

## Measurement of Socio-economic Status of Rural Male Farmers in Kwara State, Nigeria

Oladipo F.O. and Adekunle O.A.

Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

---

**Abstract:** With the dearth of socio-economic status scales and information bothering on socio-economic status of rural male farmers in Kwara State, this paper was undertaken to examine and establish the empirical procedure for socio-economic status measurement. A multi-stage sampling technique was used in selecting 640 respondents across the four ADP zones that make up Kwara Agricultural Development Project. A universe of 94 socio-economic status indicators was collated. In the item analysis of dichotomous and quantitatively measured items, the point-biserial correlation and t-test respectively were used. 46 items were found valid from the four ADP zones in the state. These 46 items were standardized into a socio-economic status scale for rural male farmers in Kwara State using sigma scoring method. The scale has concurrent validity ( $t = 62.58, p < 0.05$ ) and construct validity ( $r = 0.97, p < 0.05$ ). The scale is therefore recommended for agricultural policy makers, community development agents, extension professionals and social workers who may have interaction with rural male farmers in Kwara State, Nigeria.

**Key words:** Measurement, Socio-economic status, rural male farmers

---

### INTRODUCTION

In any society, individuals are ranked with respect to the amount of cultural possession, effective income, material possession, prestige and social participation. The position may be high or low depending on the possession and non-possession of any of these indicators. As observed by Onwueme and Ugbor<sup>[13]</sup>, members of any society are not merely differentiated according to the roles which they perform but are also ranked hierarchically.

Akinola and Patel<sup>[3]</sup>, noted that very few studies have been carried out in the area of socio-economic status scaling in Nigeria.

The scarcity of these scales could be adduced to the problems often encountered in social science research where certain characteristics such as level of living, degree of affluence, wealth and social status are to be measured.

The constraint stems from the fact that respondents do not feel comfortable to reveal information bearing on their wealth and social status directly for various personal reasons. Ekong<sup>[7]</sup> and Goldthorpe<sup>[8]</sup> explained that social service deals with human being directly and it is often unethical or impossible to control as those features which impinge upon the human being as a subject is a scientific experiment.

In developing countries, Nigeria as an example, dearth of socio-economic status scale could be adduced

to poor measurement approaches. The empirical process of social stratification in the nation has been hampered by inadequate instrument and procedure of measurement. To this Anderson and Morphy<sup>[4]</sup> conceded that this case is not so with industrialized nations and noted further that many of the existing socio-economic status scales were developed with the whites. And that it is not certain whether the same indices could be applied for the blacks. It is on this that caution has to be exercised.

Different approaches have been used in the assessment of status of individual in the society. Some researchers used cursory examination of few indicators of socio-economic status. For instance, Rosser and Haris<sup>[17]</sup> used occupation, Straus<sup>[18]</sup> assigned high socio-economic status to white collar workers and high income farmers while low socio-economic status is for manual workers and farmers with low income. However, the occupational mobility, according to Rose<sup>[16]</sup>, has made this index a difficult one.

The cursory examination is however unacceptable in this era of globalization with scientific and technological revolution. It is therefore very pertinent to provide an empirical foundation for ascribing socio-economic status position to individual rather than arbitrary description. This would follow the caution given by Lloyd<sup>[11]</sup> that socio-economic status should be devoid of arbitrariness.

For effective agricultural extension services, it is imperative to have a good understanding of the rural male farmers who constitute the virile unit, and who are actively involved in agricultural production. With the knowledge of rural male farmers' attributes, agric extension agents would be able to relate well and this will enhance, to a greater extent, the efficiency of their services. Standardized scale of socio-economic status could serve as instrument for the assessment of the socio-economic status of rural male farmers. Having obtained the socio-economic status, certain attributes and behavioural tendencies of these farmers could be deduced, Oladipo<sup>[12]</sup>.

