RESEARCH ARTICLE

(Ope<u>n Access)</u>

A gender analysis of determinants of poverty among rural farming households in Nigeria

ENIOLA OLUWATOYIN OLORUNSANYA^{1*} AND OLUBUNMI ABAYOMI OMOTESHO²

¹Dept. of Agric Economics and Extension Services, Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State, Nigeria

²Dept. of Agric. Econs. & Farm Mgt. University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria

Abstract

The study identifies the determinants of poverty among male and female-headed households in Kwara State using a randomly selected 510 representative farming households. Descriptive statistics, Foster, Greer and Thorbecke class of poverty indices as well as Tobit regression model were used as analytical tools. The robustness of the estimated Tobit parameters were also verified using stochastic dominance analysis. The results of the Foster, Greer and Thorbecke poverty measures show that the female-headed households were poorer than their male-headed counterparts. At varied poverty lines of 70-145% of the estimated line, the female-headed households were among others, household size, highest educational attainment of the household heads and membership of cooperative society. The study recommends that poverty reduction strategies in the study area should be gender specific and should focus mainly on variables that influence the poverty status of each category of households.

Keywords: Poverty measures, gender analysis, Tobit regression

1. Introduction

In Nigeria as in many other Sub-Saharan African countries, poverty is predominantly a rural phenomenon. Among its numerous causes is low or fluctuating levels of labour productivity in agrarianbased-livelihoods [15]. Poverty in Nigeria is on the increase and its incidence and severity more in agricultural sector than other sectors of the economy. The inter-linkages between gender and poverty have also been major issues in the role and effectiveness of policy interventions in poverty reduction in developing countries. Women disproportionately suffer from hunger, disease. environmental degradation and impoverishment. Gender affects vulnerability to poverty in periods of insecurity, and women are likely to find it more difficult to escape from poverty [8]. This has made gender equality an important aspect of many development projects recently. This culminates from the fact that gender inequalities and a lack of attention to gender in agricultural development have contributed to lower productivity, higher levels of poverty and undernutrition [20]. It is a known fact that differences exist between female and male headed households with respect to access to key productive assets such as land, labour, technology, credit, and extension services [35]. [35] reports that failure to recognize the roles of men and women, and the differences and inequalities

that exist between them pose a serious threat to the effectiveness of agricultural development strategies. It is worthy of note that there is a significant increase in the percentage of female-headed households than hitherto the case in Africa due to deaths of male heads, conflicts and rural-urban migration among others. Recognition must therefore be given to this category of households for any meaningful poverty reduction to take place. The positive effects that present renewed interest in agriculture might bring may not reach this category of households directly if a genuine attention is not paid to them [32]. This study therefore carried out a gender differentiated isolation of the determinants of poverty among rural farming households in Nigeria using Kwara State as a case study. The other objectives of the study are: examination of the socio-economic characteristics of the rural farming households based on gender of the household heads as well as presentation of the expenditure patterns of the farming households also based on gender of the household heads. The results emanating from the study indicate that households' experiences of poverty differ greatly in the study area based on gender of the household heads. The factors influencing poverty status of the two categories of households are also somewhat different and should be tackled headlong for meaningful poverty reduction in the state.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: section 2 summarises some past studies on poverty, Section 3 describes the methodology for results presentation in section 4. Section 5 concludes.

2 Review of Literature

[12] reports gender as a key determinant to vulnerability to poverty in Bayelsa State, Nigeria. Using National Bureau of Statistics 2009-2010 NLSS data the study assessed poverty and its vulnerability in the state with a constructed poverty line of N22393.62. The results of the Foster, Greer and Thorbecke weighted poverty indices show the incidence, gap and severity of poverty of households in the state to be 25, 14.26 and 8.6 percent respectively. About sixty-percent of the households were also vulnerable to poverty. The major determinants of poverty in the state aside from gender were household size and per capita expenditure on education, health care and food. [1] uses data spanning 15 years to study subjective and consumption poverty in urban Ethiopia. The study finds out that despite rapid economic growth and declining poverty, subjective poverty remains largely unchanged in the country. Households with history of poverty continue to perceive themselves as poor despite improved level of consumption. The relative economic position of households is a strong determinant of subjective poverty in the country. Having some type of employment also makes households less likely to perceive themselves as poor even if they remain in objective poverty. The study concludes that subjective poverty should be included in measurement of impact of growth on welfare in the Kenya. [10] stress the existence of gender based income gaps across African production systems. Household level data from 21 regions across eight African countries, collected in 2002 and 2008 were used to analyze production dynamics, market participation, and nonfarm linkages. It was found that gender gaps were absent in 17 of the regions regardless of the overall regional income level. Their results suggest that neither poverty nor growth in general discriminates against female headed

households, but that causes of gender discrimination need to be found in specific regional contexts. [11] uses estimates from Ghana Living Standard Surveys to measure vulnerability to asset-poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa. The results of the study show that expected asset- poverty is a reliable proxy for expected consumption- poverty. The study also finds that households in rural areas are more vulnerable to poverty than those in urban areas using demographic health surveys in eight Sub-Saharan African countries.

3. Methodology

This study was conducted in Kwara State, an essentially agrarian area with about 80 per cent of her population living in rural areas. The entire rural farming households in the state were the target population for the study. Primary data obtained through a set of pre-tested structured questionnaire administered with the aid of 16 trained enumerators in 2007 were used for the study. The bulk of the information collected was mainly on weekly households' consumption expenditure and income. Information was also obtained on socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the households. Kwara State is divided into four agricultural zones by the State Agricultural Development Project (KWADP). A two stage simple random sampling technique was used for selecting the representative farming households for the study. The first stage was a random selection of 36 villages from the four agricultural zones. Based on the farming household listing by the local authority, 10% of the population in each village was selected using random sampling technique; this was the second state (Table 1). The cooking pot definition of household was adopted and as such households that conformed to this consumption-based definition of households were used. All in all a total of 510 rural farming households were used for the study.

| Zones | Number of Selected Rural Villages | Number of Farming Households in Each of the Rural Villages | Number of Selected Households |
|-------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| А | 6 | 700 | 70 |
| В | 5 | 550 | 55 |
| С | 15 | 2200 | 220 |
| D | 10 | 1650 | 165 |
| Total | 36 | 540 | 510 |

 Table 1: Selected Villages and Households Distribution

Source: Field Survey, 2007

Poverty Assessment

Poverty refers to the lower decile or quintile of the distribution of economic welfare which is consumption expenditure per adult equivalent for the purpose of this study. Foster, Greer and Thorbecke class of weighted poverty indices were used to profile the poverty status of the rural farming households in the State [17]. The formula, following Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (FGT) is given as:

$$P_{\rm r} = 1/n \sum_{i=1}^{q} (z - y_i / z)^{\rm r}$$
(1)

Where P_{Γ} is the weighted poverty index; n is the number of households; y_i is the expenditure per adult equivalent of *ith* household; z is the poverty line defined as 2/3 of mean consumption per adult equivalent of the sampled population [16]; q is the number of the sampled household population below the poverty line; α is the aversion to poverty (a coefficient reflecting different degrees of importance accorded to the depth of poverty and it ranges from 0 to 2. The FGT measure of poverty has been criticized for its inability to capture all dimensions of poverty since poverty is a multi-dimensional phenomenon. The quantitative measure of poverty such as the FGT only helps to provide partial information about poverty. No single approach to poverty appraisal can capture all the essential aspects of poverty. The mixing of quantitative and qualitative skills in poverty appraisal therefore gives a better result [35].

Determinants of Poverty

Isolation of the determinants of poverty for the farming households was achieved with Tobit regression model. The Tobit censored regression model is given as:

Si =
$$S_i^* = SX_i + e_i$$
 if $S_i^* > 0$ (2)
 $0 = SX_i + e_i$ if $S_i^* < 0$ (3)
 $i = 1,2,3....20$ (4)

Where: S_i is the limited dependent variable, it is discrete when the households are not poor (it assumes zero value in this case) and continuous when they are poor that is equal to S_i^* . S_i^* is the poverty gap defined as $(Z - Y_i/Z)$ and Z is the poverty line; X_i is the vector of explanatory variables; Y_i consumption expenditure per adult equivalent; β vector of unknown parameters; e_i is independently distributed error term. The Tobit regression model is however limited in its heavy reliance on normality and homoskedasticity in the underlying latent variable S^* , in case of heteroskedasticity however one never knows what the maximum likelihood estimates is actually estimating [Greene] Nonetheless the Tobit regression model is preferred above Logit model for its ability to measure the depth of poverty as well as isolate its determinants. The independent variables hypothesised as determinants of poverty following [19] and with some modification are classified into demographic, farm related, institutional and living condition. They are presented in Table 2.

The empirical models were used to draw inferences on the probability of and the determinants of poverty for the two categories of households. Following a Tobit decomposition framework suggested by [24], the effect of changes in the explanatory variables (X_i) on the probability and depth of poverty of the households were obtained.

