

## Household Level Factors Responsible for Gender Poverty Among Cassava Farmers in Odeda Local Government Area of Ogun State

**Ayinde, Taiwo O.**

University of Ibadan (Agricultural Economics Department)

**Omobowale Oni**

University of Ibadan (Agricultural Economics Department)

**Ayinde, Abayomi O.**

University of Ibadan (Public Health Epidemiology)

**Agbonjinmi, L.A**

Maternal & Child Health Department,  
Babcock University, Ilesan Remo, Ogun State

**Disu Kehinde**

PLSO Nigeria, Abuja

**Lily Dillimono**

PLSO Nigeria, Abuja

**Ogunlabi, Julius A**

University of Ibadan

**Ogunode Niyi Jacob**

University of Abuja

### Abstract:

Poverty is multidimensional, enduring and is prevailing not only globally, but also particular cultural, political and economic features of a specific country increasing it. The gulf between haves and have-nots has lingered. Gender disparities, inequality, spatial dimensions, political instability, weak institutions and lack of spiritual capital causes the poverty. The objective of this study was to examine the determinants of poverty among cassava producing households by gender of household heads in Odeda local government area of Ogun state. A total of 120 cassava farming household comprising of 76 male headed households and 46 female headed households were interviewed using structured questionnaire, in obtaining information from them. The study revealed that there is a positive relationship between the household size and poverty status for both the female headed households and male headed households and also the age of the household head has a negative relationship with the poverty status of the female household while farm experience and off farm activities were negatively related to the poverty status among the male household. Also, it was found out that neither of the households dominates one another in the poverty analysis. It was concluded that the household size of both the male and female households is an important determinant of

poverty status as it was significant to the poverty status of the respondents. Also age is also an important factor which determines the welfare status of the female household heads, that is the more the older they grow, the more improved their welfare status will be, that is the lower their chances of been poor, it was also concluded that years of experience is an important factor influencing poverty, the more experienced the male household are, the lesser the probability of them being poor. It was also concluded that the male headed households are poorer than the female headed households in the study area. It was therefore recommended that there is a need to intensify family planning services so as to improve knowledge and benefits of family planning and also there is need for improvement in enhancement of human capital through trough training in life skills and vocations which would help stimulate the innate entrepreneurial potentials of the people and expand their income generating capacities and become more productive most especially for the female household heads.

## INTRODUCTION

Poverty is a general phenomenon that is perceived to mean different things to different people at different times and places. Ogwumike (2001) defined poverty as a situation where a household or an individual is unable to meet the basic necessities of life, which include consumption and non-consumption items, considered as minimum requirement to sustain livelihood. Ogwumike (2001) and Odusola (2001) also referred to poverty as a condition of deprivation which could be in form of social inferiority, isolation, physical weakness, vulnerability, powerlessness and humiliation. Also Poverty is interpreted not only as lack of income, but more generally as deprivation in various life domains. These include financial difficulties, basic needs, housing conditions, durables, health, social contacts, participation, and life satisfaction (D'Ambrosio *et al.*, 2009). In more specific terms, poverty can be described as the level of deprivation that encompasses shortfalls and inadequacies in basic human needs, which prevent people from achieving internationally acceptable level of well-being, that is, relative poverty. At the extreme is absolute poverty, which reflects the condition of people who live below the poverty line or those that lack income necessary to satisfy basic food needs; and those affected are no longer in a position to lead a life worthy of human dignity (Hemmer 1994). Poverty in Nigeria is rising with almost more than half of the people living on less than \$1 a day (Subair, 2012). The percentage of Nigerians living in absolute poverty - those who can afford only the bare essentials of food, shelter and clothing - rose to 60.9% in 2010, compared with 54.7% in 2004 (Subair, 2012).

Gender according to the N-Agro manual (2017), “refers not only to male and female but to the socially constructed roles, behaviours, activities and attributes that a society assigns to both men and women. Gender analysis is thus the study of the different roles of women and men in order to understand what they do, what resources they have, and what their need and priorities are. Gender affects the distribution of resource wealth, work, decision making, political power as well as the enjoyment of rights and entitlement within the household (Welch *et al.*, 2000). Women from poor farm households engage in a variety of income generating and expenditure saving activities. In some cases, these activities supplement contribution by males while in others they are the primary or the sole source of household livelihoods (Kabeer, 2003). Women are twice as likely as men to be involved in agriculture related activities (Odame *et al.*, 2002). 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.

The most disheartening characteristic of Nigerian society today is that most of its members are living in a state of destitution while the remaining insignificant minority are living in affluence (Anyanwu 2010). Poverty in Nigeria is known to have no geographical boundary as it can be seen in the Northern, Eastern, Western and Southern area of the country, Nigeria is said to belong to the

countries that have the highest rate of poverty (Anyanwu 2010). Policy wise, the results generated from this study shall facilitate proper understanding of the determinants of poverty status among cassava farmers based on gender. Ultimately, policies that shall reduce poverty level among cassava farming household shall be suggested in order to improve the contribution of the commodity to economic development.

### Broad Objective

The main objective of the study is to determine the various household level factors responsible for gender poverty among cassava farmers in Odeda local government area of Ogun state. The specific objectives are:

1. Profile the cassava farmers by their poverty and socio economic status.
2. Determine the incidence, depth and severity of poverty among the male and female respondents
3. Determine the factors driving poverty status of the cassava farmers based on gender.
4. Assess whether the extent of poverty has increased overtime among male and female headed households.

### METHODOLOGY

A descriptive cross sectional study design was used for this study. This study was carried out in Odeda Local Government Area (LGA) of Ogun State. Odeda Local Government is made up of three Zones which are Odeda, Ilugun and Opeji zones in which each zones comprises of different farm settlements, The Local Government shares boundaries with Ibarapa and Ido Local Government of Oyo State in the north and east, while Obafemi/ Owode Local Government to the south and west respectively. A multi stage random sampling technique was used for the study. Thereafter, a stratified random sampling of cassava farmers (male and female) from each village on sampling proportion to size basis was used in order to achieve 120 cassava farmers (in total) from Odeda local government area of Ogun state. Primary data was collected through the use of a well-structured questionnaire. The logistic regression model was employed in achieving the third objective.