Realizing that the data used in the measurement of socio-economic status demands more reliable procedure for developing a scale to measure socio-economic status of individuals in our society, there is therefore, a need to develop scale for measuring socio-economic status of rural male farmers. It is on this premise that this paper focused the measurement of a socio-economic status of rural male farmers in Kwara State, Nigeria.

The main objective of this study is to construct and standardize a socio-economic status scale for rural male farmers in Kwara State, Nigeria.

The specific objectives are:

1. to collate a universe of social status indicators of rural male farmers in Kwara State;
2. to validate social status indicators for rural male farmers in the four ADP zones of Kwara State;
3. to identify valid socio-economic indicators for rural male farmers in Kwara State;
4. to standardize a scale to measure socio-economic status of rural male farmers in Kwara State;
5. to determine the validity and reliability of the scale.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

The population for this study was rural male farmers in Kwara State. The Kwara State has 16 local government areas grouped into four Agricultural Development Project (ADP) zones Kwara Diary<sup>[10]</sup>. Purposive sampling was used in the pre-selection of 16 villages in each zone, out of about 20 villages constituting about 70%.

**Sampling Technique and Sample Size:** To explain the sampling technique and sample size for this study, the table 1 below is very relevant.

The sampling procedure was multistage.

**Stage I:** Purposive sampling was used in the pre-listing (pre-selection) of sixteen (16) villages in each zone. This was done by firstly visiting the Local Government

Secretariat and ADP zonal offices to get the list of villages primarily known for farming (as occupation) such that rural male farmers whose livelihood is majorly farming are selected for the study. The selection was made such that every Local Government Area was involved purposively to ensure that all sub-cultures were considered for the study.

**Stage II:** From the pre-listed sixteen (16) villages, in each zone, a simple random selection of eight (8) villages was made. Each name of the sixteen (16) villages was written on a piece of paper and squeezed. A passerby was asked to pick any eight (8). The eight (8) picked villages thus formed the actual representative villages from each zone.

**Stage III:** From each of the eight (8) villages in each zone, the male farmers' listing was done through the assistance of the community leader. Such were those whose livelihood is farming as an occupation and not just on part-time. Going by these stages, in each zone, eight (8) villages were selected and in each village, a random selection of twenty (20) male farmers were chosen, making a sample size of one hundred and sixty (160) respondents per zone. For the whole state, that is, in the whole four zones the total sample were six hundred and forty (640) male farmers.

**The Interview Schedule:** The items for the experimental schedule were selected through a preliminary survey conducted by asking few male farmers in each of the ADP zones to identify items that could enhance the socio-economic status of male farmers. In addition, as Patel and Antonio<sup>[14]</sup> did, more items were selected through personal survey and observation in the villages, private correspondence with other experts in rural development and review of literatures.

The list of items collated consisted of one hundred and four (104) items which was later pruned to retain only the more essential items. In this regard, the criteria used were that the items to be selected should be observable, scorable, and suitable for the area and must be good indicators of socio-economic status. Therefore, ambiguous (vague) items and those possessed by only one socio-economic status category such as refrigerator, outside brooms, mud house, books/newspaper shelves, blender, and walking sticks were rejected from the list. The abridged list thus prepared consisted of ninety-four (94) items. This schedule was later pre-tested with twenty (20) farmers selected at random for the rural area. In this regard, necessary modifications in the schedule structure, arrangement of the questions and other necessary

changes were effected. The final draft of the schedule was eventually prepared into structured questionnaire that was used to elicit information from the respondents.

**Data Collection and Data Analysis:** The ninety four (94) items constituting the final draft of the schedule collated were eventually designed to form the first part of the questionnaire used for the study. The other aspect of the questionnaire featured the adoption of some ADP technologies.

Item analysis procedure was used in finding out the discrimination power of the items Socio-economic Status (S.E.S) indicators. The item analysis was done for the 94 items in each of the ADP zones of Kwara State.

