

Gender Differentials in Household Poverty Reduction Activities in Akoko South West Local Government Area of Ondo State

Mrs. Fasoranti, M.M. (Ph.D)

Economics department, adekunle ajasin university, akungba-akoko, ondo state, nigeria.

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJAREMS/v4-i2/1750> DOI:10.6007/IJAREMS/v4-i2/1750

Published Online: 09 January 2015

Abstract

Over the years, poverty index among households in Nigeria has continued to fluctuate, calling for concerted efforts by all stakeholders in human development towards addressing the issue. The study examined the different poverty reduction activities, the attitude and proportion of beneficiaries by gender in Akoko South West Local Government Area of Ondo State. Data was sourced through well structured questionnaire administered on randomly selected 152 respondents. Data collected was analyzed through descriptive statistics and simple regression model. Results showed that 75% of the total respondents were between age 5-35 years and that 92% possessed formal education. A higher proportion of male household members were involved in non-domestic activities such as family farm labour, hired labour and hawking while the female were more into domestic and less stressful activities. Also, female members participated willingly in poverty reduction activities while their male counterparts were less willing and in most cases, demanded incentives before doing so. Among other things, female members were found to spend more hours per day on poverty reduction activities than the male members of the family. Given that, the majority of those who are unwilling to participate in poverty reduction activities or at most demand incentives before doing so are within the school age bracket, this study recommends that household in the study area should access government poverty reduction programmes so as to excuse the affected members from such activities. Too much involvement in poverty reduction activities portends dangers for school age children-physical and moral hazards, distractions from academic works and exposure to kidnapping and raping of the girl-child.

Keywords: Poverty, Gender, Poverty Reduction.

Introduction

Poverty has become an issue of concern for individuals, households and nations all over the world. The mention of the word poverty stirs up a lot of misgivings in the hearts of people due to its devastating effect. Poverty is a hydra-headed concept that means different things to different people in different ages and places. According to the World Bank (1995), poverty is a pronounced deprivation in well being with reflections in low incomes, inability to acquire the basic necessities of life, low levels of health and education, poor accessibility to clean water and sanitation services, inadequate physical security, lack of voice, and insufficient

capacity and opportunities to improve one's life. To Hazell and Haddad (2001) poverty has to do with two interacting deprivations- physiological and social deprivations. Physiological deprivation has to do with the inability of individuals to treat or achieve basic materials and physiological needs reflected in lack of income which consequently limits access to food, education, health, housing, water and sanitation services. On the other hand, social deprivation refers to the absence of empowering elements such as autonomy, time, information, dignity and lack of self esteem and exclusion from important decision making processes. Summarizing the above and many other definitions of poverty, one can say that poverty is a state of lacks often associated with needs, hardship and deficiency of resources required to make life better and pleasant.

In Nigeria, poverty has been in existence before independence but of a smaller intensity than what obtains in these present days. Nevertheless, though people had enough to eat, income and infrastructural development were low. With the discovery of oil in commercial quantity, revenue was divested to the development of infrastructure and social services. Moreover, wages of workers mostly in non-agricultural sector were increased and consequently, per capita income increased. According to Olayele (2000), this development adversely affected the agricultural sector as more people deserted the farm business for easy oil money in the urban areas. Consequently, the contribution of agriculture to GDP and food production fell turning the country into a net importer of food. With the fall in oil prices as from the early 1980s, per capita income, consumption and welfare dropped significantly and according to World Bank (1995), this marked the beginning of real poverty in Nigeria. Ever since this period, poverty has been a major issue to contend with by the various governments as it has become endemic and visible. The poverty incidence rose from 23.1 in 1980 to 42.7 in 1992, 65.6 in 1996 but fell to 54.4 in 2004 rose to 69% in 2010.

The situation of the poor is very pathetic. The poor lacks influence and voice in the society, lives in the rural areas characterized by poor roads, health services, water and electricity.