### RESULTS

#### Socioeconomics characteristics

**Table 3a: Socioeconomics characteristics of Household Heads**

Description	Female HH		Male HH	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Age(years)				
25-34	0	0	5	6.58
34-44	6	13.64	15	19.74
45-54	21	47.73	24	31.58
55-64	12	27.27	16	21.05
65-74	5	11.36	13	17.11
>75	0	0	3	3.95
Total	44	100	76	100
Mean	52.29545		52.34211	

SD	8.171361		12.63176	
<b>Marital Status</b>				
Single	0	0	2	2.63
Married	2	4.55	66	86.84
Divorced	10	22.73	0	0
Widowed	32	72.73	8	10.53
Total	44	100	76	100
<b>Educational Status</b>				
No formal Education	24	54.55	40	52.63
Primary	14	31.82	18	23.68
Secondary	6	13.64	16	21.05
Tertiary	0	0	2	2.63
Total	44	100	76	100
Mean	3.545455		4.368421	
SD	4.353318		5.181614	
<b>Household size</b>				
1-4	9	20.45	12	15.79
5-8	26	59.09	45	59.21
>8	9	20.45	19	25.00
Total	44	100	76	100
Mean	6.636364		7.315789	
S.D	3.155585		3.402785	

Source: Field survey, 2017

Table 3b: Socioeconomics characteristics of Household Heads

Description	Female HH		Male HH	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Farm size (ha)</b>				
0.0-1.0	21	47.73	14	18.42
1.1-2.0	18	40.91	30	39.47
2.1-3.0	5	11.36	25	32.89
>3.0	0	0	7	9.21
Total	44	100	76	100
Mean	0.636363		2.072368	
S.D	0.685087		1.094544	
<b>Cooperative group</b>				
Yes	11	25.00	51	67.11

No	33	75.00	25	32.89
Total	44	100	76	100
<b>Household exp (PP)(naira)</b>				
10001-20000	3	6.38	0	0
20001-30000	2	4.26	5	6.33
30001-40000	7	14.89	11	16.46
>40001	32	74.47	60	77.22
Total	44	100	76	
Mean	47704.55		59710.53	
SD	14296.82		20806.93	
<b>Household Exp(LP)</b>				
10001-20000	8	15.91	6	7.59
20001-30000	14	31.82	14	17.72
30001-40000	12	25.00	25	31.65
>40001	9	27.00	34	43.04
Total	44	100	76	100
Mean	32931.82		39321.05	
SD	13558.05		12980.8	
<b>Farm Income(CS)</b>				
0-50000	7	15.91	60	78.95
50001-100000	22	50.00	16	21.05
>100000	15	34.09	0	0
Total	44	100	76	100
Mean	81125		175071.1	
SD	34223.98		233513.3	

Table 3c: Socioeconomics characteristics of Household Heads

Description	Female HH		Male HH	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Farm Income (LS)</b>				
0-50000	23	52.27	29	38.16
50001-100000	12	27.27	23	30.26
>100000	9	20.45	24	31.58
Total	44	100	76	100
Mean	60545.45		126418.4	
SD	33265.11		183025	
<b>Farm experience</b>				
0-20	39	88.64	40	52.63
21-40	5	11.36	33	43.42
41-60	0	0	3	3.95
Total	44	100	76	100
Mean	15.61364		22.72368	

SD	6.955727		11.67402	
<b>Off farm activities</b>				
Yes	22	50	43	56.58
No	22	50	33	43.42
Total	44	100	76	100

Source: Field survey, 2017

### Profiling respondents by poverty and socioeconomic status

#### Poverty Status of the Farm Households

In order to achieve this, the poverty lines of the male and female headed households were calculated to disaggregate the household into poor and non-poor status. Thereafter, the households were profiled based on their poverty status.

#### Poverty status of Female and Male household heads

The poverty line as specified in the methodology was used to define the poverty status and classify the cassava farmer into poor and non-poor. The mean monthly per capita household expenditure of the farming households were estimated to be ₦9216.795 while the poverty line was estimated to be ₦6144.53. Result from Table 4.3.2, showed that 68.1% of the female head household were non-poor while 31.8% were poor (31.8%). While for the male respondents, 32.89% of the male headed household were poor and 67.11% of them were found to be non-poor since their household monthly expenditure fell above the constructed poverty line. This implies that in the study area the incidence of poverty among the male household heads is slightly higher than that of their female counterparts. This result agrees to the findings of Adekoya, (2014) where poverty incidence was found to be higher among male headed households (60%) relative to female headed households (58.3%). Overall, 32.5% of the respondents were poor that is those whose monthly expenditure fall below the poverty line of ₦6144.53 and the remaining 67.5% of the respondents were non-poor that is they are above the poverty line. This implies that 32.5% of the cassava farmers in Odeda local government area were poor and were not able to meet up with their required daily needs. This finding was similar to Amsalu (2014) where it was estimated that 43% of the cassava farming households sampled were classified as poor and not being able to afford their daily needs.

**Table 4. Poverty status of female and male respondents**

Poverty status	Female HH		Male HH		Overall	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Freq	%
Poor	14	31.8	25	32.89	39	32.50
Non-poor	30	68.1	51	67.11	81	67.50
Total	44	100.00	76	100.00	120	100.0
Mean per capita expenditure	₦9216.795					
Poverty line	₦6144.53					

Source: Field survey, 2017

### Decomposition of Poverty status by socio economic characteristics

The headcount index which measures the proportion of the population below the poverty line was used as an indicator of poverty for this study. Table 5 shows a gender comparison of poverty and the socioeconomic characteristics such as age of the household head, marital status, educational status, membership of cooperative groups and household size of a household head and that of his/her household.

