Empirical Determination of Socio-economic Status and its Relationship with Selected Characteristics of Rural Male Farmers in Kwara State, Nigeria

F.O. Oladipo and O.A. Adekunle

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

Abstract: Determination of socio-economic status (SES) is a very useful concept in understanding certain attributes of a person. For effective extension service, there is the need to know the SES and associated characteristics of farmers. This paper therefore sought to determine the SES of rural male farmers in Kwara State and as well examining the relationship between the SES score and farmers' personal characteristics. A multi-stage random sampling technique was used to sample 20 farmers from each of eight villages in each of the four zones that are Kwara State Agricultural Development Programme (ADP). A total of 640 respondents were sampled. Direct face-to-face interview methods with structured schedule were used for the purpose of data collection. Data were analyzed using ANOVA, multiple regression, point-biserial correlation and t-test statistical tools. For the four ADP zones, 94 SES indicators were collated. From this, only 46 SES items were found valid across the state. For zones A, B, C and D, the valid items were 66, 63, 69 and 71 respectively. There was a positive relationship between SES and some selected personal characteristics of the rural male farmers in the state. It was revealed that SES level was explained by adoption rate, leadership position, cosmopolitaness, educational level and attitude to innovation ($R^2 = 0.962$). Among the variables, attitude to innovation correlates positively ($r = 0.973$) with SES than other personal construct for SES. This is followed by adoption ($r = 0.936$), cosmopoliteness ($r = 0.931$), leadership ($r = 0.16$) and educational level ($r = 0.027$). The SES of rural male farmers could therefore be predicted by any of the tested constructs.

Key words: Determination, socio-economic status, relationship, selected characteristics, male farmers.

INTRODUCTION

Socio-economic status denotes the position of an individual in a community with respect to the amount of cultural possession, effective income, material possession, prestige and social participation. The factors, which account for the SES of individual in a society, are determined by the society. Schaefer[12] remarked that socio-economic classes are broad division composed of individuals who recognise one another as peers and cultural groupings marked by distinctive standards and styles of living, characteristics values and social attitudes.

Anderson[3] maintained that socio-economic status is a key notion in sociology that has been found useful in psychology, education and other related fields like Agricultural Extension. However, in the essence of it is that individual differences in their position in a social hierarchy is as a result of large variety of determinants and that their social positions have profound behavioural effects.

Social theorists have conceptually distinguished, among a host of related constructs, the most important scheme being Weber's triad of prestige or status wealth and power. This affects the level of living, and this level of living has been a dependent variable affected by production, and inversely by the size of population. Level of living according to Schaefer[12], Webb et al.[13], is concerned with the consumption or one of economic goods. Possession of an item is however not sufficient. It shows therefore that an item must be related to consumption pattern in order to differentiate actual levels of living from possession for symbolic reason. In relation to this Adhikary[1] and Oladipo[10] before conceded that the number of contacts made outside the immediate community (cosmopolitaness) and other relevant factors are essential in measuring socio-economic status. Nelson[8] identified variable or constructs of socio-economic indicators of enhanced natural resources management at a national scale to include adoption of innovation, attitude to change, programme participation, age, educational level and farm type.

Adhikary[1] also worked on the relationship of some socio-economic status and variables such as extension contact, attitude to innovation, crop yield index, communication service, etc. Similarly, Ghosh, Goswami and Mazumdar[6] examined the association

Corresponding Author: F.O. Oladipo, Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

between socio-economic variables and urban contact, risk orientation, attitude to dairy farming, etc.

This paper, noting the importance of farmers' attribute (socio-economic status), on which any developmental programmes for empowering inclined upon, sought to determine empirically the socio-economic status (SES) of rural male farmers in Kwara State, Nigeria. And more importantly, considering the theoretical backup, examine the relationship between the SES and some personal characteristics, (adoption, leadership position, cosmopolitaness, educational level and attitude to innovation) of rural male farmers in Kwara State, Nigeria.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The population for this study was rural male farmers is Kwara State. The Kwara State has 16 local government areas grouped into four Agricultural Development Project (ADP) zones[7]. Kwara Diary Purposive sampling was used in the pre-selection of 16 villages in each zone, out of about 20 villages constituting about 70%. From the pre-listed 16 villages, in each zone, a simple random selection of villages was made. And from each of the villages in each zone, the male farmers listing was done through the assistance of community leader. In each zone, 8 villages were selected and in each village, a random selection of 20 male farmers was chosen, making a sample size of 160 respondents per zone. However, for the whole state, (covering the four ADP zones), the total sample was 640 male farmers. Before going to formal data collection, a pilot study was carried out and accordingly appropriate changes in the construction and sequence of interview schedule were made. The schedule consisted of 94 collated items and other aspects of adoption behaviour, leadership position, cosmopolitaness, education level and the attitude to innovation. The schedule was administered to the respondents and the responses were recorded. Data were collected through face-to-face interview by the researchers themselves.