To alleviate poverty among the people, various Nigerian governments have embarked on different programmes through sectoral and non-sectoral approaches. The sectoral approaches has to do with poverty related programmes in agriculture, health, education, transport, housing and financial sectors. The non- sectoral approach includes the National Directorate of Employment (NDE), Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI), Better Life for Rural Women, Family Support programme, National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP), Subsidy Reinvestment Programme (SURE-P) and several others. Apart from government efforts, no-governmental organizations were also involved in poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Examples include Country Women Association of Nigeria (COWAN), Farmers Development Union (FADU) and Women Farmers Association of Nigerian (WOFAN). Many of these programmes failed in the bid to reduce the incidence of poverty in the country. The failure of these programmes have been linked by Oduwole and Fadeyi (2013) to the adhoc nature of such programmes, poor design and execution, inadequate staffing and equipment, wrong location of poverty alleviation projects, use of over sophisticated equipment, high running costs, absence of effective collaboration between the three tiers of governments, duplication of functions and unhealthy rivalries among others.

Members of the households (adults and children) are not left out in the efforts to alleviate poverty. Everyone is involved in one or more poverty reduction activities in the family. Among the Yorubas, the division of labour in the family has always been on gender basis. Children have always been regarded as economic and social assets and it is regarded as

a taboo or curse for a family to be without children. According to Torimiro and Lawal (2001), a high premium is placed on children because of their role in the generation of incomes in rural household. Among other things, religion and culture tend to confer absolute right by parents on their children. For instance, the Holy Bible commanded children to honour, respect and obey their parents (Ephesians 6 verse 1-3). Moreover, the Bible regarded children as weapons in the hands of their parents (Psalms 127, verses 3-5).

In most low income households, every member is compelled to get involved in various activities to generate income or reduce cash outflows and increase family welfare. The questions then are: what are household poverty reduction activities of each member according to gender? What is the attitude of each gender towards household poverty reduction activities? Does the difference in socialization of male and female gender result in gender differentials in household poverty reduction activities? This study is set to examine these questions by considering the poverty alleviation activities of both gender, determining the involvement of each gender and also examining the attitude of each gender towards the poverty alleviation activities in the family.

Studies on Gender differentials in Household poverty reduction activities are relatively rare and where such exist, they are restricted to certain parts of the world. In Nigeria, the nearest study was conducted by Alimi *et al* (2004) and it focused on the activities of children in poverty reduction in Osun State. To my knowledge, there have not been any work on this topic in the study area. Therefore this study provides a more recent outlook on this topic. Hence, this study stands to bridge this gap and also stands as addition to literatures in the study area.

Literature Review

Poverty has been conceived in different ways. Some conceived it as economic issues measured as a minimum flow of real income or as a bundle of basic needs (Barnes, 2010). In line with this, Karkwenda (2002) conceived poverty as a “multidimensional phenomenon” influenced by a wide range of factors such as lack of access to income earning and productive activities and to essential social services. However, others saw poverty as something beyond the borders of Economics. Edoh (2003) saw poverty as hunger and malnutrition, ill health, limited or lack of access to education and other basic services, increased mortality from illness, homelessness and inadequate housing, unsafe environment, social discriminations and exclusion, and lack of participation in decision, civil, social and cultural life. To Adejo (2006), poverty is reflected in poverty of history, intellect and ideology. In his own view, the poor are persons of insufficient income, inadequate food intake, basic health care, shelter, safe drinking water, poor environmental cleanliness, education and skills and information. Relatively, the World Bank defined poverty in terms of ‘poverty line’ in which anyone living below a dollar per day is regarded as a poor person. However, this may not adequately depict the plight of the poor in Nigeria where poverty includes lack of non-materials needs such as freedom, security of life and property, self esteem, health services, education, accessibility to portable water, sanitation services and good housing facilities.