There was high prevalence of poverty (36%) for those within the age bracket of within 45-54 years for both male and female respondents (31.58% and 47.47% respectively), It was also found out that for the male respondents that are within the age bracket of 65-74 years, 35-44% of them are poor compared with their female counterpart. There was higher prevalence of poverty for lower educational attainment of the household heads for the female and male headed households respectively and for the female headed households, this implies that education of rural farmers is a factor that must be taken into consideration in poverty alleviation as this will enable the farmers to fully appreciate as well as use new technologies made available to them which will ultimately bring about increase in farm output under cultivation.

Higher poverty rates were found with increasing household size comprising of 5-8 members (59% and 50%) for the male headed households and female headed households respectively. Result from the table further revealed that there was a higher prevalence of poverty (47.72%) among the female headed households who has farm size of between 0.1-1 acres of land while for their male counterpart, the prevalence of poverty for those with the farm size of within 1.1-2.0 acres was found to be slightly high at 39.47%. Households who were members of one cooperative societal group or the other were poorer in both male and female-headed households (67.10% and 75% respectively).

Poverty was seen to be decreasing with an increase in household income for the female-headed households while it seems to be fluctuating for the male headed households.

**Table 5a Decomposition of Poverty Status by Socioeconomic Characteristics**

Socioeconomic Characteristics	MHH			FHH		
	Poor	Non-poor	All	Poor	Non-poor	All
<b>Age of the household heads(years)</b>						
25-34	0(0.00%)	5(9.80)	5(6.58%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)
35-44	5(20.00%)	10(19.60%)	15(19.74%)	2(14.29%)	4(13.33%)	6(13.64%)
45-54	5(20.00%)	19(37.25%)	24(31.58%)	4(28.57%)	17(56.67%)	21(47.47%)
55-64	5(20.00%)	11(21.57%)	16(21.05%)	3(21.43%)	9(30.00%)	12(27.27%)
65-74	9(36.00%)	4(7.84%)	13(17.1%)	5 (35.71%)	0(0.00%)	5(11.36%)
>74	1(4.00%)	2(3.92%)	3(3.94%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)
Total	25	51	76	14	30	44

<b>Marital status</b>							
Single		0(0.00%)	2(3.92%)	2(2.63%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)
Married		24(96.0%)	42(82.35%)	66(86.84%)	1(7.14%)	1(3.33%)	2(4.54%)
Divorced		0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)	2(18.00%)	8(24.24%)	10(22.72%)
Widowed		1 (4.00%)	7(13.73%)	8(10.53%)	11(78.57%)	21(70.00%)	32(72.72%)
Total		25	51	76	14	30	44
<b>Educational status</b>							
No formal education		6(24.00%)	34(66.67%)	40(52.63%)	4(28.57%)	20(66.67%)	24(54.54%)
Primary		13(52.00%)	5(9.80%)	18(23.68%)	7(50.00%)	7(23.33%)	14(31.81%)
Secondary		5(20.00%)	11(21.57%)	16(21.05%)	3(21.43%)	3(10.00%)	6(13.63%)
Tertiary		1(4.00%)	1(1.96%)	2(2.63%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)
Total		25	51	76	14	30	44

**Table 5b Decomposition of Poverty Status by Socioeconomic Characteristics**

	<b>MHH</b>			<b>FHH</b>		
	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Non-poor</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Non-poor</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>Household size</b>						
1-4	0(0.00%)	12(23.5%)	12(15.79%)	1(7.14%)	8(26.67%)	9(20.45%)
5-8	15(60.00%)	30(58.82%)	45(59.21%)	5(35.71%)	21(70.00%)	26(50.09%)
>8	10(40.00%)	9(17.65%)	19(25.00%)	8(57.14%)	1(3.33%)	9(25%)
Total	25	51	76	14	30	44
<b>Farm size</b>						
0.0-1.0	3(12.00%)	11(21.57%)	14(18.42%)	9(64.29%)	12(40.00%)	21(47.72%)
1.1-2.0	7(28.00%)	23(45.09%)	30(39.47%)	5(35.71%)	13(43.33%)	18(40.0%)
2.1-3.0	11(44.00%)	14(27.45%)	25(32.89%)	0(0.00%)	5(16.67%)	5(11.36%)
>3.0	4(16.00%)	3(5.88%)	7(9.2%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)
Total	25	51	76	14	30	44



**Membership of cooperative group**

Yes	18(72.00%)	33(64.7%)	51(67.10%)	10(71.43%)	23(76.67%)	33(75.00%)
No	7(28.00%)	18(35.29%)	25(32.89%)	4(28.57%)	7(23.33%)	11(25.00%)
Total	25	51		14	30	44

**Household expenditure**

10001-20000	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)	3(21.43%)	0(0.00%)	3(6.81%)
20001-30000	5(20.00%)	2(3.92%)	7(9.21%)	1(7.14%)	1(3.33%)	2(4.54%)
30001-40000	7(28.00%)	6(11.76%)	13(17.1%)	3(21.43%)	4(13.33%)	7(15.90%)
>40001	10(40.00%)	46(90.19%)	56(73.68)	7(50.00%)	25(83.33%)	32(72.72%)
Total	25	51	76	14	30	44

**Table 5c Decomposition of Poverty Status by Socioeconomic Characteristics**

	<b>MHH Poor</b>	<b>Non-poor</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>FHH Poor</b>	<b>Non-poor</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>Farm income (Last season)</b>						
0-50000	9(36.00%)	29(56.86%)	29(38.16%)	7(50.00%)	16(53.33%)	23(52.27%)
50001-100000	5(20.00%)	18(35.29%)	23(30.26%)	4(28.57%)	8(26.67%)	12(27.27%)
>100000	11(44.00%)	13(25.49%)	24(31.58%)	3(21.43%)	6(20.00%)	9(20.46%)
Total	25	51	76	14	30	44
<b>Farm income(current season)</b>						
0-50000	2(8.00%)	11(21.57%)	13(17.11%)	2(14.29%)	5(16.67%)	7(15.91%)
50001-100000	4(16.00%)	12(23.53%)	16(21.05%)	7(50.00%)	15(50.00%)	22(50%)
>100000	19(76.00%)	28(54.90%)	47(61.84%)	5(35.71%)	10(33.33%)	15(34.09%)
Total	25	51	76	14	30	44

