



## **Rural Dwellers' Perception of Human Trafficking and its Implication for Agricultural Production in Edo State, Nigeria**

**Ofuoku, A. U. and Uzokwe, U. N.** (Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Delta State University, Asaba Campus, PMB 95074, Asaba, Delta State, Nigeria)

**Citation:** Ofuoku, A. U. and Uzokwe, U. N. (2012) "Rural Dwellers' Perception of Human Trafficking and its Implication for Agricultural Production in Edo State, Nigeria", Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 394-404.



**Author(s)**

**Ofuoku, A. U.**

Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Delta State University, Asaba Campus, PMB 95074, Asaba, Delta State, Nigeria

*Email:* [ofuoku@yahoo.com](mailto:ofuoku@yahoo.com)

**Uzokwe, U. N.**

Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Delta State University, Asaba Campus, PMB 95074, Asaba, Delta State, Nigeria

*Email:*

[uheadauzokwe@yahoo.com](mailto:uheadauzokwe@yahoo.com)

## **Rural Dwellers' Perception of Human Trafficking and its Implication for Agricultural Production in Edo State, Nigeria**

### **Abstract**

This study was carried out to ascertain the perception of rural dwellers on human trafficking in relation to its effect on agricultural production in the three Senatorial Districts of Edo State, Nigeria. A sample size of 120 household heads was used for the study. Structured questionnaire and interview schedule were used to collect data for the study. The data were analyzed using frequency counts, means and percentage while Chi-Square statistical model and Tobit regression analytical model were used to test the hypotheses. It was discovered that the household members were trafficked as a result of push and pull factors. The trafficked members of household were actively involved in farming practices before being trafficked. There is significant relationship between human trafficking and agriculture production. Shortage of farm labor, decreased farm size, reduced farm income, reduced farm output, extra expenditure on hired labor and storage of food supply by the community were perceived as effect of human trafficking on agriculture. Age of the household head and the household size had significant effect on the number of household member trafficked. Human trafficking has an adverse effect on agricultural production. Extension department should therefore integrate anti-human trafficking campaigns with their services to the farming population.

**Keywords:** Rural dwellers, human trafficking, push factors and pull factors

### **Introduction**

Trafficking in human beings, especially women and girls is not new (UNESCO, 2006) and historically it has taken many forms but in the context of globalization has acquired shocking new dimensions. It is a complex multifaceted phenomenon involving multiple stake holders at the institutional and commercial level (UNICEF, 2004). It is a demand driven global business with a huge market for cheap labor and commercial sex confronting often insufficient or unexercised policy frame works or trained personnel to prevent it (UNDP, 2005).

Although Nigeria has enormous natural and human resources (Nigeria is still the 11<sup>th</sup>

largest producer of oil in the world), (UNESCO, 2006). Nigeria is still rated as one of the poorest countries in the world with per capital GNP of US \$280 for a population of about 133 million. Nigeria is a country rich in resources but with wide spread poverty (World Bank, 2005). Nigeria especially the southern part has a reputation for being one of the leading African countries in human trafficking. Trafficking involves the recruitment, transportation transfer, harboring or receipt of persons for the purpose of exploitation (UNCATO), (2000) as cited by UNESCO (2006). Men, women, and children are trafficked for many purposes, such as sexual exploitation, begging, underpaid and exploited forced labor in the agricultural, manufacturing,

construction industries as well as in domestic services.

About 92% of Nigerians trafficked to European countries for prostitution and other hard labor come from Edo and Delta States of Nigeria and are from rural areas (International Police Organization, 2000). Studies have shown that those recruited for trafficking are mainly women and children from poor family backgrounds and rural communities. Trafficking of potential farmers from the rural area however reduces the absolute number of the work force available within a family. The decline in both food and cash crop production has been attributed to so many factors such as shortage of extension personnel to educate the farmers on new innovation from research stations. This has also been linked to the insufficiency of agricultural production labor in Nigeria. The class of people trafficked are the major producers of food in Nigeria. Beyond the abuse involved in the commercial trafficking of women and children, human trafficking also entails all form of forced labor, debt bondage, and coerced domestic labor (Pugin 2009).