Household poverty reduction activities are divided along gender line. In Africa, studies showed that women constitute 75% of agricultural labour force, and between 60% and 80% of food processing and marketing (Kwesiga, 1999; Afolabi, 2005). Moreover, women act as direct and indirect care givers as they are majorly involved in child care and care for the aged and the sick, preparation of food for the family, cleaning, washing of cloth, processing of food and fetching of firewood. They are mostly involved in spiritual exercises to ensure the well

being of their families. To Azikwe (1992), women are noted for providing food, education and clothing for their children. Ekesionye and Okolo (2012) concluded that all things being equal, women have equal abilities with men and so can completely favourably with them. Unfortunately, a high percentage of women labour are unaccounted for in national income accounting as such activities do not pass through the market system. On the other hand, men are regarded as bread winners and so spend most of their time in income generating activities, manufacturing, construction, transportation and communication and social services (Nigeria Gender Statistics Book, 2008).

Children are also not left out in household poverty reduction activities. In the Southwest part of Nigeria, children are regarded as viable assets in the family. They are involved in various domestic and non-domestic activities to generate income or reduce expenses or cash outflows of their household to alleviate poverty (Alimi, *et al*, 2004).

Moreover, children also constitute a very important source of labour in agriculture and other related activities as shown by Ojo (1999) and Olawoye (2001). However, there have been different reactions to the involvement of children in household poverty reduction activities. Bouis *et al* (1998) and Amin (1994) saw it as mere exploitation and also as an avenue of exposing children to moral and physical hazard. On the other hand, Mbanefoh regarded it as a means of socialization. In another vein, Torimoro and Lawal (2001) regarded children as potential and productive contributors to the generation of household incomes.

A study conducted by Alimi *et al* (2004) considered the use of children in household poverty reduction activities. The result of poor economic condition and the influence of religion and culture that make parents/guardians have full control over their children and wards. The study examined the gender differentials in household poverty reduction activities of Rural children in Iwo Local Government Area of Osun State. Data collected through the use of well structured questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, regression technique and altitudinal measures. The study showed that children contributed to household welfare through their labour. A higher proportion of female were involved in HPRAs than male children. Girls were mostly involved in food preparation, other household cares and care of infants while boys were mostly in family farm labour, hired labour and street trading. Among other things, girls spent more time in food preparation and care of infants while boys spent more time in farming activities and street trading. Ranking the HPRAs put family farm labour as more important for boys and food preparation for girls. The study further showed that most boys and girls exhibit negative attitudes towards HPRAs. Given this, the study proffered that where children involvement could not be outlawed; there should be considerable reduction in time spent on HPRAs.

The present study differs from the previous ones in that not only the HPRAs for children are considered but also those of adult male and female members of the family.

Methodology

Study Area

The study was conducted in Akoko South West Local Government Area of Ondo State. The Local Government covered Akungba-Akoko, Oka-Akoko, Iwaro, Supare and Etioro, with the headquarter at Oka. The area covered 266km² with a population of 229,486 (NPC, 2006). Agriculture constitutes the major source of employment and income. Major crops planted are cocoa, cassava, maize, coconut, yam, plantain, vegetables and palm oil. Also, food processing, animal husbandry, handicraft and trading are common activities in the area. The people are

mostly Yoruba with similar custom and belief and they speak different derivatives of the Yoruba language.

Sources of Data, Sampling Method and Sample Size

Data were primary sourced through the use of well structured questionnaire administered on respondents in the study area. Secondary sources include relevant text, books, learned journals and statistical bulletins. Thirty respondents were randomly selected from each of the communities in the local government area. However, only 152 respondents properly filled and returned the questionnaires.

The study used descriptive analysis to analyze the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents. Tables, percentages, t-statistics and regression techniques were also used.

The model used in this study derived from Alimi *et al* (2004) with little modification. Here the respondents were not limited to children of age 5-14 but it covers adults male and female. Also, two additional variables were included-hawking and domestic service in light of current situation in the study area.

The hypothesis specified for the study was analyzed with the statistic t-term. The test statistic for difference between two population means is given as:

$$t_c = \frac{(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2) - (\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

This is used to test for:

Ho: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$

H: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 \neq 0$

Where:

S_1^2 and S_2^2 are sample variance for male and female members of the family respectively.