As used by Akinola and Patel<sup>[3]</sup>, the uniform scoring method was adopted for the possession and non-possession of item, the value of one (1) and zero (0) respectively were assigned. Items measured quantitatively have possession scores which ranged from one to six (1 - 6) depending on the number of items recorded against the indicator. With this approach, a score was obtained for each respondent. Therefore, for all the respondent in each ADP zone scores were arranged from low to high in order to form the criterion scores.

For dichotomous items, the point-biserial correlation coefficient (rpbis) was used for the item analysis. The criterion scores, number of possession, number of non-possession and total for each criterion score were tabulated. Items selected as valid were those with rpbis of 0.55 and above.

On the other hand, for the quantitatively measured items, the criterion scores, possession scores and the total for each criterion scores were tabulated. The upper twenty five per cent (25%) and lower twenty five per cent (25%) possession scores were analyzed with t-test at 0.05 level of significance. Those valid were significant items.

Finally, all the selected valid items were subjected to weighting and standardization adopting the sigma scoring procedure as used by Jagne and Patel<sup>[9]</sup>. The tables 2 and 3 below show the procedure.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The result of the item analysis is shown in the table 4.

On ADP zones, through which the whole state was grouped, it was found that sixty-six (66), sixty-three (63), sixty-nine (69) and seventy one (71) items were valid in zones A, B, C and D respectively.

**The Socio-economic Status Scale:** The forty six (46) valid socio-economic status indicators in Kwara State were standardized using the sigma scoring method into a socio-economic status scale. This is shown in the table 5 below.

**The Strata for Rural Male Farmers Socio-economic Status:** The socio-economic status scores were generated through the responses of rural male farmers vis-à-vis the "possession" and "non-possession" of the items on the scale. The scores ranged between one hundred and thirty five (135) and three hundred and one (301). These scores were eventually categorized into three strata with 39.14 percentile. The result obtained is shown in the table 6.

From the table 6 it is shown that rural male farmers who scored below 171 belong to low socio-economic status while those who scored between 172 - 230 belong to middle socio-economic status. Those with 231 and above are in high socio-economic status category.

In other word, among the rural male farmers in the four ADP zones, these three (3) socio-economic categories were identified. With this three-field of classification, the result agreed with Onwueme and Ugbor<sup>[13]</sup> that three social classes were distinct in any society.

**Validation of the Scale:** The obtained socio-economic status scale was subjected to both construct and concurrent validity.

**Construct Validity:** The scale was validated against adoption scores. The adoption scores were correlated with the socio-economic status scores and the coefficient of 0.92  $p < 0.05$  ascertained the construct validity. There was a positive relationship between the adoption and socio-economic status of the farmers. This result is in line with the findings of Rogers<sup>[15]</sup>, Chapin<sup>[6]</sup>, Adhikary<sup>[11]</sup> and Akinola and Patel<sup>[3]</sup>.

**Concurrent Validity:** As used by Akinola and Patel<sup>[3]</sup>, the 't' test was employed in testing the concurrent validity of the scale. The socio-economic status scores obtained were arranged from low to high. The scores of the upper 25% made up one hundred and sixty respondents and lower 25% made up of another one hundred and sixty respondents were compared using t-test distribution. A t-value ( $t = 62.58, p < 0.05$ ) ascertained the concurrent validity of the scale. The implication of this is that the scale discriminates between low and high classes of socio-economic status. This is in congruent with the findings of Svensson<sup>[19]</sup> and Bills<sup>[5]</sup>.

**Table 1:** Sampling Distribution and Size

Zones	No. of LGA	No. of pre-listed villages from each zone	Actual No. of villages chosen	Sample size/village	Total No. of respondents
A	2	16	8	20	160
B	2	16	8	20	160
C	5	16	8	20	160
D	7	16	8	20	160
	16	64	32	80	640

Source: field survey, 2008

**Table 2:** Standardisation of Valid Socio-Economic Status Indicators Using Sigma Scoring for Children in Tertiary Institution