Nigeria ratified the UN protocol to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons especially women and children in 2001 and passed a national law against trafficking entitled "Trafficking in persons (Prohibition) law Enforcement and Administration Act 2003". Nigeria is one of the few African countries that passed such a law. Nigeria also passed the child Right Act in 2003, which deals comprehensively with the issue of child trafficking. Economic empowerment and reintegration programmers have tried to address the problem of trafficking but they did not achieve the expected results. Awareness-raising activities proved to be more vigorous. Despite these initiatives, human trafficking remains a critical problem in Nigeria. There is a continuing need for the further ratification and implementation of international legislation along with the use of national legal tools currently available for fight against trafficking in human beings.

One of the major problems is that women and children who make up the vast majority of the trafficking chain get involved as a result of push factors that are rooted in poverty, inequality and discrimination, resulting in survival strategies that expose the most vulnerable to exploitation and abuse. It is ultimately poverty, high unemployment and lack of opportunity, the quest for a means of survival that are the engine driving human trafficking (UNIFEM, 2002).

Schemes in the field of agriculture were introduced by past governments which were aimed at reducing the influx of rural dwellers into urban areas, as well as making our country Nigeria a self sufficient nation in basic food production. Scheme such as farm settlement scheme (1956), operation feed the nation (1976), Green revolution (1979) and Agricultural Development Programme (ADP) still did not eradicate the problem of food shortage. In spite of all the efforts and money expended in these schemes, food shortage remains a fundamental problem and despite the initiatives of the government, human trafficking remains a critical problem. It is suspected that the movement of people from the farming communities by way of being trafficked is one of the causes of food shortage. Considering this fact a study like this is considered worth carrying out.

The number of people trafficked for exploitation has greatly increased overtime as a result of so many factors. The study will afford the researcher an opportunity to carry out extensive research on rural household or dwellers that have in one way or the other involved themselves in human trafficking and the effect it resulted into in terms of agricultural production in Edo State.

The study work serves as a document that would guide extension organizations and policy makers in the design of extension exercises and review of agricultural development policies and programmes.

### Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study was to ascertain the perception of rural dwellers on human trafficking in relation to its effect on agricultural production in Edo State.

The specific objectives were to:

- i. determine the socio economic characteristics of the rural dwellers,
- ii. identify factors that make people get involved in human trafficking,
- iii. ascertain the effect of human trafficking on agricultural production.

### Hypotheses

Two null hypotheses will be tested

**Ho<sub>1</sub>:** human trafficking has no significant effect on agricultural production in the study area.

**Ho<sub>2</sub>:** the socio-economic characteristics of traffic source household heads have no influence on human trafficking.

### Methodology

The study will be conducted in Edo state. It is important to note that Edo state is highly involved in human trafficking. The study will cover the three senatorial district of Edo state. That is, Edo north, Edo central and Edo south senatorial district. According to National census (1991), about 58 percent of the population of Edo state is Edo south while Edo central and north is at 17 and 25 percent respectively.

Edo state has a total population of 3,218, 332 (National Census Nigeria, 2006) it is made up of 18 local Government areas with various villages and communities, the state capital is Benin city with a total population of 762,719 (National census Nigeria 2006) the people of Edo state are known for bronze casting and farming, but a few numbers of

them are gainfully employed as school teachers, Civil servant and owners of small scale business.

A reconnaissance survey was conducted in the study area Edo state. The sample size of the study was one hundred and twenty household randomly selected from the study area. The sampling procedure that was adopted in selecting the villages is purposive sampling techniques. That is, only the villages that have been practically involved in human trafficking in the past 10 years were selected systematically regardless of their socio-economic status or background.

Due to limited time for this work, fifteen (15) villages were purposely selected from the three (3) senatorial districts that make up the state. Seven (7) from Edo south senatorial district this include: Ugbighoko, Oregbeni, Aduwawa, Urhonigbe, Iyekeogba, Usen and Ugbor. Five (5) from Edo north senatorial district this include: Igarra, Okpela, Jattu, Ibie and Fugar. While three (3) villages from Edo central senatorial district namely: Ujoelen, Ewoyi and Eguare. Seventy (70) household heads were interviewed in Edo South, thirty (30) household heads in Edo North and twenty (20) household heads in Edo Central senatorial district to give a total of one hundred and twenty (120) respondents. This was done using quota sampling technique base on population distribution of the state. The method that was employed in obtaining household heads for interview was by random sampling technique. That is, writing the number of houses in each of the villages in a piece of paper fold it and mixed together in a basket.

