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Abstract

About 90 percent of Burundi population depends on agriculture for their livelihoods. Agriculture employs the majority of labor force and is the basis source of income particularly for people living in rural areas. Agricultural income determines the purchasing power of many people living in rural areas. It is therefore important to examine the determinants of agricultural income for proper policy formulation that will help to improve welfare of farmers. The main objective of this study is to analyze the determinants of agricultural income among smallholder farmers in Northern part of Burundi. Based on field survey which covered 218 respondents and using linear regression, we found that among 8 variables used in the analysis, only the family size and the farm size have shown significant effects on agricultural income at 1% and 10% levels respectively. Some suggestions were also mentioned to sustain the agricultural returns, the well-being of farm households and to improve the rural infrastructure.
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Introduction

Agriculture has played a leading role in the growth of economies and simultaneously it reduced the poverty and transformed the wealth of many Latin American Countries, however, the application of similar concept has not occurred yet in sub-Saharan Africa (Ibekwe et al., 2010).

The most part of the African countries, specifically countries in Sub-Saharan are yet to meet the criteria in order to be a competitive player in a growing agricultural revolution and the productivity still lags far behind when compared to rest of the world (Babatunde and Qaim, 2010).

Agriculture remains a powerful engine room for the development and an area of employment that provide job opportunities for people without job in rural areas because of their linkages to urban centers (Dethier and Effenberger, 2011).

According to Liang et al. (2012) validate that the impact generated upon by the policy on rural livelihoods differs from the collection of household. There is higher amount of off-farm...
entire household income from the small farms (Knerr, 2012).

Hence, these outcome imply that the abilities of both farm business and farm households to be of assistance to administer weather, climate and market risks allied through agriculture production in line with income from the farm household diversification changes over space and time by particular demographic and economic factors connected with those farms household (Mishra et al., 2010).

In relation to that, Démurger et al. (2010) have made known that Economic reforms in most parts of rural China have derived many privileges to diversify both within-farm and off-farm activities.

To fully facilitate and improve the income diversification for rural farm household, take positive steps to develop rural infrastructure by such as supplying electricity and establishing good quality access to markets (Fausat, 2012).

Diversification of properties, farming activities, and income is more vital to respective rural household in African (Barrett and Reardon, 2000) with such diversification into off-farm, earnings contributes a sound percentage to the household and the availability of agricultural development institutions would greatly support the access of credit facilities and eventually improve income in rural areas (Fausat, 2012).

Joliffe (2004) proposes that education could be an influencing factor to which growing in numbers the educational accomplishment regarding farm households is believed to impact on others activities instead of farm work that likely to result in workforce out of agriculture with higher returns in other jobs.

Mishra et al. (2009) exposed that rationale of basic farm policy is to elevate good income for the farmers and to improve living standards, the policy need to be adjusted to suit the changes in farm household and its businesses over time period.

The present study was undertaken with the following specific objectives.

a. Examine some socioeconomics characteristics
b. To examine the determinants agricultural income among smallholder farmers.

**Income determinants**

Burundian economy and the livelihood of its more than 90 percent of people entirely based on agriculture with this 90 percent plus of the population live in 1.5 million smallholder farming (Curtis, 2013; FAO, 2013; Beck et al., 2010; USAID, 2012; WFP, 2004).

The households which produce 95 per cent of the country’s food supposed that owning a land into agricultural productions are some of the pivotal aspects of rural livelihoods in Burundi (WFP, 2008), and most household in the entire country including Kirundo Province on the northern part of the country and they generate their income from agricultural production.

Burundi is grouped into three parts of livelihood, 75% of population depends primarily on agriculture, 14% rely on both agriculture and livestock, and the residual 11% survive from temporary employment, small business, and paid jobs WFP (2004).

According to IFAD (2012) have understood that unfavorable effects of lengthened drought, as resulted in the boosting of crops related pests and apparently reduced in land productivity were common in the eastern and northern regions of Burundi.

WFP (2004) accepted that population growth in Burundi with the influx of refugees have attributed to the intense pressure on the land.

IFAD sustained its solid facts that the average farm size within Burundi is narrowing, with the soil dramatically losing its fertility and degraded. At the same instance, literally all public land has been distributed or occupied by people.
Lacking food security and raising malnutrition are turning out chronic for an increasing percentage of households. According to Démurger et al. (2010) believed that Economic reforms in some rural parts of China have driven fair privileges to broaden both within-farm and off-farm activities.