Data Analysis: Statistical analysis was done with the help of SPSS 10.0 packages.

Concerning the scale and in determining the valid items, item analysis procedure was used to find out the discrimination power of the 94 items (SES indicators) in each of the ADP zones.

The uniform scoring method as used by Akinola and Patel[2], 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 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 respondents in each ADP zone scores were ranged from low to high in order to form the criterion scores.

For dichotomous item 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 tabulated using t-test at 0.05 level of significance. Those valid were significant items (see table 3).

Finally, all the selected valid items were subjected to weighting and standardization adopting the sigma scoring procedure as used by Jagne and Patel[14]. The tables 1 and 2 below show the procedure.

All these standard scores of valid items were added together to get the respondent's SES score. The standard scores for the response categories were generated with sigma scoring method for the adoption of some ADP technology, education level and leadership position. For cosmopolitaness the sigma score was later transformed to 't' scores. And for the measurement of attitude of innovation, 4-points Likert scale was used. Innovation score for a respondent was obtained by adding together the respondent score for each attitude statement on attributes.

The SES scores and these personal characteristic scores were compared using ANOVA through SPSS package. To get more in-depth knowledge of SES, a deeper analysis was employed using Multiple Progression analysis. Finally, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used in determining the degree of relationship between SES and the selected characteristics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From the result of item analysis in the table 3 (**see Appendix**), forty six (46) items were found valid across the state. However, 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 is shown in the table 4.

Table 1: Standardisation of Valid Socio-Economic Status Indicators Using Sigma Scoring for Number of wives

No of Possession	F	CF	CFM	CPM	Z	(Z + 2) X 2	Standard score
0	52	52	26	0.041	-1.739	0.522	1
1	68	120	86	0.134	-1.108	1.784	2
2	44	164	142	0.222	-0.762	2.476	2
3	84	248	206	0.322	-0.462	3.076	3
4	392	640	444	0.694	0.507	5.014	5

Table 2: Standardisation of Valid Socio-Economic Status Indicators Using Sigma Scoring for Plots of land owned in the village

	F	Proportion		Z	(Z + 2) X 2	Standard score
Yes	136	$\frac{100-21.25}{100-10.63}$	2 =0.894	1.248	6.496	6
No	504	78.75	2 =0.394	-0.269	3.462	3

Table 3: 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	×	t
11	Neck lace	0.23	×	0.93	❐	0.77	❐	0.34	×	rpbis
12	Ownership of cement house in village	0.74	❐	0.86	❐	0.62	❐	0.75	❐	"
13	Ownership of cement house outside in village	0.73	❐	0.89	❐	0.66	×	0.84	❐	"
14	Earth pot	15.085	❐	6.927	❐	1.085	❐	1.085	×	t
15	Earth plate	13.131	❐	4.990	❐	13.131	❐	0.131	×	t
16	High position of in-law in the society	18.109	❐	11.192	❐	11.109	❐	11.109	❐	t
17	Traditional attires	5.088	❐	6.624	❐	5.088	❐	5.088	❐	t
18	Pair of shoes	7.448	❐	8.850	❐	7.448	❐	7.448	❐	t
19	Rooms with cement floor	5.484	❐	6.686	❐	5.484	❐	5.484	❐	t
20	Personal well	0.40	×	0.32	×	0.94	❐	0.91	❐	rpbis
21	Chieftancy tittle	0.73	❐	0.24	❐	0.97	❐	0.82	❐	"