In this study, structured questionnaire and direct personal interview schedule were used for data collection. Discussion was held also in local languages in cases of personal interview to ensure that household heads had the opportunity to supply relevant information since some of them had no formal education.

Data collected from the household head were analyzed using descriptive and inferential

statistics. Descriptive statistical tools used include frequency count; mean derived from 4-point Likert type scale and percentage were used to analyze objective one, two and three. While the inferential statistics used include chi square and Tobit regression analysis which were used to test hypothesis one and two respectively.

The chi square formula is written as follows:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{[(fo-fe) - 0.5]^2}{fe}$$

The Regression model formula is written as follows:

$$Y = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7, X_8)$$

Where:

Y = Human trafficking (Number of persons trafficked)

X<sub>1</sub> = Age (Years)

X<sub>2</sub> = Gender (Dummy: Male=1, female=0)

X<sub>3</sub> = Educational level (Tertiary = 3, Secondary = 2, Primary =1, No formal Education = 0)

X<sub>4</sub> = Marital status (Single = 1, Married = 0)

X<sub>5</sub> = Income level (Very attractive = 2, attractive = 1, not attractive = 0)

X<sub>6</sub> = Farming experience (1-10 years = 2, 11-20 years = 1, More 20 years = 0)

X<sub>7</sub> = Household size (Number of persons)

X<sub>8</sub> = Educational level of House hold trafficked (Tertiary = 3, Secondary = 2, Primary =1, No formal Education = 0)

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Socio-economic characteristics of household heads**

Most (55.80%) of the household heads were females, while 44.20% of them were males. This agrees with National Population Census (2006), that female population is almost twice the population of male. The headship of most of the homes by females is capable of prompting human trafficking since the household responsibilities weigh much on these women, thereby prompting poverty. According to table 4.1, 17.5% of them were between the age brackets of 50-59, 20.8% of

them were between the ages of 60-69 years, 13.3% of them were between the age bracket of 70-79 years and only 8% were above 80 years of age. The implication of this is that 82.5% of the respondents were above 60 years of age and they were old and cannot carryout farming activities as much as the younger ones. Meanwhile, most of the younger ones have left farming activities to the older generation because of the erroneous thought that farming activities are meant for the old, poor and formally uneducated citizens.

While 18.3% of household heads had tertiary education, 19.2% had Primary education, 25% had no formal education and most (37.5%) of them had Secondary education. This implies that 81.7% of the household head had one form of education or the other. This is expected to enhance their awareness on the ills associated with human trafficking. The highest proportion (62.5%) of household heads were married, 5% n were single 10.8% were divorced and 21.7% widow/widower.

Most (45.8%) of the households were of the sizes of 4 – 6 persons, while 8.3% had household sizes ranging from 10 -12 persons and 0.8% had household sizes of above 13 persons. This implies that most of the household were large in size .This can lubricate the wheel of poverty. Poor people tend to have high propensity of having many children which they end up not taking care of. According to UNESCO, (2006) over population increases the risk that these children will be trafficked to live with other extended family members in wealthier or urban communities or seek employment outside the family network.

Most (68.5%) of the household members trafficked were females, while 31.5% were males. This confirms the findings of Ofuoku (2010), UNICEF (2004) who suggested that most of the people trafficked are women and girls.

Among the respondents, 28.3% earned ₦50,000 - ₦100,000; 10.8% earned ₦100,000 - ₦150,000, 12.5% earned ₦150,000 - ₦200,000, 35.8% earned ₦200,000 - ₦250,000 and 12.5% earned

above ₦250,000. This implies that the majority of the household heads lived on an estimated amount of ₦600 per day. This shows that they are relatively poor in the study area as this is below the required World standard of US \$ 1.0 per day.

As for the farming experience of the household heads, 27.5% of them had less than 10 years experience, 12.5% had farming experience of between 10-15 years, 21.7% of them had farming experience of about 16-20 years, 27.5% had 21-25 years farming experience and 10.8% had farming experience of above 25 years. This simply implies that majority of the farmers have good experiences in their various field of farming.

With respect to household heads' farm size, 20% of them had farm land less than 2 hectares, 18.3% had 2 hectares of farm land, 14.2% had 3 hectares of farm land, 30% had 4 hectares of farm land and 17.5% had land above 5 hectares. This indicates that most household heads were small-holder farmers. This means that the farms cannot adequately cater for their household needs. This has implication for poverty and therefore, human trafficking.