**Farm****experience**

0-20	8(32.00%)	32(62.75%)	40(52.63%)	13(92.86%)	26(86.67%)	39(88.63%)
21-40	16(64.00%)	17(33.33%)	33(43.42%)	1(7.14%)	4(13.33%)	5(11.36%)
41-60	1(4.00%)	2(3.93%)	3(3.95%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)	0(0.00%)
Total	25	51	76	14	30	44

**Off farm****activities**

Yes	15(60.00%)	18(35.29%)	33(43.42%)	4(28.57%)	18(60.00%)	22(50.00%)
No	10(40.00%)	33(64.71%)	43(56.57%)	10(71.43%)	12(40.00%)	22(50.00%)
Total	25	51	76	11	30	44

Source; Field survey, 2017

**Incidence, depth and severity of poverty among the respondents**

The cassava farming households poverty status in the local government was analysed using the three indicators; prevalence of poverty/poverty incidence (Po), poverty depth (P1) and severity of poverty (P2). Prevalence of poverty indicate the percentage of the households falling below the poverty line; poverty depth shows the amount by which the poor fall short of the poverty line and severity of poverty is the sum of the square of poverty depth divided by the number of poor households in the sample.

Findings from Table 6, the prevalence of poverty among the cassava farming households in Odeda local government was higher for male headed households than for the females, 32.9 per cent of the male headed households were poor while 31.8% of the female headed households were poor. This implied that in the study area the incidence of poverty among the male household head was slightly higher than that of their female counterparts,

It was further revealed that for the overall prevalence of poverty, (0.325) representing 32.5% of the farm households with consumption expenditure level below the poverty line. The poverty depth was 0.078 representing 7.8% whose average consumption expenditure was below the poverty line. This gap represents the percentage of expenditure required to bring poor households below the poverty line up to the poverty line. The severity of poverty index was 0.029 representing 2.9% of the households which represents the poorest among the poor farm households who require the attention of policy maker in the distribution of the standard of living indicators, such as health care services, clean water and income generating activities. This result agrees to the findings of Adekoya, (2014) where poverty incidence was found to be higher among male headed households (60%) relative to female headed households (58.3%).

**Table 6 Foster, Greer and Thorbecke Poverty Indicators for cassava Farming Households in Odeda local government based on Gender of the Household Head**

Items	P0(poverty incidence)	P1(poverty gap)	P2(poverty severity)
Female Households	0.318	0.089	0.036
Male Households	0.329	0.075	0.024
All Households	0.325	0.078	0.029

Source; Field survey, 2017

### **Farm Household Poverty Status (The Incidence, depth and severity of poverty according to Household Characteristics )**

The poverty indicators were further examined along with some selected household's characteristics such as Age of household heads, Educational status, Household size among others. According to table 7, it was revealed that 69% and 42% of the male household heads that are between the age of 65-74 years and 55-64years respectively were found be poor with their poverty gap at 7% and 10% respectively and their poverty severity at 4% and 4% respectively while the incidence of poverty for the female household heads was found to be estimated at 33% and 25% for those between the age of 35-44years and 55-64years respectively with their poverty gap at 9% and 11% respectively and their poverty severity at 3% and 5% respectively. Also elderly household heads are of special importance in terms of poverty especially if they have to fend for themselves and for their dependants.

It was further revealed that households that are unmarried have lower incidence of poverty than married household heads for the female and male household heads. The reason could be that married couples have many dependants and other unseen circumstances. This is similar to the findings of Fekadu, (2013) who found that unmarried household heads have lower incidence of poverty compared to their married counterpart. Poverty incidence is markedly higher among households that possess primary education; 72% for the male and 50% for female household heads respectively. This was followed by the household that possesses secondary education (31% and 50% for the male and female household heads respectively). There were lower poverty incidence among those that possesses no formal education and tertiary education. This implied that education of rural farmers is a factor that must be taken into consideration in poverty alleviation. This will enable the farmers to fully appreciate as well as use new technologies made available which ultimately bring about increase in farm size under cultivation. However, higher incidence of poverty was observed among farming households with household size of more than 8 members for both male and female households (53% and 89% for male and female households respectively). It is to be noted that with lower household size, there will be lower expenditure to meet household needs while the low returns to labour in farm work account for the high poverty among farming households. For the households that belong to any societal cooperative groups, the incidence of poverty was found to be at 35% for the male household heads while 36% of the female households that does not belong to any societal cooperative society were found to be poor. It was also found out that there was higher incidence of poverty among the female cassava farming households who have a farm experience of 1-20years at 33% which indicates that the prevalence of poverty decreases as the farming experience increases. While for the male headed household, 48% of those that have between 21-40years of farming experience were found to be poor. Also the poverty incidence for the households that engages in off farm activities was found to be higher at 43% for the male household heads compared to those households that do not have any form of off farm activities at 37%. For the female household heads, it was found out that 45% of those that did not engage in any off farm activities were poor while only 18% of those that engages in off farm activities are poor. This result however agrees with the findings of Adekoya, (2014) in which 40% of those that engages in off farm activities were found to be poor

**Table 7a Farm Household Poverty Status according to Household Characteristics**

Socioeconomic characteristics	Male HH				Female HH			
	Frequency	P0	P1	P2	Frequency	P0	P1	P2
<b>Age</b>								
25-34	5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
35-44	15	0.33	0.12	0.05	6	0.33	0.09	0.03
45-54	24	0.21	0.04	0.02	21	0.19	0.06	0.04
55-64	16	0.42	0.10	0.04	12	0.25	0.11	0.05
65-74	13	0.69	0.07	0.04	5	1.00	0.08	0.03
>75	3	0.33	0.06	0.01	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
Single	2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
Married	66	0.36	0.09	0.06	2	0.50	0.02	0.00
Divorced	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	10	0.20	0.09	0.05
Widowed	8	0.13	0.11	0.05	32	0.34	0.11	0.05
No formal education	40	0.15	0.08	0.05	24	0.16	0.05	0.03
Primary	18	0.72	0.11	0.05	14	0.50	0.15	0.06
Secondary	16	0.31	0.05	0.03	6	0.50	0.17	0.07
Tertiary	2	0.05	0.08	0.03	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Household size</b>								
1-4	12	0.00	0.00	0.00	9	0.11	0.02	0.06
5-8	45	0.33	0.16	0.08	26	0.19	0.05	0.03
>8	19	0.53	0.03	0.02	9	0.89	0.17	0.06