3. Results and discussion

Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables based on Gender of the Household Heads

Table 3 shows the summary of the descriptive statistics based on gender of the household heads. Expectedly male-headed households (84%) were more than female-headed households (16%) in the study area. The presence of female-headed households was due to death of male heads, migration, divorce and economic reasons. The mean age for the household heads for the two categories of households were 51.9 54.0 years for male and female-headed and households respectively. Usually in rural settings in Nigeria households constitute usually more than one generation; the young married adults and their children live with their parents and often time eat from the same pot. The heads of the households in such cases are usually the male or female grandparents. This explains the high average age for the two categories of households. Another reason for high average age is the fact that farming business is usually carried out by the elderly in Nigeria due to rural-urban migration. In terms of years of schooling, 60 percent of adult household members in the femaleheaded households had informal education while only forty percent of adult household members in the maleheaded households had no formal education.

| Demographic Variables Age of household head of National production of the function National production of the second National production production National production of the second National production of the second National production production National production preserves presecond National production producting the negatively | D 11 | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| VariablesX, Measured in protein y cars. It is assumed to be positively related to poverty [31]. D=-1i the head is a male, 0 if otherwise.Limit assumed to be megatively related to poverty [23].A dummy indicating the schooling completed bead is a male, 0 if otherwise.A dummy indicating the schooling completed bead is a male, 0 if otherwise.A dummy indicating the members that is, thouse above 15 years.Male-polygamous X, married and has more than one wife.Female-married X, A dummy indicating the marriad status and gender of the hoasehold head. D=1 if the head is a framale with absente hasband that is away most of the time, 0 if otherwise.Female-widowed X, A dummy indicating the marriad status and gender of the hoasehold head. D=1 if the head is a framale with otherwise.Female-widowed X, A dummy indicating the marriad status and gender of the hoasehold head. D=1 if the head is a framale with otherwise.Female-widowed X, A dummy indicating the marriad status and gender of the hoasehold head. D=1 if the sched is a framale with household head. D=1 if the masure of the level of operty [23].Female-widowed X, A dummy indicating the marriad status and gender of the marriad status and gender of the sched is a framale with otherwise.Female-widowed X, A dummy indicating the marriad status and the sched is the sched is a cons. 0 if otherwise.Female-widowed X, A dummy indicating the marriad status and gender of the sched is a cons. 0 if otherwise.Female-widowed X, A dummy indicating the marriad status and gender of the sched is a cons. 0 if otherwise.Farm Related VariablesYa the Major occupation A dummy indicating the man | Demographic | Age of household head | Gender of the household | Average years of | Male-monogamous |
| Measured in years. It is assumed to be geneticely leaded to positively related to be | Variables | X_1 | head | schooling of adult | X_4 |
| Farm Related Farm size Land access and is expected to be poverty [9]. Adummy indicating the head is a male, 0 if otherwise. Second the test of powerty [23] Second the bear and marind bead is a male, 0 if otherwise. Male-polygamous X, Also a dummy indicating gender and married and has more than one wife. Female-married X, Adummy indicating the the head is a female with the head is a female with the head is a female with otherwise. Female-widlowed X, Adummy indicating the the head is a female with the household head. D=-1 if the head is a female with the head is a female with the head is a female with the household head. D=-1 if female maters of the level positively related to poverty [2]. Adjusted household the ath of fead the powerty [2]. Farm Related Variables Farm size the theore the head is made sequence to be negatively related to poverty [2]. Adummy indicating the relation fead to powerty [2]. Adummy indicating the relation fead to powerty [2]. Mater of the head to powerty [2]. Farm Related Variables | | Measured in years. It is | X_2 | household members | A dummy indicating the |
| positively related to poverty [3]. related to poverty [3]. Average years of otherwise of index is a male, 0 if otherwise [23]. status of the household is one wife, 0 if otherwise. Male-polygamous X ₁ Nale-polygamous X ₂ Female-married X ₆ A durmy indicating the magnitud status and gender of the household is otherwise. Female-married X ₆ A durmy indicating the main status and gender of the household head. D=1 if formale and marial status and gender of the household head. D=1 if formale and marial status and gender of the household head. D=1 if formale and marial status and gender of the household head. D=1 if formale and marial status and gender of the household head. D=1 if formale and marial status and gender of the household head. D=1 if formale and marial status and gender of the household head. D=1 if formale and marial status and gender of the household head. D=1 if formale and marial status and gender of the household head. D=1 if formale and marial status and gender of the household head. D=1 if formale and marial status and gender of the household head. D=1 if formale and the state and the | | assumed to be | Expected to be negatively | X_3 | gender and marital |
| Farm Related Farm size Land access sind scenes (1) and bookshold solution (1) and bookshold sol | | positively related to | related to poverty $D=1$ if | Average years of | status of the household |
| Farm Related Farm size Land access Again of farming households Adummy indicating the head is a firmal status and gender of the household head. D=1 if a farming lossehold sea. Adummy indicating the head is a firmal status and gender of the household head. D=1 if a farming lossehold sea. Farm Related Farm size Adum of the level of genvise. Adum of t | | poverty [31]. D=1if the | head is a male. 0 if | schooling completed | head. $D = 9$ if male and |
| Farm Related Farm size Land access to the larger of the level of poverty [23]. Adum sindicating the major occupation of the lower of the level of poverty [23]. Adummy indicating the major occupation of the lower of the level of poverty [23]. Farm Related to the major occupation and 0 if otherwise. Adummy indicating the major occupation of the level of poverty [23]. Ratio of food expendency X ₁₀ Adummy indicating the major occupation and 0 if otherwise. Adummy indicating the major occupation of the level of poverty [23]. Ratio of food expendency X ₁₀ Adummy indicating the major occupation of the level of poverty [23]. Ratio of food expendency X ₁₀ Adummy indicating the major occupation of the level of poverty [23]. Adum to prove the level of poverty [23]. Ratio of food expendency X ₁₀ Adummy indicating the major occupation of the level of poverty [23]. Ratio of food expendency X ₁₀ Adummy indicating the major occupation of the level of poverty [23]. Adummy indicating the major occupation of the level of poverty [24]. Ratio of food expendency X ₁₀ Adummy indicating the major occupation and 0 if otherwise. Farm Related Farm size Land access X ₁₁ Adummy indicating the major occupation and 0 if otherwise. Adummy indicating the major occupation of the bowshold bard. Adummy indicating the major occupation of the bowshold bard. Non-farm income Major occupation and 0 if otherwise. Adummy indicating the major occupation and 0 if otherwise. Non-farm income No Variables Mage occupation and 0 if otherwise. Non-farm inc | | head is a male 0 if | otherwise [23] | hy adult household | has one wife 0 if |
| Farm Related Farm size Land access Adummy indicating the major occupation of the basehold is a sequence of the posteriol (23) Adummy indicating the major occupation of the basehold is a sequence of the posteriol (23) Farm Related Farm size Adummy indicating the major occupation of adults above and above for the posteriol (23) Adult dependencyX ₁₀ Adult depende | | otherwise | 0110111100[20] | members that is | otherwise |
| Farm Related Variables Farm size X ₁ Land access X ₁ Land access Adummy indicating the marital status of the the bousehold had. D=1 if the bousehold | | omerwise. | | those above 15 years | omerwise. |
| Farm Related Farm size Land access and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [23]. Ratio of food food poverty [23]. Ratio of food food poverty [23]. Farm Related Farm size Adummy indicating the nead is in the nous biolid size and also a diverce, of if otherwise. Adjusted household mad. D=1 if a female and a diverce, of if otherwise. Ratio of food food poverty [23]. Farm Related Farm size Adummy indicating the nead is in the post of farming household baour. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty [23]. Adjusted household size and also a diverce, of if otherwise. Ratio of food food poverty [23]. Farm Related Farm size Land access and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [23]. Adummy indicating the nead is a diverce, of forming household and poverty [23]. Ratio of food food poverty [23]. Mater polyce and in beach size and also a negatively related to poverty [23]. Mater polyce and also a diverce and also a diverce and also a diverce and also a diverce and in beach size and also a diverce and in beach size and also a diverce and also a diverce and also a diverce and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [23]. Ratio of food food poverty [23]. Farm size X ₁₄ X ₁₅ Adummy indicating the major occupation of the household in and D=off yea and 0 if in naira per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [29]. Number of the sease and 0 if in anira per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [29]. | | | | of and is expected to | |
| Farm Related Farm size Land access and is expected to be positively related to poverty [9]. Adummy indicating the main adults abuse and gender of the household status and gender of the status frame in the household status and gender of the status frame in the tatio fraction of total expenditure V ₁₂ . Farm Related Variables Farm size Land access V ₁₃ Adummy indicating the ratio fraction of total expenditure V ₁₂ . Farm Related Variables Farm size Land access of farming households to hard the ratio fraction of the poverty [23]. Adummy indicating the ratio fraction of the household to the ratio fraction of the households to hard the ratio fraction of the households to hard the ratio fraction of the households to hard the ratio fraction of the household to the poverty [26]. Malor occupation Najor occupation o | | | | oj age, is expected to | |
| Farm Related Variables Farm size Name Land access of farming indicating the married and has more than one wife. Female-middewide X _k A dummy indicating the married and has more than one wife. Female-widdowed X _k A dummy indicating the married and has more than one wife. Female-widdowed X _k A dummy indicating the married and has more than one wife. Female-widdowed X _k A dummy indicating the married and has more the bousehold head. D = 1 if a female and absente husband that is away most of the time, 0 if otherwise. Female-widdowed X _k A dummy indicating the married and has more the household head. D = 1 if a female and absente husband that is away most of the time, 0 if otherwise. Adjusted household size X ₁₁ Measured in adult equivalent and expected to be positively related to poverty [2]. Ratio of food expected to be positively related to poverty [2]. Farm Related Variables Farm size X ₁₄ Measured in hectares and is expected to be require training households to household head. D = 1 if farming households to hard D = 0 if yoverty [3] Land access of farming households to hard D = 0 if yoverty [2]. Anount of credit witized for farming natis preseason, it is expected to be require the beat of household head. D = 1 if farming is the major occupation X ₁₆ A dummy indicating membership of occuperative society. It is expected to be require the busehold head. D = 1 if farming is the major occupation A trait farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise. Number of income X ₁₆ A dummy indicating membership of accoperative society. It is expected to be require the buseholds, it is expected to be regatively related to poverty [19] Non-farm income masare. The closer the source of water, the better for the household heousehold head. D = 1 is owreef of water, the better for the households. | | | | be negatively related | |
| Make-polygamous X_s Also a dummy indicating gender and marital status and gender of the head. D=1 if the head is a female-maritel X_s head. D=1 if the head is a female with absentee husband that is away most of the time, 0 if otherwise.Female-divorced X_s A dummy indicating the marital status and gender of the household head. D=1 if female and a dwarmy indicating the marital status and marital status a | | | | to poverty [23] | |
| Also a dummy indicating gender and marital status of the head. D=1 fit he head is in than one wile.A dummy indicating the marital status and gender of the head is a first he head is a female with absentee husband that is away most of the time, of if otherwise.A dummy indicating the marital status of the household head. D=1 if female and a divorce. 0 if otherwise.A dummy indicating the marital status of the household head. D=1 if female and a divorce. 0 if otherwise.A dummy indicating the marital status of the household head. D=1 if female and a divorce. 0 if otherwise.A dummy indicating the marital status and possible head. D=1 if female and a divorce. 0 if otherwise.A dummy indicating the marital status and marital status and divorce. 0 if otherwise.A dummy indicating the marital status and marital status and divorce. 0 if otherwise.A dummy indicating the marital status and marital status and and browshold head. D=1 if female and a divorce. 0 if otherwise.A dummy indicating the marital status and widewed, 0 if otherwise.Farm Related VariablesFarm size \mathbf{X}_{14} Land access a disexpected to be in poverty [9].A dummy showing access of farming households to and is expected to be in asis expected to be in againe expenditure spen on the addition of the household head. D=1A dummy indicating the marital status and expenditure spen on total expenditure spen on poverty [2].Ratio of food expenditure spen expenditure spen total expenditure spen total expenditure spen total to poverty [2].Farm Related VariablesFarm size \mathbf{X}_1 Land access a dummy s | | Male-polygamous X ₅ | Female-married X ₆ | Female-divorced X ₇ | Female-widowed X ₈ |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size \mathbf{X}_{14} Land access \mathbf{X}_{15} Adult dependency. \mathbf{X}_{15} Aduant of credit \mathbf{X}_{16} Ratio of food head. D=1 if (the household head. D=1 if (the household size and also a mort drawn into positively related to poverty [9].Adult dependency. (the proportion of adults abov dependency. positively related to poverty [9].Adult dependency. (the proportion of adults abov dependency. (the proportion of adults abov dependency. poverty [9].Ratio of food expected to be poverty [2].Farm Related VariablesFarm size \mathbf{X}_{14} Land access \mathbf{X}_{16} Aduanty indicating access to remittances \mathbf{X}_{16} Measured in hectures and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [3]otherwise [5]Amount of credit utilized for farming in naira per senon, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [19]Major occupation \mathbf{X}_{17} \mathbf{X}_{18} Number of visits by extension agents per monther mincome is expected to be negatively related to poverty [19]Major occupation \mathbf{X}_{17} \mathbf{X}_{18} Mount of credit utilized for farming is expected to be negatively related to poverty [19]Major occupation occupation and 0 if otherwise.Major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major | | Also a dummy | A dummy indicating the | A dummy indicating | A dummy indicating the |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size X_{14} Land access A dummy indicating the major socupation of otherwise.Adjust dependency X_{10} otherwise.Ratio of food expenditure X_{12} measures of the level of dependency. positively related to poverty [9].Ratio of food expenditure X_{12} measures of the level of dependency. Proportion of adults above dependency. positively related to poverty [9].Ratio of food expenditure X_{12} measures of the level of dependency.Ratio of food expenditure X_{12} measures of the level of dependency.Farm Related VariablesFarm size X_{14} Land access A dummy indicating the major occupation of the household size and 0 if otherwise [5]Adjusted household size X_{14} Measured in hectares and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]Ratio of food expenditure X_{12} measures of the level of dependency.Farm Related VariablesFarm size X_{14} Land access A dummy showing access of farming households to land D=Dif yes and 0 if otherwise [5]Adjusted household size X_{14} A dummy indicating the major occupation of the households, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [6]Number of income X_{16} A dummy indicating membership of a cocupation of otherwise.Institutional VariablesMeasured in Palsered wall X_{12} A dummy indicating membership of a cocupative societ X_{20} A dummy indicating membership of a coperative societ, 1 is expected to be negatively related to poverty S_{21} if otherwise.Iving Condition VariablesChink Destance in X_{22} A dummy indicating membership of a | | indicating gender and | marital status and gender of | the gender and | marital status and |