\bar{x}_1 and \bar{x}_2 = sample means for male and female respectively

μ_1 and μ_2 = population means of male and female respectively

n_1 and n_2 = sample size of male and female respectively

To test for difference between two population proportions

$$t_c = \frac{(\bar{P}_1 - \bar{P}_2) - (P_1 - P_2)}{\sqrt{\frac{P_1(1-P_1)}{n_1} + \frac{P_2(1-P_2)}{n_2}}}$$

Where p_1 = sample proportion of male

P_2 = sample proportion of female

n_1 = sample size for male

n_2 = sample size for female

Here Ho: $p_1 - p_2$

H₁: $p_1 - p_2$

The regression model is as stated below

$$Y_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 D_i \dots\dots\dots (3)$$

Where Y = hours spent per week in HPRA

α_0 = mean daily hour by male on HPRA

α_1 = shows by how much daily hours on HPRA of female exceed that of male

$D_i = 1$ if female and $D_i = 0$ if male

$\alpha_0 + \alpha_1$ = mean daily hours spent by female on HPRA.

This regression model is used since the only independent variable (sex) is binary (Gujarati, 1988). The model shows the relative importance of the contribution of each gender to HPRAs.

If for male, $D_i = 0$, then $Y = \alpha_0$

If for female, $D_i = 1$, then $Y = \alpha_0 + \alpha_i$

Here $H_0: \alpha_i = 0$ i.e no sex discrimination

$H_1: \alpha_i \neq 0$ i.e there is sex discrimination

If α_i is positive and significant, then the mean daily hours on HPRAs by female is significantly higher than that of male.

The attitudinal response to HPRA by gender is measured on 3-point viz willingly, unwillingly/forced and motivation/incentives. In addition, a 4-point scale viz strongly agreed (4), agreed (3), disagreed (2) and strongly disagreed (1) was used to analyze the perception of respondents about household poverty reduction activities.

Results and Discussion

(a) Socio-Economic Characteristics of Respondents

i. Age Distribution of Respondents

Table 1 shows that 32.9%, 42.1% and 25% of total respondents fell within age brackets 5-17, 18-36 and above respectively. The implication is that adult in the various households sampled are more involved in household poverty reduction activities. They accounted for about 67.1% of total respondents.

Table 1:
Age Distribution

		Frequency (n=152)	Percent (%)
Age	5-17	50	32.9
	18-35	64	42.1
	36 and above	38	25.0
	Total	152	100.0

Source: Field Survey (2015)

ii. Sex Distribution of Respondents

From Table 2, study shows that female household members constituted 51.3% of total respondents while 48.7% were male showing that female household members were more involved in household poverty reduction activities. Among other things, 63.8% and 36.2% of respondents were single and married respectively (Table 3).

Table 2:
Sex Distribution

		Frequency (n=152)	Percent (%)
Sex	Male	74	48.7
	Female	78	51.3
	Total	152	100.0

Source: Field Survey (2015)

Table 3:
Marital Status Distribution

		Frequency (n=152)	Percent (%)
Marital Status	Single	97	63.8
	Married	55	36.2
	Total	152	100.0

Source: Field Survey (2015)

ii. Educational Background of Respondents

Table 4 shows that 92.1% of respondents had one form of education or the other. About 7.9%, 40.8% and 43.4% had primary, secondary and tertiary education respectively. Only 7.9% had no formal education.

Table 4:
Educational Background

		Frequency (n=152)	Percent (%)
Educational Background	No formal Education	12	7.9
	Primary Education	12	7.9
	Secondary Education	62	40.8
	Tertiary Education	66	43.4
	Total	152	100.0

Source: Field Survey (2015)

iv. Occupational Distribution of Respondents

From the Table 5, it has been shown that 11.2%, 11.8%, 19.7% and 7.2% of respondents were engaged in farming, petty trading, civil service and craft respectively. Also, about 50.1% of respondents were still schooling and so has no specific job.