**Table 7b Farm Household Poverty Status according to Household Characteristics**

Socioeconomic characteristics	Male HH				Female HH			
	Frequency	P0	P1	P2	Frequency	P0	P1	P2
<b>Membership of societal cooperative group</b>								
Yes	51	0.35	0.09	0.05	33	0.30	0.09	0.04
No	25	0.28	0.16	0.08	11	0.36	0.14	0.06
<b>Farm experience (in years)</b>								
1-20	40	0.20	0.20	0.09	39	0.33	0.05	0.01
21-40	33	0.48	0.04	0.03	5	0.20	0.08	0.02

41-60	3	0.33	0.12	0.04	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Off farm activities</b>								
Yes	33	0.43	0.11	0.06	22	0.18	0.04	0.02
No	43	0.37	0.09	0.07	22	0.45	0.17	0.07

Source: Field survey, 2017

### Determinants of poverty status among Farm Households

Factors responsible for poverty among male and female households in the study area were identified. In order to achieve this, socio economic variables such as age of household heads, Quadratic age, marital status of the household heads, Years of schooling, Farm experience, Household size, Assets and of Farm activities were taken into consideration.

### Determinants of poverty status among Male household heads

The estimated coefficients for the likelihood ratio chi-square was significant ( $p < 0.01$ ), with chi-square value of 44.18. The pseudo  $R^2$  at 0.46% shows that 46% of the poverty status of the male household heads is explained by the selected variables.

The result of the regression showed that years of schooling ( $p < 0.05$ ), farm experience ( $p < 0.05$ ), household size ( $p < 0.01$ ) and off farm activities (0.05) significantly influenced the probability that male headed households will be poor or not poor. The household size was significant at 1% level and had a positive sign, indicating that increase in household size directly or indirectly reduces income per-head (per-capita income) as well as impair standard of living of the households. This is thus in line with Okpachu *et al*, (2017), where increase in household size increased the poverty level among the farming household. It also agreed with Amao *et al*, (2013), World Bank, (1996) and Omonona, (2001). They found that the more the member of household increases, the more the likelihood of being poor among the rural farmers.

Years of Farm experience was also significant at 5% level and had a negative sign which indicated that as the farm experience of the farmers' increases, the probability of being poor decreases. This could be as a result of the fact that as the farmer becomes older, he tends to use the experience he has gathered to add value to him so as to improve his yield.

The years of schooling was found to be significant at 5% level and had a positive sign which was positively related to the poverty incidence of the respondents, which implied that the more educated the male household heads are, the more the likelihood of poverty. However, this result is contrary to other literatures such as Sekhampu *et al*, (2014), Adekoya, (2014), Olorunsanya *et al*, (2014) and Anyanwu, (2010). They found that educational level had a negative relationship to welfare and that increase in the years of schooling reduced poverty.

Off farm activities was found to be negatively significant indicating that increase in off farm activities reduces the likelihood of the households being poor. This is as a result of not depending on farm income alone, and the diversification of the farmer into other income generating activities such as trading, carpentry, motorcycling etc. increases the likelihood of not being poor. This result thus goes in line with Olorunsanya *et al*, (2014) and Adekoya, (2014) where the off farm activities were negatively significant at 5% and 1% levels respectively and reduced poverty level among rural farmers in Kwara state

**Table 8: Parameter estimates of the logistic regression analysis for the male households**

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal effect	Z	P>z
Constant	-13.67877	7.560481	—	-1.81	0.070
Age	0.3053954	0.255498	0.04287	1.20	0.232
Age Squared	-0.0014703	0.0022371	-0.00024	-0.66	0.511
Marital status	-0.5434081	0.8078879	0.001233	-0.67	0.501
Years of schooling	0.1814662**	0.0805289	0.024188	2.25	0.024
Farm experience	-0.1543436**	0.0649214	-0.015424	-2.38	0.017
Farm size	0.4095914	0.3949061	0.063376	1.04	0.300
Household size	0.4308421***	0.1617179	0.059808	2.66	0.008
Asset	0.4185918	0.2788924	5.49e-07	1.50	0.133
Off farm activities	-1.118616**	0.5106327	-0.13546	-2.19	0.028
Number of Observations	76				
LR chi <sup>2</sup> (9)	44.18,				
Prob> chi <sup>2</sup>	0.0000				
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.4589				
Log likelihood	26.05006				

Source; Field survey, 2017

Represents 1% and 5% significant levels respectively.

#### Determinants of poverty status among the Female household heads

The estimated coefficients for the likelihood ratio chi-square was significant ( $p < 0.01$ ) for the female headed households with chi-square value of 36.97. The pseudo  $R^2$  at 0.67 shows that 67% of the poverty status of the female household heads is explained by the selected variables. The result of the regression showed that age of the female household head ( $p < 0.10$ ), squared age ( $p < 0.10$ ) and household size (0.10) significantly influenced the probability that female headed households will be

poor or not poor. The age of the female household head which was found to be statistically significant at the 10% level of significance and its coefficient was negative with the regressand. This implied that increase in this variable may likely increase the probability of not being poor. This variable was also found to be significant for households headed by female by Achia, *et al* (2010), Sekhampu *et al* (2014) and Anyanwu (2010) in their study on the gendered analysis of the determinants of poverty among rural farmers.

The quadratic of age which was also found to be statistically significant at 10% implies that an increase in the squared age of the female respondents increases the probability of being poor. This variable was also found to be significant for the female headed households in a study by Anyanwu, (2010) in his study on the analysis of poverty based on the gender of the household heads. The household size of the female which is significant at 10% level implies that an increase in household size directly or indirectly reduces income per-head (per-capita income) as well as impair standard of living of the households. This is thus in line with (Okpachu *et al*, (2017), where household size is significant at 5% and was positive. It also agreed with Amao *et al*, (2013), World Bank, (1996) and Omonona, (2001).