| head. D=1 if the head is married and has more than one wife.the head is a female with absentee husband that is away most of the time, 0 if otherwise.head. D=1 if female and advoced, 0 if otherwise.Child dependencyX, Proportion of children under 15 years that are not drawn into household labour. It is positively related to poverty [9].Adult dependencyX is Proportion of adults above to year the level of dependency.Adult dependency Xis Proportion of adults above to year the level of dependency.Adult dependency Xis Proportion of adults above to year the level of dependency.Adult dependency.Adult dependency.Farm Related VariablesFarm size XisLand access A durmsy indicating otherwise.Land access XisAdurmsy indicating access to remittances from friends and relations. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty [29]Remittance Access Xis A durmsy indicating working members sin the households to land D=0 if poverty [6]Amount of credit utilized for farming in naira per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [6]Number of income earners in the households, it is secret to be negatively related to poverty [9]Major occupation Xir Cocupation and 0 if otherwise.Number of nairing societ, Y. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty [9]Major occupation cocupation and 0 if otherwise.Number of nairing on the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society Xis A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative societ, Y. Is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D= 1 if fi | | marital status of the | the household head. D=1 if | marital status of the | gender of the household |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size X ₁₄ Land access A duntry idicating the major cocupation of the bouschold labour. It is expected to be poverty [9].Adult dependencyX ₁₆ Proportion of adults above dependency. Proportion of adults above dependency. Poverty leated to poverty [9].Adult dependencyX ₁₆ Proportion of adults above dependency. Proportion of adults above dependency.Adjusted household size X ₁₁ Measured in adult equivalent and coperative scatcal do be poverty [9].Ratio of food expenditure V ₁₂ Engel index, it measures from friends and relations. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty [9].Farm Related VariablesFarm size X ₁₆ Land access X ₁₆ Adummy indicating in main parameters of farming households to land D=Diff yes and 0 if otherwise.[5]Adount of credit utilized for farming in main paraesano, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [13]Nom-farm income in access to remittances A dummy indicating the major occupation of the households to land D=Diff yes and 0 if otherwise.[5]Non-farm income in naira per month. Households, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [13]Institutional VariablesMembership of a cooperative society. L is expected to be negatively related to poverty lengent on 0 if otherwise.Number of income tagent and to be negatively related to poverty lengent and to be poverty lengent and to be negatively related to poverty lengent and to be negatively related to poverty lengent and to cocupation and 0 if otherwise.Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X ₂₀ A dummy indicating membership | | head. D=1 if the head is | the head is a female with | household head. D = | head. D=1 if female and |
| Farm Related Variables Farm size transize and is expected to be negatively related to nentitiente negatively related to nentin nar | | married and has more | absentee husband that is | 1 if a female and a | widowed, 0 if otherwise. |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size X ₁₄ Adult dependencyX ₁₀ Proportion of adults above 65 years in relation to the household labour. It is expected to be positively related to poverty [9].Adult dependencyX ₁₀ Proportion of adults above dependency. dependency.Adjusted household size X ₁₁ Measured in hadult equivalent and expected to be poverty [23].Ratio of food expenditure X ₁₂ Engel Index, it measures the ratio fraction of total poverty [24].Farm Related VariablesFarm size X ₁₄ Measured in hoctares and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]Land access A dummy showing access of farming households in and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]Aduumy showing access of farming households in and D=Dif yes and D if otherwise [5]Amount of credit utilized for farming in naira per season, and D if otherwise.Number of income X ₁₆ Non-farm income X ₁₈ Institutional VariablesMajor occupation A dummy indicating the major occupation ad 0 if otherwise.Major occupation of the household, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [9]Non-farm income Number of income X ₁₈ Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative societ X ₂₉ A dummy indicating the major occupation ad 0 if otherwise.Number of vater, the better household, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [9]Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in Risered wall kilometresNumber of vater, the better household, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=D if first, D if otherwise.Living Condition Variables </th <th></th> <th>than one wife.</th> <th>away most of the time, 0 if</th> <th>divorcee. 0 if</th> <th>······································</th> | | than one wife. | away most of the time, 0 if | divorcee. 0 if | ······································ |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size X14 Measured in hectares and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [3]Land access A dummy showing access of farming insuecholds and D=Dif yees and 0 if otherwise.Adjusted household size X11 Measured in adult equivalent and equivalent and poverty [23].Ratio of food expenditure to total expenditure to total ex | | than one wrie. | otherwise | otherwise | |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size National state Living ConditionLand access A dummy indicating the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Adjust dependency X ₁₀ Proportion of adults above for parts in telation to the household labour. It is expected to be goverty [9].Adjust dependency X ₁₀ Proportion of adults above for present of the level of dependency.Adjusted household size X ₁₁ Measured in adult equivalent and poverty [23].Ratio of food expenditure to total expenditure Spent on food. It is expected to be poverty [29] Remittances from friends and relations. It is expected to poverty [20] Remittances from friends and relations. It is expected to poverty [20] Remittances from friends and relations. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]Adummy showing access of farming households to and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]Ratio of food expected to be negatively related to poverty [20] Number of rearming tuilized for farming in naira per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [19]Major occupation variablesMajor occupation of tub household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Mumber of visits by extension agents per month X ₁₁ Itiving Condition VariablesMembership of cooperative society X ₂₀ A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if y | | | other wise. | other wise. | |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size X_{14} Land access of farming household sto dependency.A dummy indicating the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Manuel of adults above size X_{11} expenditure to total expected to be poverty [23].Farm Related VariablesFarm size X_{14} Land access of farming household sto poverty [33]A dummy showing access of farming household sto dependency.Amount of credit utilized for farming in an are presense.Number of income to be negatively related to poverty [29].Farm Related VariablesFarm size X_{14} Land access of farming households to negatively related to poverty [33]A dummy showing access of farming households to land D=0if yes and 0 if poverty [6]Manunt of credit utilized for farming to be negatively related to poverty [19]Major occupation occupation and 0 if otherwise.Number of income tis expected to be negatively related to poverty [19]Non-farm income to poverty [19]Main und of credit utilized for farming society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty [23]Number of income to therwise [5]Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Institutional VariablesClinic (Distance in kiometresPatever vall A dummy indicating the major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1 if yes, 0 if otherwise.Numbe | | Child dependencyX ₉ | Adult dependencyX ₁₀ | Adjusted household | Ratio of food |
| under 15 years that are not drawn into household labour. It is expected to be sepected to be poverty [9]. Positively related to poverty [9]. Positively related to poverty [9]. Poverty [10]. Pover | | Proportion of children | Proportion of adults above | size X ₁₁ | expenditure to total |
| not drawn into household size and also a measure of the level of expected to be positively related to positively related to poverty [9]. Farm Related Variables Farm size Land access and is expected to be measured in hetares and is expected to be measures of farming households to measured in hetares and is expected to be measures in the household head D=0 if farming is the major occupation of the household head D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise. Major occupation X₁₇ A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society X₂₀ A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society X₂₁ A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society X₂₂ A dummy denoting if kilometres X₂₂ A dummy denoting if Longer distance to household place of source of water, the better for the households, is the measure of north X₂₁ A mount of non-farm income in naira per source in kilometeres X₂₂ A minuter of veilist by extension agents per month X₂₁. | | under 15 years that are | 65 years in relation to the | Measured in adult | expenditure X_{12} |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size Land access and is expected to be poverty [9].Land access access 1 is expected to be dependency. poverty [23].the ratio fraction of total expenditure spent on poverty [23].Farm Related VariablesFarm size Land access X14Land access A dummy showing access of farming households to poverty [33]A dummy indicating access to remittance of farming households to in naira per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [6]Measured in hectares of farming households to in naira per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [6]Amount of credit utilized for farming in naira per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [6]Number of income X16Institutional VariablesMajor occupation X17X17Non-farm income X19Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X20 poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X21Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in N222Plastered wall household piace ofDistance to household piace ofVariablesX22 A dummy identing if household piace ofA dummy denoting if household piace ofSociet related to poverty. | | not drawn into | household size and also a | equivalent and | Engel index, it measures |
| Farm Related variables Farm size Land access transitively related to poverty [23]. Farm Related variables Farm size Land access transitively related to poverty [23]. Farm size Land access transitively related to poverty [23]. Remittance Access X₁₃ A dummy indicating access to remittances from friends and relations. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if there is access, 0 if otherwise. Major occupation X₁₀ Major occupation the major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise. Membership of cooperative society X₂₀ A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society X₂₀ A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society X₂₀ A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society X₂₀ A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society X₂₀ A dummy indicating membership of accoperative society X₂₀ A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society X₂₀ A dummy indicating membership of accoperative society X₂₀ A dummy indicating membership of accept and the bit accore in kilometers Kilometres X₂₁ A dummy denoting if k₂₂ A dummy denoting if | | household labour. It is | measure of the level of | expected to be | the ratio fraction of total |
| $\begin{tabular}{l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l $ | | expected to be | dependency | positively related to | expenditure spent on |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | positively related to | dependency. | poverty [23] | food It is expected to be |
| | | positively related to | | poverty [25]. | nogetively related to |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | poverty [9]. | | | liegativery related to |
| Farm Related Farm size Land access A dummy indicating access to remittances from friends and relations. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1 if there is access, 0 if otherwise. Variables Farm size Land access Adummy showing access to remittance Access Xis Measured in hectares and is expected to be of farming households to negatively related to land D=-0i yes and 0 if poverty [33] Adummy showing access Xis Measured in hectares and is expected to be acquirely related to land D=-0i yes and 0 if poverty [33] Adummy showing access Xis Major occupation poverty [33] otherwise [5] Amount of credit utilized for farming bouseholds to land D=-0i yes and 0 if otherwise [5] Institutional Variables Major occupation Xir Xir Major occupation Xir Xir Membership of cooperative society Xir Xir A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society Xir Number of visits by extension agents per month. Number of visits by extension agents per month. Number of visits by extension agents per month. A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society Xir Number of visits by extension agents per month. A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society Xir Number of visits by extension agents per month. A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society Xir Deit expected to be negatively related to poverty. | | | | | poverty [29] |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size X_{14} Land access X_{15} A dummy indicating access to remittances from friends and relations. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1 if there is access, 0 if otherwise.Farm Related VariablesFarm size X_{14} Land access X_{15} Amount of credit utilized for farming in anara per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]A dummy indicating the X_{16} Number of income utilized for farming in anara per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [6]Amount of credit utilized for farming in anara per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [6]Mousehold, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [9]Major occupation occupation and 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1 if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in X_{12} Plastered wall X_{23} Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{24} Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in X_{22} A dummy denoting if household place of household place of household place ofNumber of weit me many concert in the households, | | | | | Remittance Access X_{13} |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size X_{14} Land access X_{15} Amount of credit utilized for farming is access, 0 if otherwise, and is expected to be negatively related to negatively related to poverty [33]Amount of credit utilized for farming in naira per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]Amount of credit utilized for farming in naira per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]Amount of credit utilized for farming in naira per season, it is expected to be poverty [6]Amount of credit verking members in the households, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [19]Major occupation vorking membership of cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty [19]Non-farm income X17MaibesMembership of cooperative society X20 occupation and 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X21 ti s expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1 if yes, 0 if otherwise.Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X22 A dummy denoting if yes, 0 if otherwise.Nisticator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, id | | | | | A dummy indicating |