Table 3: Continue

22	Prince/Princess	12.558	□	0.237	X	12.538	□	1.558	□	rpbis
23	Cutlasses	22.299	□	3.671	□	6.299	✓	6.299	□	t
24	Hand hoes	19.723	□	9.722	□	9.732	□	6.356	□	t
25	Spade/Shovel	13.521	□	4.523	□	13.54	□	13.521	□	t
26	Axe	0.74	□	0.34	×	0.67	□	0.92	□	t
27	Wall hanger	0.78	□	0.73	□	0.68	□	0.82	□	t
28	Pit toilet	0.63	□	0.94	□	0.41	□	0.80	□	t
29	Cabinet of bed	2.132	□	3.683	□	2.132	□	2.132	□	t
30	Good type of mattress	2.628	□	4.457	□	2.628	□	2.628	□	t
31	Framed photograph of oneself	3.328	□	4.659	□	3.328	□	3.328	□	t
32	Farm size	1.868	□	1.851	□	1.897	□	1.868	□	t
33	Poultry	13.770	□	10.446	□	10.770	□	1.770	□	t
34	Fish concrete pond	0.799	×	13.002	□	0.002	□	0.002	×	t
35	Goats	17.828	□	19.168	□	9.828	×	9.828	□	t
36	Pig	0.800	×	0.774	×	0.800	□	9.800	□	t
37	Hired labour	0.70	□	0.74	□	0.55	×	0.94	□	rpbis
38	Sheep	20.237	□	0.651	×	0..237	□	0.237	×	t
39	Cattle	9.109	□	9.977	□	9.109	×	9.109	□	t
40	Yam barn	18.914	□	2.067	□	10.914	□	10.914	×	t
41	Granaries	9.565	□	0.116	×	9.565	□	9..565	□	t
42	Cassava grating machine	22.356	□	5.829	□	0.356	□	10.356	□	t
43	Grains grinding machine	14.826	□	1.650	□	0.826	×	14.826	□	t
44	Ladder	0.96	□	0.53	□	0.53	□	0.37	×	rpbis
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

Table 3: Continue

#	Item									
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	X	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
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
81	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

Table 3: Continue

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 surrey, 2008.

Table 4: 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	5
2	Number of children	0	1
		1-3	2
		4-6	4
		7-9	7
		>9	8
3	Children in primary school	0	0
		1	0
		2	0
		3	3
		4	5
		>4	6

Table 4: Continue

4	Children in secondary school	0	1
		1	4
		2	5
		3	6
		4	6
		>4	7
5	Children in tertiary institution	0	3
		1	5
		2	6
		3	7
		4	7
		>4	8
6	Number of relatives trained up to secondary school	0	3
		1	5
		2	6
		3	6
		>3	8
7	Children who are graduates	0	2
		1	3
		2	4
		3	4
		>3	6
8	Children who are in civil service	0	2
		1	3
		2	4
		3	4
		>3	6
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	5
		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

Table 4: Continue

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
18	Cutlasses	0	0
		1 - 3	2
		4 - 6	4
		7 - 9	6
		>9	9
19	Hand hoes	0	1
		1	2
		2	4
		3	5
		>3	7
20	Spade/shovel	0	2
		1	3
		2	5
		3	6
		>3	7

Table 4: Continue

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
23	Poultry	0	1
		1 - 10	3
		11 - 20	4
		21 - 30	5
		31 - 40	6
		41 - 50	6
		>50	7
24	Goat	0	0
		1 - 10	3
		11 - 120	5
		21 - 30	6
		31 - 40	8
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	Yes	1
		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

Table 4: Continue

30	Good type of mattress	0	4
		1	6
		≥ 2	7
31	Motorcycle	Yes	5
		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
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

Table 4: Continue

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.

Testing of Hypotheses: Two hypotheses were tested. Hypothesis one stated that "there is no significant difference in the socio-economic status scores of rural male farmers across the four ADP zones in Kwara State". This hypothesis tested the differences in socio-economic status scores among the major ADP zones in Kwara State. The socio-economic status scores of rural male farmers in the four ADP zones were compared using Analysis of variance (ANOVA). The statistical package for social scientists (SPSS/PCt) was used. The result is as presented in the table 5.