**Table 9: Parameter estimates of the logistic regression analysis for the female households**

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	Marginal effect	Z	P>z
Constant	100.8576	55.62198	—	1.81	0.070
Age	-4.227947*	2.220396	-0.643375	-1.90	0.057
Age Squared	0.041844*	0.0218579	0.006368	1.91	0.056
Marital status	-0.9121249	1.250142	-0.138799	-0.73	0.466
Years of schooling	-0.1225305	0.2119956	-0.018646	-0.58	0.563
Farm experience	-0.1056974	0.1312432	-0.016084	-0.81	0.421
Farm size	-1.842066	2.358835	-0.2803107	-0.78	0.435
Household size	1.379509*	0.7464888	0.2099225	1.85	0.065
Asset	-5.68e-06	7.24e-06	-8.64e-07	-0.78	0.433
Off farm activities	-0.1027522	1.770633	-0.0156366	-0.06	0.954
Number of Observation	44				

LR $\chi^2(9)$	36.97
Prob > $\chi^2$	0.000
Pseudo $R^2$	0.6717
Log likelihood	9.036

---

Source; Field survey, 2017

<sup>\*</sup>, represents 10% significant level

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

### Conclusion

Household size of both the male and female headed households was an important determinant of poverty status as it significantly influenced the poverty status of the respondents. Also, age is an important factor which determines the welfare status of the female household heads since findings from the study revealed that the more the older they grow, the more improved their welfare status. Years of experience was an important factor influencing poverty, the more experienced the male household are, the lesser the probability of them being poor.

It was also concluded that the male headed households have a slightly higher prevalence of poverty than the female headed household. Also, that neither of the households dominates one another in the poverty analysis.

### Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Given that the poverty status of a household for both male and female household head is positively related to an increase in household size, increasing household income through redistribution measures such as government grants without proper planning of family sizes may not solve the problem of poverty in Ogun state and Nigeria as a whole. There is a need to intensify family planning services so as to improve knowledge and benefits of family planning.
2. Also there is need for the provision of various societal beneficial group to the female household heads as this will improve their level of exposure and most importantly it will improve their income generating capacity. This is so because most of the female headed household did not belong to one or more societal group in the study area

## REFERENCES

1. Achia .N. O, Wangombe. A. and Khadioli .N.(2010): A Logistic Regression Model to Identify Key Determinants of Poverty Using Demographic and Health Survey Data European Journal of Social Sciences – Volume 13, 1-8
2. Adebayo O. O (2013); Analysis of poverty level among urban households in Irewole local Government area of Osun state global journal of arts humanities and social sciences *Vol. 1(1),13-19 published by European centre for research training and development uk ([www.ea-journal.org](http://www.ea-journal.org))*
3. Adejobi A.(2004): Enhancing the Access of Rural Households to Output Markets for Increased Farm Incomes, Poster paper prepared for presentation at the International



Association of Agricultural Economists Conference, Gold Coast, Australia, August 12-18, 2004

4. Adekoya, (2014): Analysis of farm households poverty status in Ogun States, Nigeria. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 2014, 4(3):325-340
5. Adeyonu, A. G., Oni, O. A., Okoruwa, V. O. and Omonona, B. T. (2012) "Seasonality in Poverty Level of Rural Farming Households in Oyo State Nigeria" *ARP Journal of Agricultural and Biological Science*, 7(8):570-575.
6. Aina, I. O (1998) "Women, culture and Society" in Amadu Sesay and AdetanwaOdebiyi (eds). *Nigerian Women in Society and Development*. *Dokun Publishing House, Ibadan*. 4(6):170-180.
7. Ajakaiye, J., Nabena and Alaba, ( 2013):Understanding the relationship between growth and employment in Nigeria, *Development and policy research unit,United nations University,UNI-Wider* 8(4): 127–129
8. Alabi, R. A. and Oviasogie, D.I. (2005): "Cassava Production and Processing in Nigeria: Opportunities and Challenges" In: Orheruata, A. M., S. O. Nwokoro, M. T. Ajayi, T. Adekunle and G. N. Asumugha (Eds.), *Agricultural Rebirth for improved production in Nigeria*. Proceedings of the 39th Annual Conference of the Agricultural Society of Nigeria held at Ambrose Alli University Ekpoma, Edo State, Nigeria. Pp 22-24.
9. Ali, S. S. and Tahir, S. (1999), Dynamics of Growth, Poverty and Inequality in Pakistan. *Pakistan Development Review*, 38(4): 337–858.
10. Aliero, H.M., Abubakar, A.S. (2007). Community Banking in Nigeria: A Unique Innovation for Empowering the Rural Poor. *Issue in Economics*, 2, 107-115.
11. Amao, J.O., I.B. Oluwatayo and F.K. Osuntope, (2013). Economics of fish demands in Lagos State, Nigeria. *J. Hum. Ecol.*, 19: 25-30.
12. Amsalu M.(2014): Impact of Smallholder Farmers Agricultural Commercialization on Rural Households' Poverty. *The International Journal of Applied Economics and Finance*, 8: 51-61
13. Anyanwu, J. C. (2010): Poverty in Nigeria: A Gendered Analysis. *The African Statistical Journal*, Volume 11(5): 1-15.
14. Anríquez .G. and Stamoulis .K.(2007): Rural Development and Poverty Reduction:Is Agriculture Still the Key? ESA Working Paper No. 07-02 [www.fao.org/es/esa](http://www.fao.org/es/esa)
15. Appadurai, A. (2004), "The Capacity to Aspire: Culture and the Terms of Recognition", in Rao, Vijayendra; Walton, Michael, *Culture and Public Action*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 59–84.
16. Awotide B.A, Diagne A, Awoyemi T.T, Ojehomon V.E.T (2012): Impact of Improved Agricultural Technology Adoption on Sustainable Rice Productivity and Rural Farmers' Welfare in Nigeria: A Local Average Treatment Effect (LATE) Technique.
17. African Economic Conference October 30- November 2, 2012, Kigali
18. Ayinde, I.A. ( 2003). Analysis of poverty level among farmers in Ogun State, Nigeria, *Asset Series A*, 3(3): 27-35.
19. Ayinde, Taiwo O et.al. level of factors responsible for gender poverty among cassava farmers in Odeda Local Government area of Ogun State. 2021
20. Babatunde R.O, Olorunsanya E.O, Adejola A.D (2008). Assessment of Rural Household Evidence from South-western Nigeria. *American-Eurasian J. Agric. & Environ. Sci.*, 3 (6): 900-905.