| Farm Related Farm size Land access Amount of credit Number of income Variables X ₁₄ X ₁₅ Adummy showing access Amount of credit Number of income is expected to be of farming households to negatively related to household Amount of credit X ₁₈ measured in hectares A dummy showing access Amount of credit X ₁₈ measured in hectares A dummy showing access Amount of credit X ₁₈ measured in hectares A dummy showing access Amount of credit X ₁₈ poverty [33] otherwise [5] in aira per season, it working members in the is expected to be poverty [19] meatively related to poverty [19] Major occupation X ₁₇ X ₁₉ Adummy indicating the major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise. Number of visits by extension agents per month. Institutional Membership of cooperative society X ₂₀ Number of visits by extension agents per month. Yariables Clinic Distance in Plastered wall Distance to potable water source in kilometers Living Clinic Distance in Plastered wall | | | | | access to remittances |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size X_{14} Land access X_{14} Amount of credit utilized for farming in access, 0 if otherwise.Amount of credit X_{16} Number of income earners in the Measured in hectares o poverty [33]Measured in hectares and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]A dummy showing access of farming households to in aniar per season, it is expected to be poverty [6]Amount of credit X_{16} Number of income earners in the May or occupation X_{17} Major occupation Variables X_{17} X_{19} Non-farm income X_{19} Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to bousehold head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1 if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X_{23} A dummy denoting if household place ofDistance to potable water source in kilometers X_{24} A during distance to household place of X_{23} A duming denoting if household place ofA noticicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, it household place of | | | | | from friends and |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size X14Land access A dummy showing access and is expected to be negatively related to land D=0if yes and 0 if poverty [33]A dummy showing access of farming households to land D=0if yes and 0 if otherwise [5]Amount of credit utilized for farming main ara per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]Mousehold stateMajor occupation VariablesMajor occupation X17 A dummy indicating the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X21Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X20 poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X21Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in kilometresPlasterd wall household place ofDistance to potable water source in kilometers X23Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in kilometresPlasterd wall household place ofDistance to potable water source in kilometers X23 | | | | | relations. It is expected |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size Saccess, 0 if otherwise.Land access A dummy showing access and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]A dummy showing access of farming households to land D=0if yes and 0 if otherwise [5]A mount of credit utilized for farming in naira per season, it working members in the households, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [6]Mumber of income earners in the Mouseholds to naira per season, it working members in the households, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [19]Major occupation VariablesMajor occupation a dummy indicating the major occupation on d0 if otherwise.Non-farm income x19Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X20 poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X21Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in kilometres X22 X22 A dummy dicating term poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, if an indicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, if an indicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, if an indicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, if an indicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, if an indicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, if an indicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, if an indicator of welfare measure. The closer the sourc | | | | | to be negatively related |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size X_{14} Land access X_{15} Amount of credit utilized for farming naise expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]Number of income earners in the household in aira per season, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]Number of income earners in the Maior occupation occupation and 0 if otherwise.Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Membership of a cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of income earners in the Major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Membership of a cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in Kilometres X ₂₂ A dummy denoting if Longer distance to household place ofNumber of velfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, | | | | | to poverty. $D=1$ if there |
| Farm Related VariablesFarm size X14Land access X14Amount of credit utilized for farming utilized for farming shows the number of income earners in the X18Measured in hectares and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]A dummy showing access of farming households to negatively related to bowerty [33]A dummy showing access of farming households to negatively related to poverty [6]Mousehold working members in the households, it is negatively related to poverty [6]Major occupation occupation and 0 if otherwise.Number of income X17Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X21Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in Longer distance to Longer distance toPlastered wall household place ofDistance to potable water source in kilometers X24 | | | | | is access 0 if otherwise |
| Variables X_{14} X_{15} Mainout of return x_{16} Number of number x_{16} Measured in hectares and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]A dummy showing access and $D=0$ if yes and 0 if poverty [33]A dummy showing access otherwise [5]A mount of credit X_{16} X_{18} Major occupation X_{17} Major occupation X_{17} Shows the number of in naira per season, it is expected to be poverty [6]Shows the number of working members in the households, it is negatively related to poverty [19]Major occupation X_{17} X_{16} Non-farm income X_{19} A dummy indicating the major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X_{20} A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in X_{22} Platered wall household place ofDistance to potable water source in kilometers X_{24} | Farm Related | Farm size | I and access | A mount of credit | Number of income |
| Variables X_{14} X_{15} X_{15} X_{16} X_{16} X_{16} Measured in hectares and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33] A_{15} X_{16} householdmeasured in hectares and is expected to be negatively related to poverty [33] A_{15} X_{16} householdmeasured in hectares and is expected to be poverty [33] A_{15} A_{16} A_{18} measured in hectares and is expected to be poverty [33] A_{16} A_{18} A_{18} measured in hectares poverty [33] A_{16} A_{100} A_{16} A_{18} Major occupation X_{17} X_{19} A_{10} A_{17} A_{19} A dummy indicating the major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise. N_{19} A_{19} Mational VariablesMembership of cooperative society X_{20} poverty. D=1 if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in X_{22} Plastered wall household place ofDistance to potable water source in kilometers X_{24} Variables X_{22} A dummy denoting if household place of A_{24} | Variables | Y | X | utilized for forming | approace in the |
| Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society. LivingMajor occupation occupation and 0 if otherwise. X_{16} Industriou Major occupation to therwise [5]Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X_{20} Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Living ConditionClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X_{22} Distance to household place ofDistance to poverty led to poverty. Plastered wall A dummy denoting if Longer distance to household place ofNumber of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} A dummy indicating membership of cooperative poverty.Distance to potable water source in kilometers X_{23} Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{24} A dummy indicating to magent provement.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{24} Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{24} | variabits | Massurad in bactoras | A dummy showing access | v | household |
| and its expected to be negatively related to poverty [33]otherwise [5]Annount of creating utilized for farming in naira per season, it is expected to be poverty [6]Shows the number of working members in the is expected to be poverty [6]Major occupation VariablesMajor occupation X_{17} Non-farm income X_{19} Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Living ConditionClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X_{23} Distance to potable water source in kilometers X_{23} Variables X_{22} A dummy denoting if Longer distance to household place ofAummy denoting if household place ofAumount of reating utilized for farming in naira per season, it working members in the is expected to be poverty [6]Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Living ConditionClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X_{23} Distance to potable water source in kilometersVariables X_{22} A dummy denoting if Longer distance to household place ofA dummy denoting if an indicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, | | and is symposted to be | of forming households to | A_{16} | nousenoiu V |
| Inegatively related torand D=0f yes and 0 fiutilized for farmingShows the number ofpoverty [33]otherwise [5]in naira per season, itworking members in thepoverty [33]otherwise [5]in naira per season, ithouseholds, it isin adjor occupationhousehold bead.poverty [6]negatively related toMajor occupationNon-farm incomeX17A dummy indicating the major occupation of the household head.D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X21Institutional | | and is expected to be | land D. Official and O if | Allount of credit | A_{18} |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | negatively related to | D=011 yes and 0 11 | | Shows the number of |
| is expected to be negatively related to poverty [6]households, it is expected to be negatively related to poverty [19]Major occupation poverty [19]Non-farm income X ₁₇ Major occupation to a dummy indicating the major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Non-farm income to main a per month.Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X ₂₀ poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X ₂₁ Living ConditionClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X ₂₂ Distance to potable water source in kilometres X ₂₃ VariablesX 22A dummy denoting if household place ofAn indicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, | | poverty [33] | otherwise [5] | in naira per season, it | working members in the |
| Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X_{20} Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Living ConditionClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall household place ofDistance to potable water source in kilometres X_{22} Variables X_{22} A dummy denoting if household place ofA dummy denoting if household place of | | | | is expected to be | households, it is |
| $\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $ | | | | negatively related to | expected to be |
| poverty [19]Major occupationNon-farm income X_{17} Non-farm incomeA dummy indicating the major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Amount of non-farm income in naira per month.Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X_{20} Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wallDistance to potable water source in kilometersLiving Condition VariablesX ₂₂ A dummy denoting if Longer distance tohousehold place ofSource of water, the better for the households, | | | | poverty [6] | negatively related to |
| Major occupationNon-farm income X_{17} X_{19} A dummy indicating the major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Amount of non-farm income in naira per month.InstitutionalMembership of cooperative society X_{20} Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} VariablesA dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} Living ConditionClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X_{23} Distance to potable water source in kilometers X_{24} Variables X_{22} A dummy denoting if Longer distance toAn indicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, | | | | | poverty [19] |
| A dummy indicating the major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.A mount of non-farm income in naira per month.Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X20 A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X21Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X23Distance to potable water source in kilometers X24VariablesX22 A dummy denoting if Longer distance toA dummy denoting if household place ofA dummy denoting if source of water, the better for the households, | | Major | occupation V | Non-fai | rm income |
| A dummy indicating the major occupation of the household head. D=1 if farming is the major occupation and 0 if otherwise.Amount of non-rann income in mara per month.Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X20 | | A dummy indicating th | Δ_{17} | Amount of non-form in | A ₁₉ |
| Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X20 A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X21Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X23Distance to potable water source in kilometers X23Living Condition VariablesX22 A dummy denoting if Longer distance toA dummy denoting if household place ofA dummy denoting if source of water, the better for the households, | | A duminy indicating u | 1 if forming is the major | Amount of non-farm n | icome in nana per monun. |
| Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X20 A dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Number of visits by extension agents per month X21Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X23Distance to potable water source in kilometers X23VariablesX22 A dummy denoting if Longer distance toA dummy denoting if household place ofDistance to potable water measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, | | nousenoid head. D= | 1 if farming is the major | | |
| Institutional VariablesMembership of cooperative society X_{20} Number of visits by extension agents per month X_{21} VariablesA dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Living ConditionClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X_{23} Distance to potable water source in kilometers X_{24} Variables X_{22} Longer distance to household place ofA dummy denoting if source of water, the better for the households, | T (1) (1) T | occupation at | nd 0 if otherwise. | | · · · |
| VariablesA dummy indicating membership of a cooperative society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.month X_{21} Living ConditionClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X_{23} Distance to potable water source in kilometers X_{24} Variables X_{22} A dummy denoting if household place ofDistance to water, the better for the households, | Institutional | Membership of co | Soperative society X_{20} | Number of visits by | y extension agents per |
| society. It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.It is expected to be negatively related to poverty. D=1if yes, 0 if otherwise.Living Condition VariablesClinic Distance in kilometresPlastered wall X_{23} Distance to potable water source in kilometers X_{24} Living Condition VariablesX22 is an indicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the household place ofDistance to potable water source in kilometers X_{24} | Variables | A dummy indicating m | embership of a cooperative | mor | ith X ₂₁ |
| | | society. It is expected | to be negatively related to | It is expected to be neg | atively related to poverty. |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } Living & Clinic Distance in & Plastered wall & Distance to potable water source in kilometers \\ \hline Condition & kilometres & X_{23} & X_{24} \\ \hline Variables & X_{22} & A dummy denoting if \\ Longer distance to & household place of & source of water, the better for the households, \\ \hline \end{array} $ | | poverty. D=1if | yes, 0 if otherwise. | | |
| $ \begin{array}{c c} \textbf{Condition} \\ \textbf{Variables} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \textbf{kilometres} & \textbf{X}_{23} & \textbf{X}_{24} \\ \textbf{X}_{22} & \textbf{A} \ \text{dummy} \ \text{denoting} \ \text{if} \\ \text{Longer} \ \text{distance to} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \textbf{A} \ \text{dummy} \ \text{denoting} \ \text{if} \\ \text{household} \ \text{place of} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \textbf{A} \ \text{output} \ \text{output} \ \text{output} \ \text{output} \ \text{output} \ \text{output} \ \text{denoting} \ \text{for an indicator} \ \text{of welfare measure.} \ \text{The closer the} \\ \text{source of water, the better for the households,} \end{array} $ | Living | Clinic Distance in | Plastered wall | Distance to potable wa | ater source in kilometers |
| Variables X_{22} A dummy denoting if household place ofAn indicator of welfare measure. The closer the source of water, the better for the households, | Condition | kilometres | X ₂₃ | | X ₂₄ |
| Longer distance to household place of source of water, the better for the households, | Variables | X ₂₂ | A dummy denoting if | An indicator of welfar | e measure. The closer the |
| | | Longer distance to | household place of | source of water, the b | etter for the households, |