No of Possession	F	CF	CFM	CPM	Z	(Z + 2) X 2	Standard score
0	312	312	156	0.244	-0.693	2.614	3
1	184	496	404	0.631	0.335	4.67	5
2	80	576	536	0.838	0.986	5.972	6
3	20	596	586	0.916	1.379	6.758	7
4	16	612	604	0.944	1.589	7.178	7
>4	28	640	626	0.978	2.014	8.028	8

Source: field survey, 2008

**Table 3:** Standardisation of Valid Socio-Economic Status Indicators Using Sigma Scoring for Membership of social club

	F	Proportion	Z	(Z + 2) X 2	Standard score
Yes	220	$\frac{100-34.38}{100-17.19} = 0.828$	0.946	5.892	6
No	420	$\frac{65.63}{100} = 0.328$	-0.445	3.11	3

Source: field survey, 2008

**Table 4:** Item Analysis of Socio-Economic Status Indicators in Kwara State

	Zone A		Zone B		Zone C		Zone D		Over All Remark Statistical Tool
	Index	DS	Index	DS	Index	DS	Index	DS	
1 Number of wives	2.316	☐	2..848	☐	2.916	☐	2.9116	☐	t
2 Total number of children	2.465	☐	2.301	☐	2.965	☐	2.965	☐	t
3 Children in primary school	1.68	☐	6.118	☐	8.621	☐	8.621	☐	t
4 Children in secondary school	12.059	☐	2..928	☐	12.059	☐	2.059	☐	t
5 Children in higher institution	7.340	☐	8.319	☐	7.340	☐	7..340	☐	t
6 Number of relatives trained up to secondary schools	7.417	☐	8..440	☐	7.417	☐	7.417	☐	t
7 Children who are graduates	2.261	☐	5.000	☐	14.261	☐	4.261	☐	t
8 Children who are in civil service work	9.762	☐	10.955	☐	9.762	☐	9..762	☐	t
9 Children in other better highly placed job	13.758	☐	1.67	☐	13.758	☐	1.758	☐	t
10 Traditional beads	0.13	×	0.24	×	0.114	×	0.10	×	rpbis
11 Neck lace	0.23	×	0.93	☐	0.77	☐	0.34	×	“
12 Ownership of cement house in village	0.74	☐	0.86	☐	0.62	☐	0.75	☐	“