21. Balogun, O. S., Ugwuanyi, C.A. and Ayoola, O. (2009): "Reserve productivity of small-scale cassava production in Kaura Local Government of Kaduna State, Nigeria". Global Food Crisis and Nigerian Agriculture, Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Conference of the Agricultural Society of Nigeria held at College of Forestry Mechanization Forestry Research Institute of Nigeria, Afa, Mando-Kaduna, Nigeria,
22. Bastos, A. *et al.* (2009). "Women and Poverty: A Gender-Sensitive Approach." *Journal of Socio-Economics*, Vol. 38, No. 5 (October), pp. 764–781
23. Belshaw, D., (1997). Strategising Poverty Reduction in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Role of Small-Scale Agriculture. Presidential Address. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 53 (2): 161- 193.
24. Borgen Project (2016): What are the causes of poverty? <https://borgenproject.org/global-poverty>
25. Bradshaw, T.K. (2006) Theories of Poverty and Anti-Poverty Programs in Community Development, *RPRC Working Paper 17(5) 05-06*.
26. Busisa, E.(2011): Determinants of poverty among households in Uganda. (*Unpublished thesis*)
27. Chakravarti, D (2006): "Voices Unheard: The Psychology of Consumption in Poverty and Development", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16 (4): 363–376,
28. Chambers. M. (1983): Confronting crisis: a comparative study of household responses to Poverty and Vulnerability in four poor urban communities', *Environmentally Sustainable Development Studies and Monographs Series N. 8*, Washing D.C.: World Bank Chant, S. and Craske, N, (2002): *Gender in Latin America*. London: Latin America Bureau 2002.
29. Chant, .S. and Sweetman .C. (2012). "The Disappearing of 'Smart Economics'? The World Development Report 2012 on Gender Equality: Some Concerns about the Preparatory Process and the Prospects for Paradigm Change." *Global Social Policy* 12 (2): 198–218.
30. Chukwuemeka (2008): Poverty and the millennium development goals in Nigeria: The nexus, *Educational Research and Review Vol. 4 (9), 405-410* <http://www.academicjournals.org/err>
31. D'Ambrosio, A., Deutsch .A, and Jacques .S(2009). *Multidimensional Approaches to Poverty Measurement: An Empirical Analysis of Poverty in Belgium, France, Germany, Italy and Spain, based on the European Panel*. Applied Economics, Taylor & Francis (Routledge), 2009, 43 (8),pp.951.
32. Dike VE (2002): "Poverty in Nigeria." *The Daily Independent (Opinion Column)*, October 6.
33. Dollar, .D. and Gatti. R (1999). "Gender Inequality, Income and Growth: Are Good Times Good for Women?" *World Bank Policy Research Report on Gender and Gender and Development, Development Working Paper Series, No. 1*.
34. Duflo.D.(2006): Does a younger male labor-force mean greater earnings inequality? *Monthly Labor Review* 105(11): 42–45.
35. Eboh, E., Oduh.M. and O. Ujah .O. (2012): drivers and sustainability of agricultural growth In Nigeria. Aiae research paper 8. African institute for applied economics, enugu.
36. Ebukiba, .E.(2010): Economic analysis of cassava production (farming) in Akwa Ibom State *Agriculture and biology journal OF North America* ISSN Print: 2151-7517, ISSN Online: 2151-7525
37. Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) (2004): *Land Tenure Susters and their impacts on Food Security and Sustainable Development in Africa*. Economic Commission for Africa.

- Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. p. 129.
38. Edeh, H. O. and Ojemade A. C., (2009): "Cost and Returns Analysis of Cassava Production in Edo State, Nigeria" Global Food Crisis and Nigerian Agriculture, Global Food Crisis and Nigerian Agriculture, Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Conference of the Agricultural Society of Nigeria held at Research fellow, African Institute of Applied Economics, Enugu State, Pp 353.
  39. Edoumiekumo, S. G., Karimo, T. M., and Tombofa, S. S. (2013).: Determinants of Households Poverty and Vulnerability in Bayelsa State of Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention 2 (12): 14 – 23*
  40. Egeonu, N. E. (2005): "Analysis of People's Participation in Rural Development Activities of Abia State Agency for Community Based Poverty Reduction Project". An Unpublished M. Sc. Thesis Submitted to the Department of Agricultural Extension, Abia State University, Uturu, Pp 498.
  41. Ezebuio, N. C., Chukwu, G. O., Okoye and Ugboaja I. C., (2008): "Policy Issues on Adoption of Improved Cassava Varieties Gender Considerations in Umuahia Zone of Abia State, Nigeria." Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference of the Agricultural Society of Nigeria. Pp 1056-1059.
  42. FAOSTAT, (2005): "Food and Agriculture Organization Database". Website [www.fao.org/faostat](http://www.fao.org/faostat).
  43. Fazoranti, M. M. (2006). "The influence of micro-credit on poverty alleviation among rural m dwellers: A case study of Akoko North West Local Government Area of Ondo State, *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol.4 (8), pp.1438-1446.
  44. Fekadu .D.( 2013): Rural Household Poverty and Vulnerability to Poverty in Oromiya, Ethiopia, Science, Technology and Arts Research journal, *June 2013, 2(2), 115-122*.
  45. Fernando Almans, Ramon Vallescà, Pilar Malla, Ramon Espasa, José I. González Faus,(1996), Year of Eradication of Poverty, <http://www.fespinal.com/espinal/lilib/en72>.
  46. Food and Agricultural Organisation(2012): Gender Differences in the Transitional Economy of Vietnam. FAO. ESA Working Paper No. 11-02 March 2011 Agricultural Development Economics Division The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation, [www.fao.org/economic/esa](http://www.fao.org/economic/esa)
  47. Garba, A. (2006). Alleviating Poverty in Northern Nigeria. A paper presented at the annual convention of Zumunta Association, Minneapolis, MN, USA. July 28-29. (GPRS, 2004): Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy Gendernet, (2011): Women's Economic Empowerment, [www.oecd.org/dac/gender](http://www.oecd.org/dac/gender)
  48. Godoy, C. D. and Dewbre. J. (2010), "Economic Importance of Agriculture for Poverty Reduction", *OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Working Papers*, No. 23, OECD Publishing.
  49. Gore, C. (2002). *Globalization, the International Poverty Trap and Chronic Poverty in the Least Developed Countries*. CPRC Working Paper No. 30.
  50. Gosselin, M. (2009): "What Is Poverty?" Economic and Social Inclusion Corporation. [http://www2.gnb.ca/content/gnb/en/departments/esic/overview/content/what\\_is\\_poverty.html](http://www2.gnb.ca/content/gnb/en/departments/esic/overview/content/what_is_poverty.html)
  51. Grondona M (2000). A cultural Typology of Economic Development", in Harrison LE, Huntington, S. P., Culture Matters, New York, NY: Basic Books, pp. 44–55.
  52. Grootaert, C (1994); Determinants of Poverty in Cote d'Ivoire in the 1980's Journal of