Table 2: Fitted Variables for the Tobit Regression Model

| Α | gender and | alysis o | f determi | nants of | poverty | y among | rural t | farming | households | in Nigeria |
|---|------------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|------------|
| | 0 | | | | | | , | | | |

| source of medical | dwelling is plastered it is | measured in kilometres. It is expected to be |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| facility might | expected to be negatively | positively related to poverty [9] |
| discourage utilization | related to poverty [9]. D=1 | |
| and result in low level | if yes, 0 if otherwise. | |
| of welfare [29] | | |

Source: Field Survey, 2007

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics based on Gender of the Household Heads

| ITEMS | MALE-HEADED | FEMALE-HEADED | ALL HOUSEHOLDS |
|---------------------------|---|---|----------------|
| | n=430 | n=80 | n=510 |
| Gender | 430 (84) | 80 (16) | 510 (100) |
| Age: | | | |
| 25-44 | 73(17) | 15 (19) | 88 (17) |
| 45-64 | 328 (76) | 49 (61) | 477 (74) |
| >64 | 29 (7) | 16 (20) | 45 (9) |
| Mean Age | 51.9 | 54.03 | 52.19 |
| Standard deviation | 9.46 | 9.61 | 9.15 |
| Marital Status | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | , |
| Single | 17 (4) | - | 17 (3.3) |
| Married | 411 (96) | 32 (40) | 443 (87) |
| Widowed | 1 () 5) | 46 (58) | 47 (9 2) |
| Divorced | 1(0.5) | 2 (2) | 3(0.6) |
| Educational Status | 1 (0.5) | 2(2) | 5(0.0) |
| No formal education | 175 (41) | 48 (60) | 223 (44) |
| Arabic | 104(24) | 3(4) | 107(20) |
| Primary | 54 (13) | 15 (19) | 69 (14) |
| Secondary | 70 (16) | 11 (13) | 81 (16) |
| Tertiary | 70(10) 27(6) | 3(4) | 30 (6) |
| Maan vaars (Eng. Long.) | 4.21 | 3 (+) | 4 00 |
| Standard deviation | 4.21 | 5.J 4.01 | 4.09 5 10 |
| Standard deviation | 5.18 | 4.91 | 3.19 |
| Post Primary Education | 102 (24) | 14(17) | 116 (22) |
| i es | 102(24) | 14(17) | 116 (23) |
| | 328 (76) | 66 (83) | 394 (77) |
| Post Secondary Education | 27 (6) | 2 (4) | 21 (6) |
| Yes | 27 (6) | 3 (4) 77 (0) | 31 (6) |
| No | 403 (94) | // (96) | 479 (94) |
| Major Occupation | | 10 (50) | |
| Farming only | 280 (65) | 42 (53) | 322 (63) |
| Farming and Trading | 45 (10) | 35 (44) | 80 (16) |
| Farming and artisan | 81 (19) | - | 81 (16) |
| Civil service and farming | 24 (6) | 3 (4) | 27 (5) |
| Farm Size | | | |
| <1 Ha | 21 (5) | 14 (18) | 35 (7) |
| 1-2 Ha | 343 (80) | 66 (82) | 409 (80) |
| Land Access | 1 | | |
| Yes | 350 (81) | 26 (33) | 404 (79) |
| No | 80 (19) | 54 (67) | 106 (21) |
| Input access | | | |
| Yes | 230 (53) | 38 (48) | 268 (67) |
| No | 200 (47) | 42 (52) | 242 (47) |
| Extension Access | | | |
| No visit | 286 (66) | 56 (70) | 342 (67) |
| 1-2 visits | 137 (32) | 21 (26) | 158 (31) |
| >2 | 7 (2) | 3 (4) | 10 (2) |
| Mean | 0.48 | 0.45 | 0.47 |
| Standard deviation | 0.76 | 0.83 | 0.77 |
| Loan Amount per Cropping | g Season | | |
| Nil | 257 (60) | 51 (64) | 308 (60) |
| <25,000 | 85 (20) | 14 (17) | 99 (19) |
| 25,000-50,000 | 70 (16) | 15 (19) | 85 (17) |
| >50,000 | 18 (4) | - | 18 (4) |
| Mean | 10,725 | 14,293.02 | 13,733 |
| Standard deviation | 15,648.01 | 26,480.46 | 25,113.64 |