**Table 4: Continue**

13	Ownership of cement house outside in village	0.73	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.89	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.66	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.84	<input type="checkbox"/>	“
14	Earth pot	15.085	<input type="checkbox"/>	6.927	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.085	×	1.085	×	t
15	Earth plate	13.131	<input type="checkbox"/>	4.990	<input type="checkbox"/>	13.131	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.131	×	t
16	High position of in-law in the society	18.109	<input type="checkbox"/>	11.192	<input type="checkbox"/>	11.109	<input type="checkbox"/>	11.109	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
17	Traditional attires	5.088	<input type="checkbox"/>	6.624	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.088	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.088	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
18	Pair of shoes	7.448	<input type="checkbox"/>	8.850	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.448	<input type="checkbox"/>	7.448	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
19	Rooms with cement floor	5.484	<input type="checkbox"/>	6.686	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.484	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.484	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
20	Personal well	0.40	×	0.32	×	0.94	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.91	<input type="checkbox"/>	rpbis
21	Chieftancy tittle	0.73	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.24	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.97	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.82	<input type="checkbox"/>	“
22	Prince/Princess	12.558	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.237	X	12.538	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.558	<input type="checkbox"/>	rpbis
23	Cutlasses	22.299	<input type="checkbox"/>	3.671	<input type="checkbox"/>	6.299	✓	6.299	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
24	Hand hoes	19.723	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.722	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.732	<input type="checkbox"/>	6.356	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
25	Spade/Shovel	13.521	<input type="checkbox"/>	4.523	<input type="checkbox"/>	13.54	<input type="checkbox"/>	13.521	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
26	Axe	0.74	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.34	×	0.67	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.92	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
27	Wall hanger	0.78	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.73	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.68	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.82	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
28	Pit toilet	0.63	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.94	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.41	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.80	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
29	Cabinet of bed	2.132	<input type="checkbox"/>	3.683	<input type="checkbox"/>	2.132	<input type="checkbox"/>	2.132	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
30	Good type of mattress	2.628	<input type="checkbox"/>	4.457	<input type="checkbox"/>	2.628	<input type="checkbox"/>	2.628	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
31	Framed photograph of oneself	3.328	<input type="checkbox"/>	4.659	<input type="checkbox"/>	3.328	<input type="checkbox"/>	3.328	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
32	Farm size	1.868	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.851	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.897	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.868	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
33	Poultry	13.770	<input type="checkbox"/>	10.446	<input type="checkbox"/>	10.770	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.770	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
34	Fish concrete pond	0.799	×	13.002	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.002	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.002	×	t
35	Goats	17.828	<input type="checkbox"/>	19.168	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.828	×	9.828	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
36	Pig	0.800	×	0.774	×	0.800	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.800	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
37	Hired labour	0.70	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.74	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.55	×	0.94	<input type="checkbox"/>	rpbis
38	Sheep	20.237	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.651	×	0.237	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.237	×	t
39	Cattle	9.109	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.977	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.109	×	9.109	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
40	Yam barn	18.914	<input type="checkbox"/>	2.067	<input type="checkbox"/>	10.914	<input type="checkbox"/>	10.914	×	t
41	Granaries	9.565	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.116	×	9.565	<input type="checkbox"/>	9.565	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
42	Cassava grating machine	22.356	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.829	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.356	<input type="checkbox"/>	10.356	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
43	Grains grinding machine	14.826	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.650	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.826	×	14.826	<input type="checkbox"/>	t
44	Ladder	0.96	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.53	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.53	<input type="checkbox"/>	0.37	×	rpbis

**Table 4: Continue**

45	Rice milling machine	22.356	☐	5.829	☐	0.356	×	0.356	☐	t
46	Fish merchant	16.337	☐	1.274	×	0.337	×	1.337	☐	t
47	Plots of land owned inside in the village	18.109	☐	21.192	☐	17.109	☐	18.109	☐	t
48	Plots of land owned outside in the village	0.871	×	1.406	×	8.871	☐	8.871	☐	t
49	Knapsack sprayer	0.43	×	0.64	☐	0.94	☐	0.59	☐	rpbis
50	Rich and having high capacity to spend on occasion	13.262	☐	15.983	☐	13262	☐	13.262	☐	t
51	Number of horse	0.533	×	0.879	×	0.553	×	0.553	×	t
52	Motor cycle	0.45	☐	0.75	☐	0.72	☐	0.791	☐	rpbis
53	Cars/Vehicles	0.47	☐	0.76	☐	0.64	☐	0.81	☐	rpbis
54	Canoes	0.795	×	1.795	☐	0.795	×	0.258	×	rpbis
55	Turntable/Speakers	0.44	×	0.89	☐	0.94	☐	0.94	☐	rpbis
56	Radio cassette	0.47	☐	0.88	☐	0.47	☐	0.47	☐	t
57	Television set	0.250	×	0.919	×	0.258	×	0.258	×	t
58	Ceiling fans/Table fans	1.395	×	0.258	×	0.795	×	0.759	×	rpbis
59	Executive chairs	0.25	×	0.47	×	0.82	☐	0.82	☐	rpbis
60	Gas lamp	0.34	×	0.34	×	0.94	☐	0.87	☐	rpbis
61	Stove	0.37	×	0.24	×	0.96	☐	0.94	☐	t
62	Personal generator	21.253	☐	0.619	×	1.230	×	0.253	×	rpbis
63	Wheel barrow	0.74	☐	0.43	×	0.74	☐	0.82	☐	rpbis
64	Wall clock	0.75	☐	0.47	☐	0.85	☐	0.62	☐	rpbis
65	Ward robe	0.95	☐	0.41	☐	0.72	☐	0.65	☐	rpbis
66	Rain coat	0.15	×	0.24	×	0.29	×	0.22	×	rpbis
67	Umbrella	0.96	☐	0.87	☐	0.88	☐	0.90	☐	rpbis
68	Touch light	3.429	×	0.499	×	3.429	☐	3.492	☐	t
69	Standing mirror	0.74	☐	0.97	☐	0.71	☐	0.81	×	rpbis
70	Dinning table	0.83	☐	0.98	☐	0.94	×	0.41	×	rpbis
71	Curtained parlor	0.795	×	0.258	×	0.795	×	0.795	☐	t
72	Metal buckets	0.354	×	0.549	☐	0.736	☐	0.736	☐	t
73	Plastic buckets	3.410	☐	5.015	☐	3.410	☐	3.410	☐	t
74	Grinding stone	4.114	☐	6.747	☐	4.114	☐	4.114	☐	t
75	Frying pan	0.94	☐	0.96	☐	0.84	☐	0.74	☐	rpbis
76	Glass cups	2.327	☐	3.816	×	2.327	×	2.327	☐	t