The variation in the socio-economic status scores of the rural male farmers in the state could be adduced to the fact that the farmers are distinctly different in respect of cultural, economic, and material possession. The state comprised of different ethnic groups: Yoruba, Nupe, Baruba and Fulanis. These farmers are also of different religions: Christianity, Islamic and Traditional religions with different beliefs and aspirations. Their attitudes are therefore bound to vary in their relationship, working habit and reactions within the society. For example, in Muslim dominated section, there is a discrimination against the production and consumption of pigs and pork, which may not be necessarily showed in the Christian culture. The geographical locations of farmers in each zone differs most especially, the soil type, availability of labour and some other prevailing conditions. The productivity (yield) would definitely vary and the available income accruable varies along side with the productivity. Therefore, with variation in income, differences in their socio-economic status scores are justified.

Given the above result, the hypothesis one is thereby rejected. This implied that there was a significant difference in the socio-economic status scores of rural male farmers across the four ADP zones. This indicated that the socio-economic status scores of the rural male farmers in the ADP zones of Kwara State varied in spite of the common socio-economic status indicators that were used for the analysis.

Hypothesis two stated that "there is no significant relationship between socio-economic status and selected characteristics (adoption, leadership, cosmopoliteness, educational level and attitude to innovation) of rural male farmers in Kwara State".

For this hypothesis, the relationship between socio-economic status and personal characteristics of rural male farmers was determined. These personal characteristics were adoption, leadership, cosmopoliteness, educational level and attitude to innovation. The socio-economic status scores and these personal characteristics were used in the multiple regression analysis. To get more in-depth knowledge of socio-economic status a deeper insight was employed using multiple regression analysis.

Multiple Regression

Independent variables = 1 = Adoption score
2 = Leadership score
3 = Cosmopoliteness score
4 = Educational qualification score
5 = Attitude to innovation score

Dependent Variable 6 = SES scores

From the tables 6,7 and 8 it is shown that 96.2% of socio-economic status was explained by the selected characteristics of the rural male farmers. An analysis of variance ($P < 0.05$) obtained was greater than the tabulated at 0.05 level of significance. This means that the null hypothesis, which stated that there is no significant difference in the socio-economic status score of rural male farmers was rejected. An analysis of variance ($F = 35.835$, $P < 0.05$) showed that there was a significant relationship between socio-economic status and personal characteristics of the rural male farmers. It is shown in table 8 that education has the highest predictor of socio-economic status (SES). Education therefore serves as an instrument for reproducing hierarchically the socio-economic order of the society. This result agrees with the submissions of Ogunfiditimi[9], Rogers[11], Bowen[5] and Schaefer[12]. They all drew conclusion that those with higher education attainment are usually being faster adopters of innovation and they all, independently in their studies, found positive relationship between the level of education and socio-economic status of individuals in the society.

Table 5: Analysis of Variance Summary Table

Sources	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-cal	Sig. F
Between groups	3	18957.181	1458.245		
Within groups	636	73947.194	118.127		
Total	639				

F-cal = 12.35, P < 0.05.

Table 6: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate
1	0.981a	0.962	0.962	10.02588

a. Predictors: (constant), leadership position, cosmopolitaness, education qualification, adoption and attitude to innovation.
Multiple R = 0.981
R square = 0.962
Adjusted R square = 0.962
Standard Error of Estimate = 10.02588

Table 7: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Sources	Df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-cal	Sig. F
Regression	5	1805055.3	411011.067		
Residual	634	53728.565	103.518	35.83550	0.000

F = 3583.550
F. cal 35.83550, P < 0.05

Table 8: Variable in Equation

Variable	B	SE Standard Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(1)Adoption	9.766E.02	0.081	0.021	1.076	0.282
(2)Leadership position	0.517	0.193	0.022	2.168	0.031
(3)Cosmopoliteness	-3.612	0.316	-0.310	-14.588	0.000
(4)Educational level	3.335	0.755	0.060	3.095	0.002
(5)Attitude to innovation	-4.198	0.073	-0.666	-30.025	0.000
Constant	356.335	2.757		140.152	0.000

R^2 = 0.962

Table 9: Correlation Matrix between Socio-Economic Status and Selected Characteristics of Rural Male Farmers

	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6
X1	1.000	0.660	0.873	0.094	0.939	0.930
X2	0.660	1.000	0.500	0.581	0.644	0.616
X3	0.873	0.500	1.000	0.085	0.925	0.938
X4	0.094	0.581	0.085	1.000	0.024	0.027
X5	0.939	0.644	0.925	0.024	1.000	0.973
X6	0.930	0.616	0.938	0.027	0.973	1.000

Source: Field Survey, 2006
NB: X1 = Adoption scores
             X2 = Leadership scores
             X3 = Cosmopoliteness scores
             X4 = Educational level
             X5 = Attitude to innovation scores
             X6 = SES scores

It is on this similar basis that Onwueme and Ughor[15] posited that impact of education on adult status is even greater than that of family background. Schaefer[12] stressed further that education represents an important means of intergenerational mobility and as such three-fourth of educated men achieve some upward mobility. From the result, next to education are cosmopolitaness, leadership position, adoption and attitude to innovation.