Extension agents visited the respondent but the frequency of visit varies among the respondents. Most (55%) of the household heads were visited twice in a year, 13.3% of them were visited quarterly in a year, 22.5% of them were visited once in a month, 25% of them were visited twice in a month, and 6.7% of them were visited at irregular number of time in a year. It was gathered that the household heads visited once and twice in a month by extension agents was based on personal relationship between them and the agents.

**Population of members of households trafficked**

Table 1 shows the distribution of household that have been trafficked. It is observed from the data collected that majority (55%) of the household heads had less than 3 of their household members trafficked, while 30% of them had household trafficked between 4 – 6 persons, 8.3% of them had trafficked household ranging from 7 – 9 persons and 6.7% of them had trafficked household ranging from 10 – 12 persons in the study area. This implies that majority of the respondent have trafficked at least one member their households.

**Table 1: Distribution based on number of members of households of household trafficked**

No.of trafficked household members	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Less than 3	66	55.0
4-6	36	30.0
7-9	10	8.3
10-12	8	6.7

**Educational Status of trafficked members of households**

Most (50.8%) of the trafficked members of the households (Table 2) had secondary education, (17.5%) had tertiary education, 7.5% were university drop - outs as a result of their inability to continue schooling because the household heads could not afford the fees. Those who had secondary education and the university drop-outs were made to stop because their parents could not afford to sponsor furthering their education

at the tertiary level. Others (18.3%) had only primary education while 13.3% had no form of formal education. The level of formal education of most of those trafficked is an indices of the poverty level.

According to UNIFEM, (2002) woman and girls are more vulnerable to being trafficked because lack of access to education which limits their opportunity and lack of legitimate and fulfilling employment facility.

**Table 2: Distribution of the educational level of trafficked household members**

Education level	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Tertiary education	21	17.5
University dropout	9	7.5
Secondary education	61	50.8
Primary education	22	18.3
No formal education	7	5.8

**Factors contributing to trafficking of household members**

Table 3 shows that Poverty (mean =3.59) was the major reason why people involved themselves in human trafficking. This agrees with UNESCO (2006), which argued that the major cause of human trafficking is poverty. There is a strong desire to survive but poverty resulting from unemployment and lack of opportunities promotes human trafficking.

According to UNESCO (2006), Nigeria is rated as one of the sixth poorest country in the world with per capital GNP of about \$280 dollars for a population of about 133 million. Todaro (2000), stated that because members of female headed household are generally restricted to low productivity in formal sector employment and experience dependency burdens, they are more likely to be poor and malnourished, and less likely to obtain formal education, health care, clean water, and sanitation. This makes them vulnerable to traffickers.

Lack of proper information (mean = 3.16) is another cause of human trafficking, it was observed that most parents lacked proper information on the nature of jobs in which their children were engaged in their various destinations. Traffickers promise lucrative job opportunities in the cities (Yakubu, 2004). According to UNAIDS et al (2004), traffickers promise potential marriage or guarantee jobs overseas, mostly in the informal and unregulated sectors such as hair dressing, nannies or domestics. The majority of trafficked persons are unaware of the form of labor to which they will be subjected.

Peer pressure from friends and relatives (mean = 3.04) also constitute a cause of

human trafficking. Household heads averred that they allowed their household members to be trafficked after listening to advice and pressure from friends and relatives that trafficking would help increase their living standard. They convinced them that after converting the foreign currency gotten by their trafficked household members into the domestic currency they would be rich.

Harmful cultural practices (mean = 3.04) such as female circumcision made some parents to traffic their children in order to prevent them from falling victims to such beliefs and cultural practices as argued by some parents, especially female single parents. This is more so as the extended families and community leaders consider it as a compulsory ritual that must be performed on every female transiting into womanhood.

The need for low skilled labor (mean = 3.46). Many parents had their household members trafficked because it was believed that the destination country could employ their household members regardless of academic specialization. In Nigeria people are trafficked mainly for prostitution, to work as domestic servants, bus conductors and street traders (UNICEF, 2004).

Expectation of high income while working in destination (mean 3.29) and low risk involved in working in destination (mean = 2.79) were among the driving forces of human trafficking. Household heads believed that working in rich countries like Europe countries and Americas would result in high income and raise their living standard. They also the risk in working is low when compared to home country.