**Table 4: Continue**

77	Kettle	0.84	☐	0.43	☐	0.24	×	0.56	☐	rpbis
78	Bicycle	0.94	☐	0.54	×	0.34	×	0.51	×	rpbis
79	Electronic iron	0.708	×	0.496	☐	0.708	×	0.708	☐	rpbis
80	Coal iron	0.422	×	3.625	☐	0.422	☐	9.422	☐	t
80	Metal spoons	0.93	☐	0.94	×	0.82	☐	0.52	☐	t
82	Travelling bags	1.529	☐	1.054	☐	5.529	☐	5.529	×	rpbis
83	Hurricane lantern	21.253	☐	3.619	☐	21.253	☐	0.253	☐	t
84	Glass plate	7.134	☐	8.093	☐	7.134	☐	7.134	☐	t
85	Wrist watch	0.74	×	0.46	×	0.92	×	0.84	×	t
86	Can you read in English	0.14	×	0.17	×	0.14	×	0.19	×	rpbis
87	Can you write in English	0.13	×	0.12	×	0.30	×	0.24	×	rpbis
88	Can you read your native dialect	0.23	×	0.124	×	0.61	☐	0.74	☐	rpbis
89	Do you read news paper often	0.14	×	0.15	×	0.30	×	0.82	☐	rpbis
90	Membership of social clubs	0.78	☐	0.65	☐	0.65	☐	0.94	☐	rpbis
91	Membership of traditional council	0.43	×	0.43	×	0.46	☐	0.83	☐	rpbis
92	Official in a religion organisation	0.79	☐	0.97	☐	0.49	☐	0.85	☐	rpbis
93	Membership of traditional council	0.21	×	0.47	☐	0.55	☐	0.81	☐	rpbis
94	Membership of co-operative society	0.85	☐	0.53	☐	0.48	☐	0.94	☐	rpbis

NB: -Key

\*= Accepted valid item

x = Rejected item

DS = Decision

T = t-test was used in the item analysis for quantitatively measured item through spss/pct.

Decision for T = Item is consider valid when the observed is higher than critical T value.

rpbis = Point biserial correlation coefficient was used in item analysis for dichotomized items

MP - MN

rpbis = \* P (1 - P)

St

Where MP = Mean Criterion score for possession of items

MN = Mean Criterion score for non-possession of items

St = Standard deviation

P = Proportion

Decision for rpbis = item is considered valid if the rpbis is above 0.55

Sources:- Field survey, 2008.