Table 5:
Occupation Distribution

Occupation	Frequency (n=152)	Percent (%)
Farming	17	11.2
Petite Trading	18	11.8
Civil Service	30	19.7
Students	76	50.0
Crafts others	11	7.2
Total	152	100.0

Source: Field Survey (2015)

(b) Household Poverty Reduction Activities (HPRA)

Certain household poverty reduction activities were identified in the study area. The activities are household food preparation, caring for infants, family farm labour, trading/street trading, hired labour, hawking, home attendance and other unspecified household chores. Tables 6 and 7 below show the participation of each age bracket and gender in the identified HPRA in the study area. The majority of male members of the household served as family farm labour in the study area (Table 6). At the level of age bracket, 18.2%, 31.3% and 33.3% of those that

served as farm labour were within age bracket 5-17, 18-35 and 36 years and above respectively. Another major activity was street trading which constituted 19.4% of total male members of the household. Household members within age bracket 36 years and above also served as hire labour to supplement the income of the family. Moreover, 20.8% of the total male respondents participated in many other unspecified household chores.

Table 6:
Types of Household Poverty Reduction Activities (Male)

Household poverty Reduction activities	Age Brackets (Years)						Grand Total	
	5-17		18-35		36 and above		Freq	%
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Household Food Preparation	01	4.5	02	6.3	0	0	03	4.2
Caring for infants	02	9.1	0	0	0	0	02	2.8
Family farm labour	04	18.2	10	31.3	06	33.3	20	27.8
Trading/street trading	06	27.3	05	15.6	03	16.6	14	19.4
Hired labour	0	0	06	18.7	06	33.3	12	16.7
Hawking	05	22.7	01	3	0	0	06	8.3
Other household chores	4	18.2	08	25	03	16.6	15	20.8
Total	22	100	32	100	18	100	72	100

Source: Field Survey (2015)

Table 7 shows the household poverty reduction activities of female members of the family. The table shows that the females were major involved in household food preparation (22.5%), caring of infants (15%), street trading (12.5%) and other unspecified household chores (17.3%). The table also shows that food preparation, caring for infant, family farm labour, trading/street trading and hawking of wares cut across all the age brackets.

Comparing the HPRA of male and female, the number of females involved in household food preparation, caring for infants was six times higher than the number of males in such activities. On the other hand, there are more males in family farm labour, hired labour and hawking than the females. These findings collaborated Alimi, *et al* (2004) where farm labour is more important to boys and food preparation more important to girls.

Table 7:

Types of Household Poverty Reduction Activities (Female)

Household poverty Reduction activities	Age Brackets (Years)						Grand Total	
	5-17		18-35		36 and above		Freq	%
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Household Food Preparation	05	17.8	07	22.0	06	30.0	18	22.5
Caring for infants	06	21.4	04	12.5	02	10.0	12	15.0
Family farm labour	01	3.6	03	9.3	03	15.0	07	8.8
Trading/street trading	06	21.4	02	6.3	02	10.0	10	12.5
Hired labour	0	0	03	9.3	04	20.0	07	8.8
Hawking	04	14.3	03	9.3	02	10.0	09	11.3
House attendance	0	0	03	9.3	0	0	03	3.8
Other household chores	06	21.4	07	22.0	01	5.0	14	17.5
Total	28	100	32	100	20	100	80	100

Source: Field Survey (2015)

(c) Attitude of Respondents towards Household Poverty Reduction Activities

Tables 8 and 9 revealed that female respondents had greater willingness towards household poverty reduction activities than their male counterparts. For females, 66.7% willingly participated while only 48.7% of males did so. Rather than being willing, 21.3% were motivated through incentives before participating in such activities. For male, the level of willingness is highest among respondents within age bracket 36 and above while it is within age bracket 18-35 years for females. Summarily, 66.7% of female respondents willingly got involved in household poverty reduction activities while 33.3% were either unwilling or motivated to do. For male, only 48.7% willing participated while 51.3% were either forced or given incentives before getting involved. This result is in contrast to the findings of Alimi, *et al*, (2004) which showed that boys and girls are mostly unwilling to participate in household poverty reduction activities.