**Table 3: Distribution of the Factors for Human Trafficking**

Factors: (Push and Pull)	Score	Mean (x)
Poverty	431	3.59
Lack of proper information	379	3.16
Peer Pressure from friends and relatives	365	3.04
Harmful cultural Practices	323	2.69
The need for low skilled labor	415	3.46
High income in working in destination	395	3.29
Low risk involved in working in destination	335	3.29

Cut off score = 2.50 (> 2.50 important reason < 2.50 not important reason)

**Agricultural activities carried out by household members in the pre-trafficking periods.**

Table 4, indicates that the household members trafficked participated actively in the farming activities of their households before being trafficked to seek greener pastu-

reas they assisted in planting/sowing (mean=3.71) , assisted in weeding of farm land (mean=2.92), assisted in harvesting of the farm produce (mean=3.41), assisted in selling the surplus in the market (mean=2.91) and assisted in processing and storage of farm produce (mean=2.84) prior to sales in off season period.

**Table 4: Agricultural assistance rendered by household members prior to trafficking**

Nature of Assistance	Score	Mean (x)
Planting/sowing	446	3.71
Weeding of farm land	350	2.92
Harvesting farm produce	409	3.41
Selling the surplus	349	3.50
Processing and storage	341	2.84

Cut-off score = 2.50 (> 2.50 Active participating >2.50 passive participation)

**Effect of human trafficking on agricultural production as perceived by respondents**

Shortage of farm labor seems (Table 5) to be the most dominant effect (mean=3.48). Decrease in farm size (mean=2.92), decrease in farm income (mean=3.15), reduction in farm output (mean=3.08), extra expenditure on hired labor (mean=3.18) and shortage of food supplied by the community (mean=2.84) were other effects pointed out by the respondents.

An obvious consequence of human trafficking on farm labor is that the adult labor force or work force on the family will decline. Also, the need for hired labor will be positively related to the size of a family’s agricultural holdings after trafficking of one or more family member. UNESCO, (2006), pointed out that women, girls and children who make up the work force are those mostly trafficked. Ahmad and Ismail (1998)

stated that women are more involved in agricultural task than their husbands. These women engage in farming with the help of their children, they are the main source of agricultural labor. Therefore, the trafficking of women and children will adversely affect food production in the study area.

The sales of farm land to raise money for trafficking will result in drastic decrease in farm size. Most of the buyers of this land do not use them for agricultural purposes, they end up erecting buildings on them this will in turn bring about reduction in farm size and consequently farm output. It should also be noted that shortage of farm labor as a result of human trafficking will bring about a corresponding reduction in farm output, decrease in farm income and shortage of food supply by the community.

According to Uzokwe and Ofuoku, (2006) women have taken over most of the male



related traditional farm tasks so the position of women in food production is very important. If these rural women continue to be trafficked out of rural communities, the

problem of food shortage will deteriorate to an extent where there will be food scarcity especially with the geometric growth rate of the population of Nigeria.

**Table 5: Human trafficking effect on agriculture**

Variables	Score	Mean (x)
Shortage of farm labor	418	3.48
Decrease in farm size	3.5	2.92
Decrease in farm income	378	3.15
Farm output	370	3.08
Extra expenditure on hired labor	382	3.18
Shortage of food supply by the community	341	2.84

Cut-off score = 2.50 (> 2.50 an effect, >2.50 not an effect)

**Test of Hypothesis**

Ho<sub>1</sub>: Human trafficking has no significant effect on agriculture in the study area.

**Result**

The chi square statistical analysis indicates (Table 6) that chi square calculated is greater than the chi square tabulated ( $X^2_{cal} = 30.16 > X^2_{tab} = 18.31$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis that human trafficking has no significant effect on agricultural production is rejected and alternative hypothesis that human trafficking has effect on effect on agricultural production is accepted.

This implies that the movement of the work force in the agricultural sector as a result of human trafficking has brought about a drastic decrease in agricultural production. This agrees with Kabeer, (1994) who opined that women are the back bone of the

agricultural sector accounting for 70% of agricultural labor and being responsible for 60% of agricultural production and 80% of food production. Ahmad and Ismail (1998) stated that women are more involved in agricultural task than their husbands. These women engage in farming with the help of their children.