**Table 5: Socio-economic Status Scale for Rural Male Farmers in Kwara State**

S/N	Description of items	No. of items possessed/non-possession	Standard Scores/Weight
1	Number of wives	0	1
		1	2
		2	2
		3	3
		4	4
		≥4	5

**Table 5: Continue**

2	Number of children	0	1
		1-3	2
		4-6	4
		7-9	7
		>9	8
		<hr/>	
3	Children in primary school	0	0
		1	0
		2	0
		3	3
		4	5
		>4	6
<hr/>			
4	Children in secondary school	0	1
		1	4
		2	5
		3	6
		4	6
		>4	7
<hr/>			
5	Children in tertiary institution	0	3
		1	5
		2	6
		3	7
		4	7
		>4	8
<hr/>			
6	Number of relatives trained up to secondary school	0	3
		1	5
		2	6
		3	6
		>3	8
		<hr/>	
7	Children who are graduates	0	2
		1	3
		2	4
		3	4
		>3	6
		<hr/>	



**Table 5: Continue**

8	Children who are in civil service	0	2
		1	4
		2	6
		3	7
		>3	8
9	Children in other better highly placed job	0	2
		1	4
		2	6
		3	7
		>3	8
10	Ownership cement in the village	Yes	3
		No	3
11	Ownership of cement inside the village	Yes	6
		No	3
12	High position of in-law in the society.	Yes	6
		No	3
13	Traditional attires	0	3
		1	5
		2	7
		>2	8
14	Pair of shoes	0	3
		1	5
		2	6
		>2	8
15	Rooms with cemented floor	0	3
		1	5
		2	7
		>2	8
16	Framed photography of oneself	0	3
		1	6
		2	6
		3	7
		>3	10
17	Rich and having enough capacity to spend on occasion	Yes	6
		No	5

**Table 5: Continue**

18	Cutlasses	0	0
		1 - 3	2
		4 - 6	4
		7 - 9	5
		>9	7
		<hr/>	
19	Hand hoes	0	1
		1	2
		2	4
		3	5
		>3	7
		<hr/>	
20	Spade/shovel	0	2
		1	3
		2	5
		3	6
		>3	7
		<hr/>	
21	Wall hanger	Yes	6
		No	3
22	Farm size	Less than 1 hectare	3
		1 Hectare	5
		2 Hectare	5
		3 Hectare	6
		4 Hectare	7
		>5 Hectare	9
		<hr/>	
23	Poultry	0	1
		1 - 10	3
		11 - 20	4
		21 - 30	5
		31 - 40	6
		41 - 50	6
		>50	7
		<hr/>	
24	Goat	0	0
		1 - 10	3
		11 - 120	5
		21 - 30	6
		31 - 40	8

**Table 5: Continue**

25	Hired labour	Yes	6
		No	3
26	Cattle	0	2
		1 - 10	4
		11 - 20	5
		21 - 30	6
		31 - 40	7
		>40	8
		27	Yam barn
No	3		
28	Plots of land owned in the village	Yes	6
		No	3
29	Cabinet bed	0	4
		1	6
		2	7
		>2	8
		30	Good type of mattress
1	6		
≥2	7		
31	Motorcycle	Yes	6
		No	3
32	Cars/vehicle	Yes	5
		No	3
33	Radio/cassette player	Yes	6
		No	3
34	Wall clock	Yes	5
		No	3
35	Umbrella	0	0
		1	1
		2	4
		>2	4
36	Standing mirror	Yes	6
		No	3
37	Plastic buckets	0	3
		1	6
		2	7
		>2	8

**Table 5: Continue**

38	Grinding stones	Yes	5
		No	2
39	Frying pan	Yes	6
		No	3
40	Glass cup	1 - 5	4
		6 - 10	6
		11 - 15	7
		> 15	8
41	Metal spoons	1 - 5	3
		6 - 10	5
		>10	7
42	Glass plate	1 - 3	3
		4 - 6	5
		7 - 9	6
		10 - 12	7
		13 - 15	7
		>15	8
43	Wrist watch	Yes	7
		No	4
44	Membership of social club	Yes	6
		No	3
45	Official in religion organisation	Yes	6
		No	3
46	Membership of cooperative society	Yes	5
		No	2

Source: field survey, 2008

**Table 6: Kwara State Rural Male Farmers' Socio-economic Classes**

Score Range	Socio-economic Class
Below 171	Low socio-economic status
172 - 230	Middle socio-economic status
Above 231	High socio-economic status

Source: field survey, 2008

**Reliability Analysis:** The reliability of the scale was determined using test-re-test method. Ten per cent (10%) of the selected respondents in each zone with a total of sixty four (64) respondents were used for the test. The correlation coefficient of 0.97 obtained ascertained the reliability of the scale.