From the variables in the equation, the prediction equation could be written as follows.

$$\hat{y} = a + b_{1\,x\,1} + b_{2\,x\,2} + b_{3\,x\,3} + b_{4\,x\,4} + b_{5\,x\,5}$$
$$\hat{y} = 356.335 + 9.76\,61_{x1} + 0.517_{x2} + (-3.612) + 3.335 + (-4.198)$$

The above equation could be used to predict socio-economic status scores of rural male farmers in Kwara State gives x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 and x_5.

PMP Correlation: The Pearson correlation was used in determining the degree of relationship between socio-economic status and adoption, leadership, cosmopoliteness, educational level, and attitude to innovation. This is presented in the table below.

In the table 9, the correlation matrix showed that attitude to innovation has the highest positive correlation (r = 0.973) with socio-economic status. This was followed by adoption (r = 0.930), cosmopoliteness (r = 0.938), leadership (r = 0.616) and educational level (r = 0.027).

Conclusion: Fourty-six socio-economic status innovations were found valid across the state. There was a significant difference in the SES of rural male farmers in the 4 ADP zones of Kwara State. There was a positive relationship between SES and the selected personal characteristics of the rural male farmers in the state as the study revealed that SES level was explained by adoption rate, leadership position, cosmopolitaness, educational level and attitude to innovation (R = 0.962). It therefore follows that SES of rural male farmers could be predicted by any of the examined constructs.

REFERENCES

1. Adhikary, M.M., 2004. National and socio-economical resources vis-à-vis crop productivity 0 an adaptable linkage for sustainable development in Indian sub-continent. Proceedings of the 4th International Crop Science Congress Brisbane. Australia 26 September – 1 October 2004.

2. 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.

3. Anderson, S.B.S. and R.T. Murphy, 1975. *Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, pp: 32-379.

4. Atala, T.K., J.P. Voh, Y.A. Abdullahi and J.A. Shebayan, 1993. "Professional competencies needed by Extension agents in Three Northern State of Nigeria" in (Eds) Olowu Tery (1993) "The Nigeria Journal of Run Extension and Development, 1(2x3): 95-105.

5. Bowen, W.G., 2004. The Quest for Equity: "Class" (Socio-economic status) in American Higher Education. A paper presented for the Jefferson Foundation Distinguished Lecture series University of Virginia on April 7th, 2004.

6. Ghosh, R.K., A. Goswami and A.K. Mazomdar, 2005. "Adoption Behaviour of the diary farmers in relation to artificial insemination in cooperative farming system". In Livestock research for Rural Development, 17(3).

7. Kwara Diary, 2008.

8. Nelson, R., 2004. Socio-economic indicators for natural resources management: capacity to change and adopt sustainable management practices in Australian Agriculture prepared for the National Land and Water Resources Audit Canberra, November.

9. Ogunfiditimi, T.O., 1981. "Adoption of Improved Practices: A Choice under Uncertainty". Ibadan Journal of Extension Education, 18(182): 30-35.

10. 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.

11. Rogers, E.M., 2003. Diffusions of innovations 5th Edition, New York: Free Press.

12. Schaefer, R.T., 2004. *Sociology*: A brief introduction 5th Edition. The McGraw-Hill Companies. Inc.

13. Webb, T., K. Cody, C. Mues and B. Harrison, 2003. Social and Economic Information for NRM: An initial Discussion Paper, National Land and water Resources Audit.

14. 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).

15. Onwueme, M.S. and O. Ugbor, 1994. *Education and Society: The Sociology of Education.* Nigerian Research Association. Benin-City: University of Benin., 5-79.

16. Webb, T., K. Cody, C. Mues and B. Harrison, 2003. Social and Economic Information for NRM: An initial Discussion Paper, National Land and water Resources Audit.