According to Uzokwe and Ofuoku (2006) women have taken over most of the male related traditional farm task so the position of women in food production is very important. If these rural women continue to be trafficked out rural communities (the homes of agricultural practices) the problem of food shortage will deteriorate to an extent where there will be food scarcity, especially with the geometric growth rate of the population of Nigeria. This will translate into food production shortage.

**Table 6: The effect of human trafficking on agriculture**

Effect on agricultural production	Household heads perception of human trafficking			Total
	Agree	Disagree	Undecided	
Shortage of farm labor	88	22	10	120
Decrease in farm size	59	37	24	120
Decrease in farm income	64	31	25	120
Reduction in farm output	69	27	24	120
Extra expenditure on hired labor	73	24	23	120
Shortage of food supply by the community	51	38	31	120
<b>Total</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>720</b>

$X^2_{cal} = 30.16, X^2_{tab} = 18.31, =$  significant at 5% level

**H<sub>02</sub>:** The socio economic characteristics of traffic source household heads have no influence on human trafficking.

**Result**

In testing this hypothesis the socio economic characteristics of house hold heads were subjected to multiple regression analysis using the Tobit regression model is shown in Table 7.

Table 7 shows that the R<sup>2</sup> value is 0.364 which indicates that 36.4% of the socio economic characteristics of the household heads entered into the model accounted for the number of persons trafficked in the study area. It is observed that only two variables out of eight variables were found to be statistically significant at 0.05level of significance. These variables are age(X<sub>1</sub>) and household size(X<sub>7</sub>). This implies that since 82.5% of the household heads were above 60 years of age and are old with very little farm income, they end up trafficking their young and productive children to supplement their income.

According to UNESCO (2006) younger ones in age fall victim to human trafficking because of peer pressure and lack of alternative opportunities within their impoverished home countries. They often

seek out traffickers on their own initiative and are thus recruited. UNESCO (2006) further observed that Nigeria Young women and children are the ones trafficked and thousands of young women and girls were trafficked into the sex industry especially in Europe. Older women are not trafficked because of their ages.

Household size (X<sub>7</sub>); this implies that the larger the household size the more the risk of being trafficked because of deprivations rooted in poverty nurtured by *too large* family to cater for.. This agrees with UNESCO (2006) which stated that over population increases the risk that children will be trafficked to live with others extended family members in wealthier or urban communities or seek employment outside the family network.

According to Truong (2006), men tend not to devote their earnings to the household, leaving the women responsible for the survival of their families especially families of large sizes. These women then seek to diversify their sources of income (Chant, 2003) which increase their risk of being trafficked or offer their children for trafficking to other lands.

**Table 7: The effect of Socio-economic variables on the number of Household Trafficked**

Variables	Co-efficient	Std. Error	T-value	Sig
Constant		0.286	1.952	0.053
Age(X <sub>1</sub> )	0.257	0.038	2.956*	0.004
Gender(X <sub>2</sub> )	-0.039	0.082	-0.501	0.617
Educational level(X <sub>3</sub> )	-0.008	0.046	-0.08	0.933
Marital status(X <sub>4</sub> )	-0.076	0.057	0.967	0.336
Income level(X <sub>5</sub> )	-0.070	0.030	-0.849	0.398
Farming experience (X <sub>6</sub> )	-0.018	0.033	-0.210	0.834
Household size(X <sub>7</sub> )	0.478	0.049	5.562*	0.000
Educational level of household trafficked (X <sub>8</sub> )	0.055	0.042	0.642	0.522

**Human Trafficking Implication for Agricultural Production**

According to UNESCO (2006) as pointed out earlier, women girls and children in rural communities are those mostly trafficked, the major occupation of rural communities is

farming. Women are the backbone of the agricultural sector, accounting for 70% of agricultural labor and being responsible for 60% of agricultural production and 80% of food production (Kabeer, 1994). Ahmad and Ismail (1998) stated that women are more

involved in agricultural tasks than their husbands. These women engage in farming with the help of their children. Those women, young girls and children who do not own their own farm are the sources of agricultural production.

Food security which is the desire of every nation cannot be achieved without the machinery pushing the production of food. According to Uzokwe and Ofuoku (2006), women have taken over most of the male related traditional farm tasks, so the position of women in foods production is a very important one. If these rural women continue to be trafficked out of rural communities, the problem of food shortage will deteriorate to an extent where there will be foods scarcity, especially with the geometric growth rate of the population of Nigeria. This will translate into food production shrinkage.