Table 8:

Attitude of Male Respondents towards Household Poverty Reduction Activities

Attitude of Respondents	Age Brackets (Years)						Grand Total	
	5-17		18-35		36 and above		Freq	%
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Willing	07	31.8	15	46.8	14	70.0	36	48.7
Unwilling (forced)	10	45.4	4	12.5	3	15.0	17	23.0
Motivation/incentives	5	22.7	13	40.6	3	15.0	21	28.3
Total	22	100	32	100	20	100	74	100

Source: Field Survey (2015)

Table 9:

Attitude of Female Respondents towards Household Poverty Reduction Activities

Attitude of Respondents	Age Brackets (Years)						Grand Total	
	5-17		18-35		36 and above		Freq	%
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%		
Willing	12	43	26	81	14	78	52	66.7
Unwilling (forced)	8	28.5	2	6	2	11	12	15.4
Motivation/incentives	8	28.5	4	13	2	11	14	17.9
Total	28	100	32	100	18	100	78	100

Source: Field Survey (2015)**(d) Perception of Respondents about Participation in Household Poverty Reduction Activities**

Table 10 below presents the perception of respondents on poverty reduction activities in the study area. Out of total respondents sampled, 33.6%, 50% and 16.4% agreed, disagreed and undecided respectively on the idea that the level of involvement of male gender in household poverty reduction activities is higher than that of female gender. As per gender differentials in the level of participation in household poverty reduction activities, 69.7% of total respondents attributed it to differences in socialization while 9.9% and 20.4% disagreed and remained undecided respectively. However, 78.3% agreed that female household members contributed more to poverty reduction activities than the male counterparts.

Table 10:
Perception of Respondents about HPRAs

	SA		AG		DA		SD	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
The level of involvement of male gender in HPRA higher than that of female	15	9.9	36	23.7	54	35.5	22	14.5
Difference in the level of socialization affect gender differences in HPRAs	46	30.3	60	39.5	12	7.9	3	2.0
Female Gender Contribution to HPRA is higher than that of male	76	50.0	43	28.3	21	13.8	5	3.3

Source: Field Survey (2015)

(e)Proportion of Respondents according to Hour Spent per day by Activity and Gender

Table 11 presents the proportion of respondents and hour spent per day by activity and gender. From the table, female spent more hours per day on activities such as household food preparation, care of infants, trading/street trading, hawking of wares and house assistance with mean hours per day of 9.82, 3.83, 2.82, 5.84 and 3.08 hours respectively while their male counterpart spent more hours on family farm labour and hired labour and they also participated more in the two activities. The proportion of gender by attitudinal response to household poverty reduction activities is presented in Table 12. It shows that a higher proportion female household members demonstrated a willing attitude while higher proportion of male household members demonstrated unwilling attitude. Moreover, a higher proportion of male desired motivation or incentives before getting involved in household poverty reduction activities.

Table 11:
Perception of Respondents and Hours Spent Per Day by Types of Activities and Gender

Types of Activities	Proportion of Participants		Mean Hours Spent Per Day	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Household food preparation	0.14	0.86	2.48	9.82
Caring for infants	0.14	0.86	.225	3.83
Family farm labour	0.74	0.26	10.22	2.88
Trading/street trading	0.58	0.42	2.44	2.82
Hired labour	0.6	0.4	4.85	2.62
Hawking	0.4	0.6	5.22	5.84
House attendance	0	1.0	0.0	3.08
Other household chores	0.52	0.48	2.75	2.82

Source: Field Survey (2015)

Table 12:
Proportion of Gender by Attitudinal Responses

Attitudes	Proportion	
	Male	Female
Willingly	0.41	0.59
Unwillingly (forced)	0.60	0.40
Motivation/incentives	0.60	0.4

Source: Field Survey (2015)

(f) Regression Results

$$Y = 7.92* + 0.92*D_i$$

$$(1.86) \quad (1.17)$$

* Significant at 5% level

The above simple linear regression was used to measure the gender differential in household poverty reduction activities. The R^2 of 0.764 showed that about 76.4% of variations in hours spent per day on HPRAs is as a result of gender differences. Given that α which is 7.92 is positive and statistically significant, it implies that the mean hours spent per day on HPRAs by the male and female household members are different and that the mean hour spent per day by female members is significantly higher. The mean hour spent by male is 7.92 while that of female is 8.84. Hence on the average, female members put in extra 0.92 hours per day than male on HPRAs.