With regard to taking part in those activities it merely plays vital functions by raising level of rural farmers’ income. Adenegan et al. (2013) exposed that those factors such as farm size, income, land tenure, food security, level of education those were linked to the gender factor, these variables had strong impact on the commercialization of agriculture and opposed that household were impacted from gender and distribution of household resources into commercialization of agricultural food crops in Ido Local Government Area of Oyo state, Nigeria.

Comparing with gender, number of females were more than males involve in food crop farming; with level of education for a good number of the farmer-respondents are low (Dadzie and Acquah, 2012). According to Oni et al. (2009). Exposed the results that a family labour with more female has a high possibility of increasing agricultural productivity, suggesting that women are needed to increase agricultural services.

Dose (2007). proposed that Human capital are important and involve some good some roles in diversification and secure earnings, Démurger et al. (2010) had stated that within-farm and off-farm activities play an important role in growing rural households’ income and proceed to gender and age bias in admittance to off-farm tasks that seen dominated by young people and mostly they are male.

According to Delgado and Siamwalla (1997) to diminish risk, diversifications of agricultural production were decided by most African farmers and tend to produce very few commodities for export. Senadza (2011) discovered that the results shown collection of non-farm income increased income inequality between the Ghana’s rural households.

According to Carletto et al. (2007) the analyzed results of the Rural Income Generating Activities (RIGA) set of data verified the earlier findings that that rural non-farm economy plays a crucial role in the generation of income for those households in rural areas. Majority of farmers are seen to be occupied in cash crops but with off-farm income supplementation in Kenya (Wanyama et al., 2010).

**Research method**

**Study area**

The Gisenyi zone is one of the 5 zones of Busoni district located in the northern part of Burundi and was selected as a study region because it is located in Bugesera natural region which currently encounter cyclical periods of drought.

Busoni district has a total land area of 420.89 square kilo meters, while the Country total area is 27,834 square kilo meters. Busoni altitude is between 1500 and 1700m, the total population of Busoni district is 121 626 inhabitants.

The climatic conditions in Gisenyi zone of Busoni district is characterized by two rainy seasons, which usually starts in September and ends in November. The second rainy season is from January to May.

Between these two seasons a short period of dry season is inserted throughout the month of December and the dry season last from June to September.

The average temperature is 20.9 degree Celsius per month, with maximum temperature of 27.1 degree Celsius and minimum temperature of 14.8 degree Celsius.

Rainfall varies between 700mm in the Bugesera depression and 1200mm on Bweru heights. Recent years, the Bugesera region
experiences disruptions rainfall and the province have always had a deficit of rainfall especially in its Bugesera (MPDRN and UNDP, 2006).

The 95% of the population of Busoni District are primarily engaged in the production of food and industrial crops. Due to the drought the agriculture production dropped sharply in recent years. Kirundo province, once considered as Burundi’s food basket, is now facing recurrent food shortages because of low rain fall. The problem lies with the inconsistency of the soil conditions. If without rainfall for almost two weeks, the soil tends to be completely dry and the harvest is lost, Muvunyi said (IRIN, 2009).

The recent assessment mission estimated that 35,710 households in three municipalities are highly food insecure, 10,710 households in Bugabira; 17,000 households in Busoni; and 8,000 households in Kirundo (USAID and R Bdi, 2010).

According to Muvunyi IRIN (2009), 307 families in Busoni have fled their homes in Gatare.

**Data collection and sampling procedure**

The data used in this study were collected through a field survey conducted in July 2012 in Gisenyi zone Busoni district, Kirundo province in the northern part of Burundi. A random sampling approach was adopted where the questionnaires were administered through individual structured interviews with the head of the households.

A total number of 218 households were surveyed. The interview was conducted in both centers; Kubaniro and Rugarama.

A team of six people were involved in the administration of the questionnaire after being trained. Organized questionnaires were asked to gather information from the household heads.

Before the data collection process began, the data collection team discussed with the local leader of the community to gather basic information about the community. Small holder farmers with many years of experiences were identified and selected for interview.

Those farmers their main source of livelihood was through agriculture and they were important for the study because they were able to recall some solid years back, according to Mubaya et al. (2012) those people were as good source to capture information related to their livelihood in the past.

This study used the descriptive statistics to examine the socio economics characteristics of interviewers and multiple regression analysis was use to examine the determinants of income among the smallholder farmers.