Olorunsanya and Omotesho, 2014

| Cooperative Membership | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------|
| Yes | 140 (33) | 17 (21) | 157 (31) |
| No | 290 (67) | 63 (79) | 353 (69) |
| Farm Income | | | |
| Nil | 87 (20) | 27 (34) | 114 (22) |
| 0-25,000 | 133 (31) | 28 (35) | 161 (32) |
| 25,001-100,000 | 148 (35) | 18 (23) | 166 (32) |
| >100,000 | 62 (14) | 7 (8) | 69 (14) |
| Mean | 108,526.57 | 64,054.19 | 101,550.51 |
| Standard deviation | 117,131.01 | 74,434.69 | 112,629.28 |
| Non-Farm Income (N) per 1 | month | | |
| Nil | 302 (70) | 55 (69) | 357 (70) |
| 0-2,500 | 99 (23) | 17 (21) | 116 (23) |
| 2,501-5,000 | 17 (4) | 8 (10) | 25 (5) |
| >5000 | 12 (3) | - | 12 (2) |
| Mean | 992.56 | 630 | 767.06 |
| Standard deviation | 2,069.52 | 1,131.42 | 1,952.42 |
| Household Size | | | |
| Small (1-5) | 35 (8) | 28 (35) | 63 (12) |
| Medium (6-10) | 216 (50) | 49 (61) | 266 (52) |
| Large >10 | 179 (42) | 3 (4) | 181 (36) |
| Mean | 10.10 | 6.39 | 9.52 |
| Child dependency Ratio | | | |
| Nil (0) | 10 (2) | 2 (3) | 12 (2) |
| 0.01-5 | 271 (63) | 37 (46) | 308 (60) |
| 0.51-1.0 | 149 (35) | 41 (51) | 190 (37) |
| Mean | 0.49 | 0.54 | 0.50 |
| Standard deviation | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.18 |
| Adult Dependency Ratio | | | |
| Yes | 56 (13) | 6 (8) | 62 (12) |
| No | 374 (87) | 74 (92) | 448 (88) |
| Remittance Access | | | |
| Yes | 194 (45) | 61 (76) | 255 (50) |
| No | 236 (55) | 19 (24) | 255 (50) |
| Ratio of Food Expenditure | to Total Expenditur | e | |
| 0-0.5 | 39 (9) | 5 (6) | 44 (9) |
| 0.61-1.0 | 391 (9) | 5 (6) | 44 (9) |
| Mean | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.64 |
| Standard deviation | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.15 |

Source: Field Survey, 2007.

More adult members in the male-headed households had post primary and post secondary education (24% and 6%) than the female-headed households (17% and 4% respectively). This corroborates earlier reports by [34, 28]. The gender differentials in education were also evident in the mean years of schooling of the adult members in the male-headed households (4.21 years) as against 3.50 years in the female-headed households (literacy in English language). Generally, educational attainment is lower for females than for males in Nigeria, as in most of Africa; these inequalities persist but are also diminishing [26, 28].

Sixty-five per cent of the male-headed households engaged in full time farming; while 42 per cent of the female-headed households took farming as means of livelihood. The percentage of livelihood diversification varied with gender of the household heads. Forty-four per cent of the households headed by females were into farming and trading while ten per cent of the households-headed by male engaged in farming and trading. Rural farming households' involvements in civil service were relatively small in the study area; 6% and 4% respectively for male and female-headed households. Nonetheless, farming as a means of livelihood is still the major occupation in rural Kwara for the two categories of households. [26] reported a similar finding.

Expenditure Pattern of Rural Farming Households based on Gender of the Household Heads

The expenditure pattern of the rural farming households in the study area is presented in this section based on gender of the household heads. The mean consumption expenditure per adult equivalent A gender analysis of determinants of poverty among rural farming households in Nigeria

for the female-headed households was N2410.375 The means are statistically different from each other (Table 4).

| | Ite | ms | | All Households | Male-Headed | Female-Headed |
|--------------------|------|-----|-------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| | | | | n=510 | Households | Households |
| | | | | | n=430 | n=80 |
| Mean | Real | | Consumption | N2568.95 | N 2584.41* | N2410.38* |
| Expenditu | ire | Per | Adult | | 11200 1112 | 112120000 |
| Equivalent(MPAEHE) | | | | | | |

Table 4: Disaggregation of Consumption Expenditure based on Gender the Household Heads

Source: Field Survey, 2007. The tests are for differences by gender of the household head. *denotes significance at 1%.

The mean per adult equivalent household expenditure for all households was $\Re 2,557.11$

Poverty Profile of Rural Households in Kwara State based on Gender of the Household Heads

The results of the poverty indices of the rural farming households in the study area are presented in Table 5 based on gender of the household heads. The head count indices are 63 and 59 per cent respectively

for the female and male-headed households. The indices are significantly different from the whole group indices at 1%. This is in conformity with [23] for Cape Verde. Female-headed households are particularly disadvantaged due to poor access to productive resources than their male-headed counterparts. They are also less educated and lack asset that can serve as economic security and collateral for credit facilities to advance their course.

Table 5: Foster, Greer and Thorbecke Poverty Indicators for Rural Farming Households in Kwara State based

on Gender of the Household Head

| ITEM | P_0 | P_1 | P_2 | q | п | Contr | ibution | to |
|----------------|--------|--------|--------|-----|-----|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | | P ₀ | P ₁ | P ₂ |
| Gender | ** | sk sk | sk sk | | | | | |
| Female | 0.63 | 0.18 | 0.06 | 50 | 80 | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.19 |
| Mala | 0.50** | 0.16** | 0.05** | 051 | 420 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| Male | 0.59 | 0.16 | 0.05 | 251 | 430 | 0.83 | 0.82 | 0.81 |
| All Households | 0.58 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 301 | 510 | | | |

Source: Field survey, 2007. The tests are for differences from whole group.**denotes significance at 1% level, * denotes significant at 5% level.

Determinants of Rural Farming Households in Kwara State Based on Gender of the Households' Heads

The results of the Tobit regression model is presented in Table 6 based on gender of the household heads. The following variables significantly influence the poverty status of the male-headed households in the study area. These are: average years of schooling of adult household members, membership of cooperative societies by the household heads, farm size, child dependency ratio, ratio of food expenditure to total expenditure, farming as the only occupation of the household heads, access to farm land, quality of accommodation of the households, household size, distance to water and medical facilities and amount of non-farm income earned per month by the household. Age of the household head, distance to water and

medical facilities, child and adult dependency ratios, farming as the only occupation of the households as well as ratio of food expenditure to total expenditure had positive relationship with poverty status of maleheaded farming households in Kwara State. The remaining significant variables however affected their poverty status negatively. Average years of schooling of adult household members and the size of the household had significant negative and positive marginal contribution of -0.053 and 0.014 respectively to poverty status of rural male-headed households in the study area. Male-headed households in the study area had large household size (42% had above 10 members per household, Table 2). Large household size has been reported as a positive correlate of poverty. [27] confirms this assertion. High educational attainment on the other hand had negative relationship with poverty. Households with more educated members will be able to adopt new yield improving technologies and have better ability to manage farm effectively and efficiently *ceteris paribus*. Such households will also be able to engage in off-farm activities. This could result in high level of income and eventual higher level of consumption for such households.

| Table 6: Maximum Likelihood Estimates of Tobit Regression for Poverty based on Gender of the Household |
|--|
| Honda |

| fieaus | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Item | Male- | Headed | Female | e-Headed | | |
| Demographic Variables | Coefficients | Marginal Effects | Coefficients | Marginal Effects | | |
| Age of the household heads | 0.002 (1.76) | 0.002 (1.77) | 0.005***(2.01) | 0.004*** (2.03) | | |
| Years of Schooling | -0.078** | -0.053** | -0.033*** | -0.028*** | | |
| _ | (-3.103) | (-3.143) | (-2.700) | (-2.708) | | |
| Child Dependency | 0.174**(3.20) | 0.118**(3.20) | 0.057(0.69) | 0.049 (0.69) | | |
| Adult Dependency | 0.221(1.10) | 0.150 (1.10) | -0.669 (-1.26) | -0.579(-1.28) | | |
| Adjusted-Household Size | 0.020*** (6.65) | 0.014***(6.53) | 0.036***(4.53) | 0.031*** (4.57) | | |
| Food Ratio | 0.281***(4.23) | 0.190***(4.25) | 0.344*** (3.52) | 0.297*** (3.57) | | |
| Marital Status | - | - | -0.150**(-2.420) | 0.083**(-2.56) | | |
| Socio-Economic Variables | | | | | | |
| Farm Size | -0.078*** | -0.053*** | -0.192*** | -0.166*** | | |
| | (-4.45) | (-4.646) | (-3.830) | (-3.938) | | |
| Major Occupation | 0.021*** (2.97) | 0.014*** (2.996) | 0.0186*** (2.549) | 0.0161*** (2.55) | | |
| Cooperative | -0.086*** | -0.058*** | -0.056 | -0.048 | | |
| | (-4.19) | (-4.21) | (-1.43) | (-1.44) | | |
| Land Access | -0.045** | -0.030 | -0.026 | -0.022 | | |
| | (-2.28) | (-2.27) | (-0.85) | (-0.86) | | |
| Extension | -0.015 | -0.010 | -0.056*** | -0.035*** | | |
| | (-1.25) | (-1.25) | (-2.35) | (-2.56) | | |
| Other working members | -0.028 | -0.019 | -0.091*** (-3.61) | -0.079*** | | |
| C | (-1.89) | (-1.88) | · · · · | (-3.94) | | |
| Non-Farm Income | -0.135E-2** | -0.112E-2** | -0.304E-2** | -0.263E-2** | | |
| | (-2.60) | (-2.60) | (-2.10) | (-2.19) | | |
| Loans Amount | 0.326E-3 | 0.221E-3 | -0.1098E-3 | -0.9498E-3 | | |
| | (-0.95) | (0.95) | (-1.2) | (-1.20) | | |
| Remittances | -0.031 | -0.026 | -0.023** | -0.20** | | |
| | (-0.65) | (-0.66) | (-2.10) | (-2.42) | | |
| Living Condition Variables | × , | | | | | |
| Clinic Distance | 0.036*** | 0.025*** | 0.049*** | 0.042*** (3.92) | | |
| | (6.50) | (6.57) | (3.797) | | | |
| Plastered Wall | -0.035** | -0.023** | -0.008 | -0.022 | | |
| | (-2.02) | (-2.1) | (-0.29) | (-0.36) | | |
| Water Distance | 0.158 *** | 0.109*** | 0.164*** | 0.085*** | | |
| | (4.34) | (4.31) | (2.09) | (2.1) | | |
| Constant | 0.411*** | | 0580*** | | | |
| | (2.98) | | (2.86) | | | |
| Sigma (†) | 0.438*** | | 0.872*** | | | |
| | (22.45) | | (21.9) | | | |

Results of the Tobit Regression for Poverty. *** Denotes Parameters significant at 1%, ** Denotes significant at 5% and* Denotes significant at 10%. Figures in parentheses are robust Z-statistics.