5. Summary, Recommendation and Conclusion

The study examined the Gender differentials in household poverty reduction activities in Akoko South West Local Government Area of Ondo State. It examined the various poverty reduction activities, the attitude of the respondents, the hours spent per gender in each activity and the proportion of each gender in the identified activities. Data was collected through structured questionnaire administered on 152 randomly selected respondents in the study area. Data was analyzed through the use of descriptive and simple regression analysis. Results showed that 32.9%, and 42.1% of respondents were in age bracket 5-17 and 18-35 years respectively. About 92% of respondents possessed formal education ranging from primary to tertiary education. The major poverty reduction activities in the study area were household food preparation, care of infants, family farm labour, trading, hawking and hired labour. Results showed that a higher percentage of male respondents were involved in non-domestic activities such as family farm labour, and hired labour while female respondents are more into domestic and less stressful activities. Higher percentage of female household members willingly participated in poverty reduction activities while higher percentage of male counterparts were less willing and in some cases had to be induced before participating in such activities. Among other things, findings show that female members spent greater hours per day on such activities than their male counterparts. Given that those who are either unwilling or demand incentives before taking part in poverty reduction activities are within school age, this study recommends that households in the study area should access more of government poverty reduction programmes so as to free those members from such activities. Too much participation in such activities constitutes distraction from academic works and also exposes such to lots of hazards-moral and physical.

References

- Adejo, A.M. (2006). Poverty in the Land of Plenty. *NUBESS Journal of Contemporary Issues*, 1 (2).
- Afolabi, M.M. (2005). Women, as Pillars on National Economy in Nigeria. A Study of Economic Activity of Rural Women in 6 Local Government Areas of Ondo State, Nigeria. Centre for Gender and Social Policies Studies. Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile Ife, Nigeria.
- Alimi, T., Ayanwale, A.B., Bamire, A.S. and Bello, H.M. (2004). Gender Differentials in Household Poverty Reduction Activities of Rural Children. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 9 (1) 67-73.
- Amin, A.A. (1994). The Socio-Economic Impact of Child Labour in Cameroon, Capital and Society. *Centre for Development Area Studies*, Montreal, Canada: McGill University, 27 (2).
- Bouis, H. E., Palabrica-Costein, M., Solon, O., Westbrook, D., and Limbo, A.B. (1998). Gender Equality and Investment in Adolescents in Rural Philippines Research Report, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington DC.
- Edoh, T. (2002). Poverty and Survival of Democracy in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Political and Administrative Studies*, 1 (4),
- Ekesionye, E.N. and Okolo, A.N. (2012). Women Empowerment and Participation in Economic Activities: indispensable Tools for Self Reliance and Development of Nigerian Society. *Educational Research and Review*, 7 (1) 10-18.
- Hazell, P. and Haddad, L. (2001). Agricultural Research and Poverty Reduction, International Food Policy Research Institute. Food, Agriculture and the Environment. *Discussion Paper No. 34*.
- Kankwanda, M. (2002). Poverty Eradication: where Africa Stands. London: *Economica*.
- Kwesija, J.C. (1999). Central yet Peripheral: The Rural Women farmer and Issues of African Development, International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan.
- Mbanefoh, N. (2000). The Girl-Child Participation in Primary and Secondary Schools in Nigeria. Institute of African Studies, Nsukka, University of Nigeria.1-39.
- Oduwale, J.A. and Fadeyi, A.O. (2013). Gender, Economic activities and Poverty in Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Peace, Gender and Development*, 2 (7) 106-125.
- Ojo, M.O. (1999). Child Abuse and Dry Season Farming in Ilesa West Local Government Area of Osun State. *Proceedings of 2nd Annual Conference of Children in Agriculture Programmes* held at Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile Ife, May 3-7, 253-258.
- Olawoye, J.E. (2001). Contemporary Research Interest and Problem Areas in Agricultural Extension and Rural Development. The Ibadan Extension Monograph Series No. 2, Department of Agricultural Extension and Development, pp. 47.
- World Bank (1995). Nigeria: Poverty Assessment.