**Conclusion:** The use of empirical instrument particularly scale has become a necessity following the observation of Akinola and Patel<sup>[3]</sup> as reported by Akinbile<sup>[2]</sup>, there is a plethora of literature in developing countries describing socio-economic status but they often lack empirical validity.

However, for rural male farmers in Kwara State, valid items of socio-economic status (SES) have been identified for a scale, which has been standardized and found reliable.

## REFERENCES

1. Adhikary, M.M., 2004. National and socio-economical resources vis-à-vis crop productivity an adaptable linkage for sustainable development in Indian sub-continent. Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Crop Science Congress Brisbane. Australia 26 September - 1 October 2004.

2. Akinbile, L.A., 1999. "Scaling Technique for multi-item variables" in Eds Oladele, I.O., Akinbile, L.A. and Adekoya, O.E. (1999). *Social science Research*. Approaches, Techniques and Reporting. Ijebu-Ode: Shanu Books Nigeria Ltd.
3. Akinola, C.A. and A.U. Patel, 1987. "Construction and Standardization of a Scale of Measure Socio-economic Status, of Heads of Rural Households (Gandu) in the Funtua Zone of Kaduna State". *Journal of Rural Development*, 10(1): 85-96.
4. Anderson, S.B. and R.T. Murphy, 1975. *Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, pp: 32-379.
5. Bills, D.B., D.S. Godfrey and A.O. Hallen, 1985. "A scale to measure socio-economic status of occupations in Brazel". *Rural Sociology*, 50(2): 225 - 250.
6. Chapin, F.S., 1983. *Measurement of Social Status*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp: 43.
7. Ekong, E.E., 2003. *An Introduction to Rural Sociology*. Ibadan: Jumak Publishers Ltd, pp: 439.
8. Goldthorpe, J.H., 2000. Rent, class conflict and class structure: A reply to Sorenson. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(6): 1572 - 1582.
9. Jagne, J.N. and A.U. Patel, 1981. "Adoption of the Individual and Package of Improved Practices by Package and Non-Package Groundnut Farmers in the Gambia". *The Nigerian Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 1(1).
10. Kwara Diary, 2008.
11. Lloyd, P.C., 1974. *Power and Independence: Urban Africans Perception of Social Inequality*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp: 39.
12. Oladipo, F.O., 2006. *Construction and Standardization of a Socio-economic Status scale of rural male farmers in Kwara State*. Ph.D. Thesis in the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ilorin.
13. Onwueme, M.S. and O. Ugbor, 1994. *Education and Society: The Sociology of Education*. Nigerian Research Association. Benin-City: University of Benin, 5 - 79.
14. Patel, A.U. and Q.B.O. Anthonio, 1974. Construction and standardization of a scale of measuring Socio-Economic Status (SES) of rural farm families in Western Nigeria. *Journal of Economic and Social Studies*, 16.
15. Rogers, E.M., 1983. *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: The Free Press, 247 - 282.
16. Rose, D., 2001. *Comprising socio-economic classification: some comments on Goux's and Maurin's Social classes and employment relationships* Colchester: ISER; University of Essex
17. Rosser, C. and C. Harris, 1974. *The Family and Social Change*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp: 93 - 101.
18. Straus, M.A., 1975. "Social class and farm City Differences in Interaction with Kin in Relation to Societal Modernisation" *Journal of Rural Sociology*, 34(4): 476 - 495.
19. Svensson, E., 2001. Construction of a single global scale for multi-item assessments of the same variable. *Statistics in medicine*, 20: 3831 - 3846.