### **Conclusion**

Most of the persons trafficked are women and girls. Push and pull factors such as poverty, lack of proper information, peer pressure from friends and relatives, harmful cultural practices, the need for low skilled labor, high income in working in destination, and low risk involved in working in destination were the major causes of human trafficking. The trafficked members of households were actively involved in farming practices such as planting/sowing, weeding, harvesting, selling of produce, processing and storage, before being trafficked. Shortage of farm labor, decreased farm size, reduced farm income, reduced farm output, extra expenditure on hired labor and storage of food supply by the community were perceived as effect of human trafficking on agriculture. Age of the household head and the household size had significant effect on the number of household members trafficked. Human trafficking has an adverse effect on agricultural production and if not checked may lead to food production shrinkage.

### **Recommendations**

Having afore mentioned in mind it is therefore recommended that:

- Agricultural agencies should make serious effort through public sector, private sectors, governments and non-governmental organizations to improve women access to productive resources such as land, credit and appropriate technologies to enhance food production.
- Extension agencies should hammer on the encouragement of capacity building for rural women. This should be done through grass roots mobilization, action programs, training and networking.
- It is also important for agricultural agencies to develop and reinforce research and information gathering activities on the village and community level socio-cultural and financial conditions that affect rural women.
- Extension department should integrate anti human trafficking campaigns with their services to the farming population and use various ways of effective communication with and among rural women and parents using rural radio, posters, television, extension farmers meetings and others. This is the ways to guide and change the attitude of rural families and communities so as to arrest the wave of human trafficking which is always full of fake promises.
- More educational opportunities should be accorded to women and girls in rural areas, the legal status of women should be enhanced. Moves against trafficking in humans can only be effective if the source communities can be discourage from involvement in it. Government and non-governmental organizations should increase investment in rural areas through concessional resources and debt relief investment programme.
- Extension department should therefore integrate anti-human trafficking campaigns with their services to the farming population.

## References

- Ahmad, A and Ismail, N. (1998)** "Gender roles in Malaysian Agriculture: Implication for extension planning", *Journal of international Agricultural and Extension Education*, Vol. 2(1), pp. 17-25.
- Chant, I. (2003)** "The engendering of poverty analysis in developing regions: progress since the United Nations for women and priorities for the future", new working paper series, Gender institute London: London school of Economics
- Kabeer, N. (1994)** "Reversed realities", Gender Hierarchies in development thought London, UK: Verso.
- International Police Organization (2000)** Quarterly Report-August 25. Abuja, Nigeria: Nigerian Division of ICPO
- N.P.C. (2006)** "Population distribution", Benin City; National Population Commission.
- Ofuoku, A. U. (2010)** "Human Trafficking in Nigeria and its Implication for food security", *International Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 17(1), pp. 1-6.
- Pugin, V. (2009)** "Poverty, Gender and human trafficking in sub-Saharan Africa: Rethinking Best practices in Migration management", Paris: UNESCO, pg 151
- Todaro, M. (2000)** "Economic Development", New York: Addison Wesley.
- Truong, T. (2006)** "Poverty, gender and human trafficking in sub-Saharan Africa: Rethinking best practices in migration management", Paris: UNESCO.
- UNAIDS, UNICEF and USAID (2004)** "Children on the brink: A joint report of new orphan estimate and a frame work for action", [www.unicef.org/publication/index-22212.html](http://www.unicef.org/publication/index-22212.html).
- UNDP (2005)** Human Development Report. <http://hdr.undp.org>
- UNESCO (2006)** "Human trafficking in Nigeria: Root cause and recommendations", Policy paper No 14.2 (E)
- UNICEF (2003)** "Trafficking in human beings, especially women and children in Africa", Geneva: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
- UNIFEM Asia (2002)** "Trafficking in persons", A gender rights perspective, Briefing kit.
- Uzokwe, U. N. and A. U. Ofuoku (2006)** "Changes in gender division of agricultural task in Delta State, Nigeria and implications for agricultural extension Services", *Extension Farming Systems Journal*, Vol. 2 (1), pp. 91-96.
- World Bank (2005)** World Development indicators [http:// devdata. World Bank. org /wdi2005/cover.html](http://devdata.worldbank.org/wdi2005/cover.html)
- Yakubu, Z. (2004)** "Interview during the UNESCO research on human trafficking in West Africa", Paris; UNESCO.