The isolated determinants of poverty in the female-headed household category were age and marital status of the household heads, average years of schooling of adult household members, farm size, ratio of food expenditure to total expenditure, adjusted household size, number of extension visits per month, farming as the only occupation of the household head, amount of non-farm income per month, distance to water and medical facilities, number of income earners in the household and access to remittances from friends and relations. Other included variables were not statistically significant in influencing the poverty status of the female-headed households in the study areas. Similarly, the marital status of the femaleheaded households significantly influenced their poverty status negatively with significant marginal value of -0.083 at 5% level. This gave an indication that marriage reduced the poverty status of the femaleheaded households in the study area.

Determinants of Poverty Status for All Farming Households Put Together.

Fourteen variables were statistically significant at 1, 5 and 10% and these are: gender of the household head, adjusted household size and amount of non-farm income per month (Table 7). Others are average years of schooling of adult household members, farm size, age of the household head, distance to modern medical facility and potable water supply, child dependency ratio, number of income earners in the

households, ratio of food expenditure to total expenditure, farming as the only occupation of the households, membership of cooperative societies by household head and access to farm land.

Average age of adult household members, ratio of food expenditure to total expenditure, adjusted household size, distance to modern medical facility and potable water supply as well as child and adult dependency ratios affected the poverty status of rural households in the study area positively. The remaining significant variables however affected their poverty status negatively.

| Variables | Coefficients | Marginal Effects |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Demographic Variables | | |
| Age of the household heads | 0.008**(2.424) | 0.002**(2.439) |
| Gender of the household head | -0.011***(-2.442) | -0.008***(-2.442) |
| Years of Schooling | -0.077** (3.383) | -0.053**(-3.430) |
| Child Dependency | 0.149** (3.184) | 0.1035**(3.170) |
| Adult Dependency | 0.281 (1.515) | 0.195 (1.518) |
| Adjusted Household Size | 0.0172***(6.229) | 0.012***(6.227) |
| Food Ratio | 0.2637***(4.412) | 0.1823***(4.471) |
| Marital Status of Female Head | l: | |
| Married | -0.043***(-3.022) | -0.022***(3.411) |
| Farm Related Variables | | |
| Farm Size | -0.085** (-5.064) | -0.059**(-2.296) |
| Land Access | -0.035**(-2.066) | -0.024**(-2.057) |
| Loan Amount ₁₁ | -0.1464E-3(-0.448) | -0.102E-3(-0.448) |
| Occupational Variables | | |
| Remittance access | -0.023 (-0.131) | -0.016(0.131) |
| Major Occupation | 0.014** (2.728) | 0.011**(2.728) |
| Other working members | -0.031** (-2.304) | -0.022** (2.296) |
| Non-Farm Income | -0.927E-2**(-2.441) | -0.833E-2** |
| | | |
| Institutional Variables | | |
| Cooperative | 0.08*** (-4.207) | -0.054*** (-4.268) |
| Extension | -0.019 (-1.857) | -0.013 (-1.858) |
| Living Condition Variables | | |
| Clinic Distance | 0.021***(5.465) | 0.021***(5.465) |
| Plastered Wall | -0.0251(-1.773) | -0.173(1.766) |
| Water Distance | 0.1457***(4.412) | 0.1011*** (4.404) |
| Constant | 0.412*** (4.385) | 0.286*** (4.442) |
| Sigma (†) | 0.4949***23.613 | |

Table 7: Maximum Likelihood Estimates (MLE) of Tobit Regression for Poverty

Source: Results of Tobit Regression model. ***, **, * Denote significant at 1%, 5% and 10% respectively.

The result revealed that adjusted household size influenced the poverty status of rural households in the study area with a significant coefficient of 0.0172 at 1% level. This conformed to empirical and theoretical expectations that the larger the household size the more the level of consumption *ceteris paribus*. Household size had been found to be a major determinant of poverty. [27, 23] report similar findings. Farming as the only occupation was also a significant factor that affected the poverty status of the rural households in the study area. This is due to low labour productivity in agriculture compared to other occupations [4]. This results from dependency of agricultural enterprises on natural input like rainfall, soil fertility and sunshine. [15] confirms the fact that households with farming as a major occupation tend to be poor. Gender of the household heads influenced the poverty status of rural households in Kwara State with significant coefficient of 0.011 at 1% level. Gender of the household heads had been reported as a major determinant of household poverty [28]. Where male heads are married with working spouses to help off-set part of household expenditure, such households are not poor [7]. Where there are no male heads to assist in household expenditure, such households are poor [Kennedy and Haddad]. [26] however reports male-headed households to be poorer than their female-headed counterparts in Nigeria.

Elasticity of Poverty among Rural Farming Households in Kwara State The responsiveness of the rural farming households' poverty to changes in each of the significant variables affecting it is presented in Table 8. Following Tobit decomposition framework and as suggested by [24], the effect of changes in the regressors (Xi) on the probability and intensity of poverty were calculated.

| Kwara State | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Variable | Elasticity of Probability of Poverty | Elasticity of Extent of Poverty | Total Elasticity | | | | |
| Total years of schooling | -0.136 | -0.198 | -0.334 | | | | |
| Farm Size | -0.577 | -0.867 | -1.444 | | | | |
| Other worker | -0.072 | -0.088 | -0.160 | | | | |
| Child Dependency | 0.325 | 0.469 | 0.794 | | | | |
| Food Ratio | 0.730 | 1.052 | 1.782 | | | | |
| Adjusted Household Size | 0.621 | 0.893 | 1.514 | | | | |
| Water Distance | 0.281 | 0.386 | 0.667 | | | | |
| Clinic Distance | 0.460 | 0.664 | 1.124 | | | | |
| Non Farm Income | -0.383 | -0.580 | - 0.963 | | | | |
| Age | 0.657 | 0.986 | 1.643 | | | | |

Source: Estimated from the result of Tobit Regression.

Using percentage rather than the unit of measurements, the coefficient for the elasticity of the probability of poverty for the household size was 0.621 that is inelastic (Table 8); this means that a ten per cent increase in adjusted household size would increase the probability of poverty by 6.21 percent. Also the coefficient of the adjusted household size for the poverty extent was 0.8930, which means that the intensity of poverty would increase by 8.930 per cent for a 10% increase in household size. Also the elasticity coefficient for the probability of being poor for the ratio of food expenditure to total expenditure was 0.730 (inelastic); which connotes 7.30 per cent increase in the probability of poverty for a ten per cent increase in food ratio. The coefficient for the extent of poverty for the food ratio was 1.052 (elastic) implying a 10.52 per cent increase in the extent of poverty for a ten per cent increase in food ratio. The analysis further shows that an increase in food ratio increased the poverty extent than its probability. The coefficients of probability of poverty and its intensity for distance to potable water and modern medical facility were also positive and inelastic and therefore follow the same explanation.

However for the negative coefficients such as years of schooling, farm size, non-farm income, number of extension visits, and number of income earners in the households, their coefficients were less than unity and were therefore inelastic. The probability of and intensity of poverty of the farming households would be reduced by the magnitude of these coefficients for a unit increase in these explanatory variables. Generally for all the significant variables the change in the intensity of poverty was more than for the probability of poverty for a unit change in any of the explanatory variables. Also the response of farming households' size to probability and extent of poverty was third highest after food ratio and age of the household head in the study area. Large household size contributed to poverty in the study area.

Sensitivity Analysis of the Estimated Relative Poverty Line of Rural Farming Households in Kwara State

There is the need to test for the robustness of the estimated Tobit regression parameters to choice of the poverty line used due to subjectivity in the choice and selection of a poverty line. The regression model was again run for six different poverty lines to show the robustness of the regression parameters to changes in these simulated poverty lines. Table 9 shows the variables that were significantly different from zero for each of the poverty lines. The results of the simulation showed that at different poverty lines the male and female-headed households were poor although with different levels of sensitivity. At eightyfive per cent of poverty line that is 85 per cent of

N1704.74 which equaled N1463.7, fifty-nine per cent of the female-headed households were poor.