**Results and discussion**

The socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents are shown in table 1. The study indicated that the household with 4-8 members ranked highest with 48.6% while household with more than 12 members ranked lowest with 0.9%. It is obvious that households with higher family members tend to generate higher income from agriculture due to family labor than those with few members.

The result revealed that the most respondents were the male representing 88.1% while females were 11.9%. This means that, the most men have the only duty for the family and female headed family are fewer relatively to the male headed families in the study area because of the cultural and belief.
Table 1: Socioeconomics characteristics of the surveyed smallholder farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>2.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 +</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>43.37</td>
<td>13.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiteracy</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2012

The age distribution of respondents demonstrated that most respondents fall between 40-50 age groups while very few are above 80 years representing 26.6% and 0.5% respectively.

This implies that agricultural income is common among the young household heads that they can work hard and could bear to take the risks from agricultural income.

The result also revealed that most respondents are married 92.2% while 1.8% is divorced and single. Most respondents had Illiteracy accounting for 58.7%, 1.8% only obtained junior high school education, 35.8% attended primary school and 3.7% been to secondary school.

This surprises that average educational level is low among the households’ head that could certainly affect their agricultural income. Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the determinants of agricultural income among smallholder farmer’s households in the study area. The general form of the model:

\[
Y = B_0 + B_1 PNFM + B_2 AG + B_3 GND + B_4 EDCL + B_5 MRTST + B_6 FMSZ + B_7 FRTLV + B_8 CNDTIRGT + u_i
\]

Where:

- \( Y \) = Agricultural income
- \( FS \) = Family size
- \( AG \) = Age of respondent
The fundamental objectives of the regression is to determine how the explanatory variables.

Determine agriculture income in Busoni district Gisenyi zone and to ascertain the population variation of agriculture income that is explained or captured by these variables.

The fulfilment of these objectives is justified by the regression equation:

\[ Y = 0.830 + 0.303 \text{FS} - 0.046 \text{AG} + 0.055 \text{GND} + 0.130 \text{EDCL} + 0.040 \text{MRTST} + 4.43 \text{FMSZ} - 0.097 \text{FRTLV} + 0.017 \text{CNDTIRGT} + u_i \]

\( R^2 = 0.100, \ R = 0.317, \ \text{Adjusted R square} = 0.066, \ \text{Durbin-Watson} = 2.030, \ \text{and F} = 2.909. \)

The coefficient of multiple determined of 0.100 shows that about 10% of the variation in the agriculture income in the study area has been captured by the model.

Although the number is not very high, it is practically enough for us to explain economics phenomenon. The multiple-correlation coefficient of 0.317 also indicates positive relationship between the variables.

The coefficients on explanatory variables family size, gender, educational level, marital status, farm size, and condition of irrigation conformed to the expected outcome while only family size is statistically significant. The F-statistic is significant and Durbin-Watson statistic reveals a minimal autocorrelation of random variables.

Some coefficients on explanatory variables such as age and fertilization level are not reliable with the theoretical forecast and have t-value that is statistically insignificant. This may be resulted from the unreliability of agriculture income data. The fact that this equation does not fit well for the targeted area, it needs caution in the interpretation of the result but the model cannot obviously be rejected.

**Conclusion and recommendation**

Agriculture is the main source of income for the large majority of Burundians especially for those who are living in rural areas. The purpose of this study is to examine the determinants of agricultural income among stallholder’s farmers in Northern part of Burundi. Regression analysis was run to achieve the objective of this study.

Among 8 variables used in the analysis, only the family size and the farm size have shown significant effects on agricultural income at 1% and 10% levels respectively.
When household size increases by one person, agricultural income increases 30.3% Burundian currencies, an increase of one ha in farm size will lead to an increase of 44340 Burundian currencies of farmer’s income.

Based on our findings, the following recommendations are hereby suggested:

- Because of high population growth that reduces farm size among families, the flow of improved agricultural technology to farmers should be considered and will help to increase farmer’s income. Farmer’s access to credit from microfinance organizations will help to purchase farm inputs that will be used in the agricultural process, thereby, contributing to increase agricultural income.
- In order to maintain and facilitate the well-being of farm households; encourage the small household farmers to rely on off-farm income to support farm households because by only depending on agricultural income is not sufficient. Hence, the well-being of farm can play a significant role to reduce the sudden influences from income variations.
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