & Alabi A.O. (2012). Establishing Connections and Networking: The Role of Social Media in Agricultural Research in Agricultural Research
15. Tweeten, J.F. (2014). Perceptions Regarding Importance and Frequency of Use of Selected Communication Tools by Iowa Cattle Producers. Retrieved from Digital Depository @ Iowa State University. 13749.
16. Umerah, M. (2012). Comparative Assessment of Mass Media Usage by Poultry Farmers in Anambra and Enugu States of Nigeria. PG|MSC|09|51144. Department of Agricultural Extension, Nsukka. Nigeria.
17. Wyche, S. & Steinfield, C. (2015). Why Don't Farmers Use Cell Phones to Access Market Prices? Technology Affordances and Barriers to Market Information Services Adoption in Rural Kenya. *Information Technology for Development*. vol. 22 (2): 320-333.