Table 9: Sensitivity Analysis of Poverty Line of Rural Farming Households in Kwara State

| 70%Z 85% Z Z 115%Z 130%Z 145%Z Sample | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ₩1206.1 ₩1463.7 ₩1722 ₩1981,38 ₩2239.82 2498.26 Population | | | | | |
| Male-Headed : 94(22) 195(45) 251(58) 253(59) 258(60) 258(60) 430 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Female-Headed: 21(26.3) 40(59) 50(63) 50 (63) 50(63) 50 (63) 80

All Households: 115(23) 235(46) 301(59) 303(59 309(61) 309(61) 510

Source: Field Survey, 2007. Figures in parentheses are percentages of households that are poor

| Demographic Variables | | Proportion of poverty line | | | | | |
|---|-----|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 0.7 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.15 | 1.30 | 1.45 | |
| Age | * | ** | ** | ** | *** | *** | |
| Gender | ** | ** | *** | *** | *** | *** | |
| Average years of Schooling of household | ** | ** | ** | *** | *** | *** | |
| Child Dependency Ratio | | * | ** | ** | ** | ** | |
| Adult Dependency Ratio | | | | | | | |
| Adjusted Household Size | *** | ** | *** | *** | *** | *** | |
| Food Ratio | | ** | *** | *** | *** | *** | |
| Farm Related Variables | | | | | | | |
| Farm Size in hectares | ** | ** | *** | *** | *** | *** | |
| Land Access | *** | ** | ** | | | | |
| Loans Amount in naira per season | | | | | | | |
| Occupational Variables | | | | | | | |
| Major Occupation | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | |
| Other working members | | * | ** | ** | ** | ** | |
| Non-Farm Income per month | * | * | ** | * | * | * | |
| Remittance | | | | * | * | * | |
| Institutional Variables | | | | | | | |
| Cooperative membership | * | * | *** | *** | *** | *** | |
| Number of visits by Extension Agents | | | | * | ** | ** | |
| Living Condition Variables | | | | | | | |
| Clinic Distance in Kilometres | * | ** | *** | *** | *** | *** | |
| Plastered Wall | | | | *** | ** | ** | |
| Water Distance in Kilometres | * | ** | *** | *** | *** | *** | |
| Constant | ** | ** | *** | *** | ** | ** | |
| Sigma (†) | * | * | *** | *** | *** | *** | |

 Table 10: The Significant Tobit Variables at Simulated Poverty Lines

*** denotes statistics significant at 1%, ** denotes significance at 5% and * denotes significance at 10%. Obtained from the results of the Tobit Regression

The headcount index reduced to 21 per cent at 70 per cent of the estimated poverty line. It however increased to sixty-three per cent of the farming households population at 145% of the estimated poverty line meaning that a forty-five per cent increase in the estimated relative poverty line rendered sixty-three per cent of the female-headed rural farming households in Kwara State poor. At the

estimated poverty line the headcount index for the male-headed households was 58 per cent of the population. The figure reduced to 45 per cent at 85 per cent of estimated poverty line. At varying percentages of poverty lines the female-headed households were poorer than their male-headed counterparts (Table 9). This confirmed the robustness of the poverty measures used for the study.

Determinants of Poverty at Different Simulated Poverty Lines

At the simulated poverty lines the determinants of poverty for the pooled data were identified. The various significant variables affecting the poverty status of rural households in the state are shown in Table 10. Child dependency ratio, average years of schooling of adult household members, ratio of food expenditure to total expenditure, non-farm income per month, farm size, access to farm land, adjusted household size, gender of the household heads, number of extension visits per month, membership of cooperative societies by household heads, major occupation of the household heads, number of income earners in the households, distance to potable water and modern medical facilities as well as whether the dwelling place of the households was plastered or not determined the welfare status of rural farming households in Kwara State at almost all the simulated poverty lines.

The results seem to be robust to the choice of the poverty line specified; nonetheless the independent variables were sensitive to the choice of the poverty line. The coefficients of some of the regressors were however not statistically different from zero at some of the simulated poverty lines.

4. Conclusion

The study confirms earlier notion that poverty exists in the rural areas of Nigeria and that it impacts male and female-headed households differently. The female headed-households were particularly more disadvantaged using money-metric and capability measures. This is due to poor access to education and productive resources that could improve their well being. Access to extension services and remittances from friends and relations played a part in poverty reduction for the female-headed households. The impact however was not strong enough to bring them at parity with their male-headed counterparts. Large household size resulting from polygamy affects the male-headed households' poverty status positively; this and heterogeneous household nature in the study area put a high pressure on the households' well being. Poverty reduction strategies in the study area should therefore be multi-pronged. Equal access to productive resources will bring the female-headed their households at par with male-headed counterparts. Focus of the stakeholders should also be on the common causes of poverty for the two categories of households such as level of education

and household size. Adult literacy classes and primary health care centres can be provided by government for improved level of education and manageable household size through family planning. This will ensure meaningful poverty reduction in the study area. Poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon that requires a multi-pronged approach in its measurement and analysis, attempt was made by this study to look at various dimensions to poverty but a cohesive Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) introduced in the 2010 Human Development Report, [2] was not employed, this could be an area for further research.

References

- Alem, Y. and Kohlin, G. : The Impact of Food Price Inflation on Subjective Well-Being: Evidence from Urban Ethiopia. Social Indicators Research. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0318-7
- Alkire, S., and Santos, M. E. : Acute Multidimensional Poverty: A New Index for Developing Countries. United Nations Development Programme Human Development Reports Research Paper 2010.
- 3. Antoninis, M., Tackling the Largest Global Education Challenge? Secular and Religious Education in Northern Nigeria. *World Development 56 (82-92, 2014.*
- 4. Belshaw, D: Strategising Poverty Reduction in Sub- Saharan Africa: The Role of Small –Scale Agriculture. Presidential Address. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 2002, *53* (2): 161-193.
- 5. Bigsten, A., Kebede. A, and Taddesse M: Growth and Poverty Reduction in Ethiopia: Evidence from Household Panel Surveys. *World Development* 2003, *3* (1): 87-106.
- 6. Bird, K., Hulme, D., Moore, K, and Shepherd, A: Chronic Poverty and Remote Rural Areas. Chronic Poverty Research Centre (CPRC) Working Paper No. 13, 2002.
- 7. Buvinic, M and G. R. Gupta: Female-Headed Households and Female Maintained Families: Are they Worth Targeting to Reduce Poverty? *Journal* of Development and Cultural Change 1996, 259-281.
- 8. Chant, S. and Craske, N: Gender in Latin America. London: Latin America Bureau 2002.
- 9. Dhanani, S., and Islam, I: Poverty, Vulnerability and Social Protection in Indonesia. *World Development* 2002, 30 (7): 1211-1231.

- Djurfeldt, A.A.., Djurfeldt, G. and Lodin, J.B. Geography of Gender Gaps: Regional Patterns of Income and Farm-Nonfarm Interaction Among Male and Female-Headed Households in Eight African Countries. World Development 48: 32-43, 2013
- 11. Echevin, D., Measuring Vulnerability to Asset-Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa. World Development 46:211-222, 2013.
- 12. Edoumiekumo, S. G., Karimo, T. M., and Tombofa, S. S.: Determinants of Households' Poverty and Vulnerability in Bayelsa State of Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention* 2013.
- Fagernas S. and Wallace, L: Determinants of Poverty in Sierra Leone, 2003. Economic and Statistics Analysis Unit Working Paper 19, Overseas Development Institute (ODI) 2007
- 14. Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations (FAO): The State of Food and agriculture 2010-2011. Women in Agriculture: Closing Gender Gap for Development. Rome: FAO 2011. Available at:http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e0 0.htm. Last accessed 31, January, 2012.
- 15. Food and Agricultural Organisation: Gender Differences in the Transitional Economy of Vietnam. FAO, United Nation 2008.
- 16. Federal Office of Statistics: *Poverty and Agricultural Sector in Nigeria* 1999.
- Foster, J., Greer, J. and Thorbecke, E: A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures. *Econometric* 1984,, 52:761-765.
- 18. Greene, W.: Econometric Analysis. New Jersey Prentice Hall
- 19. Haddad, L and Ahmed, A: Chronic and Transitory Poverty: Evidence from Egypt, 1997 –99. World Development 2003, 31(1): 71–85.
- Human Resources and Skills Development Canada When Working is Not Enough to Escape Poverty. An Analysis of Canada's Working Poor 2006. http: <u>www.hrsdc.gc.ca</u>. : Accessed on 16th March, 2009.
- 21. International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). Rural Poverty Report. Rome, 2011.
- 22. Kennedy, S. and Haddad L: Are Preschoolers from Female-Headed Households Less Malnourished? A. Comparative Analysis of Results from Ghana and Kenya, *Journal of Development Studies* 1994, *30* (*3*): 680-695.
- 23. Martins, M.F.O. and Fernandes, J.M: The Determinant of Poverty in Cape Verde: An

Econometric approach 2008. Http: <u>www.CBS.org</u> : Accessed on Monday 16th of March, 2009.

- 24. McDonald, J.F. and Moffit, R.A: The Uses of Tobit Analysis. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 1980, 62:318-321.
- 25. National Bureau of Statistics: Gender Dimensions to Livelihoods in Nigeria. LSMS-ISA Integrated Surveys on Agriculture 2013. Available online at: www.nigerianstat.gov.ng.
- 26. National Bureau of Statistics (2010). Poverty Profile Report for Nigeria. Federal Government of Nigeria, Abuja
- Olorunsanya, E. O., Agbor, S. and Adenuga, H. A.: Determinants of Poverty among Semi-Urban Food Crop Farming Households in Niger State, Nigeria. *Lapai Journal of Science and Technology* 1(1), 2013.
- Olorunsanya, E. O., Odukale, I. O., Babatunde, R.O., Adenuga, H. A. and Babatunde, B. O. Poverty among Nomadic Fulani Households in Kwara State, Nigeria. *Development Journal of Science and Technology Research* 2013, 2 (1):46-52.
- 29. Omonona, B.T: Poverty and Its Correlates among Rural Farming Households in Kogi State. An unpublished Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria 2000.
- 30. Quisumbig, A. and Pandolfelli, L., Promising Approaches to Address the Needs of Poor Female Farmers: Resources, Constraints and Interventions. *World Development 2010, 38 (4):* 581-592
- 31. Roosen, J. Marette, S. Blanchemanche, S. and Verger, P: Does Health Information Matter for Modifying Consumption? A Field Experiment Measuring the Impact of Risk Information on Fish Consumption. *Review of Agricultural Economics* 2009, 31(1):2-20.
- 32. Sraboni, E., Malapit, H. J., Quisumbing, A. G. and Ahmed, A. U. Women's Empowerment in agriculture: What Role for Food Security in Bangladesh? *World Development 61 :11-52, 2014.*
- 33. Sunderji, A: Determinants of Household Poverty in Rural Gujarat, India. M.Sc. Project in Economics. Stockholm School of Economics 2007.
- 34. UNESCO. EFA Global Monitoring Report 2012: Youth and Skills- Putting Education to Work. Paris: UNESCO, 2012.

- 35. World Bank. World Development Report, Gender Equality and Development. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2012.
- 36. World Bank. World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking Poverty. New York, Oxford University Press, 2000.