- African Economies, Vol.6 No.2 (169-196).
53. Gujarati and Porter, (2009)., Basic Econometrics *Fifth Edition*, McGraw-HILL International Editions Economics Series, Singapore.
  54. Harrison LE (2000), “Promoting Progressive Cultural Change”, in Harrison LE, Huntington SP, Culture Matters, New York, NY: Basic Books, 14(3) 296–307.
  55. Hassan, R.M. and Babu S.C. (1991) Measurement and Determinants of Rural Poverty, Household Consumption Patterns and Food Poverty in Rural Sudan *Food Policy* 16. (6):32-44
  56. Hemmer H.R. (1994): “Possible Approaches of Poverty Oriented Development Policy:A general Survey.” *Economics* VOL.49 no. 50 pp 56-76.
  57. Hulme, D. & Mosley, P. (1996) *Finance Against Poverty*. Volume 1. London: Routledge. Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, 2006: When Working is not Enough to Escape Poverty. An Analysis of Canada’s Working Poor.
  58. Ibekwe, U. C. Chikezie C, Obasi P. C., Eze C. C. and Henry- Ukoha A., (2012): Profitability of Garri Processing in Owerri North Local Government Area of Imo State, *ARPN Journal of Science and technology* vol. 2, No 4, Pg. 340-343.
  59. Ibrahim and Umar (2008); Determinants of Poverty among Farming Households in Nasarawa State, *Nigeria 2007*; 3 (2):11-20
  60. Igbalajobi, (2013), studied the determinants of poverty incidence among rural farmers in Ondo state, *American Journal of Rural Development*, 2013, Vol. 1(5) 131-137
  61. Kabeer, N. (2003): Gender mainstreaming in poverty eradication and the development to Goals: A handbook for policy makers and other stakeholders. Otfawa: International Development Research Centre. P 16.
  62. Kanbur . R. (1990): Poverty and Development. *The Human Development Report and The World Development Report*, Policy, Research, and External affairs working papers Development Economics Office of the Vice President The World Bank March 1991 WPS 618
  63. Kazi and Raza, (1998): Households Headed by Women: Income, Employment and Household Organization, *The Pakistan Development Review* Vol. 27(4), 123-127
  64. Klasen, S. (1999) Pro Poor Growth and Gender: What can we learn from the Literature and the OPPG Case Studies? Discussion Paper by Stephan Klasen, University of Göttingen to the Operationalizing Pro-Poor Growth (OPPG) Working Group of AFD, DFID, BMZ (GTZ/KfW) and the World Bank [siteresources.worldbank.org/](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/)
  65. Klasen, S.(2005) Pro Poor Growth and Gender: What can we learn from the Literature and The OPPG Case Studies? Discussion Paper by Stephan Klasen, University of Göttingen to the Operationalizing Pro-Poor Growth (OPPG) Working Group of AFD, DFID, BMZ (GTZ/KfW) and the World Bank [siteresources.worldbank.org/](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/)
  66. Klasen, S. (2011): UNDP’s Gender-related measures: Some conceptual problems and Possible solutions. *Journal of Human Development* 7(2): 243-274.
  67. Knowles, S., Lorgelly P.K, and Owen, P.D. (2002). “Are educational gender gaps a brake oneconomic development? Some cross-country empirical evidence.” *Oxford Economic Papers* 54: 118-149.
  68. Leibbrandt M., Poswell L., Naidoo P. and Welch, M. (2006), Measuring Recent Changes in South African Inequality and Poverty Using 1996 and 2001 Census Data in: Poverty and

Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa, HSRC Press, Pretoria.  
[http://www.hsrcpress.ac.za/full\\_title\\_info.asp?id=2178](http://www.hsrcpress.ac.za/full_title_info.asp?id=2178)

69. Lindsay .G. (2000): The behaviour and self-esteem of children with specific speech and language difficulties Volume 70, Issue 4 Pages 583–601
70. Mafimisebi, T.E. (2002). Rural Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria. In Okunmadewa F. (ed.), *Poverty Reduction and the Nigeria Agricultural Sector*
71. Masika, R, Haan, A and Baden, S. (1997) Urbanization and Urban poverty; A gender analysis. SIDA report No. 54
72. Maxwell, S. (1999). The Meaning and Measurement of Poverty. Retrieved from: <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/2227.pdf>.
73. Mubasher .U. (2009): Socio-Economic Determinants of Poverty, A Case of Pakistan. *Development and International Relations, Aalborg University, Denmark, 10th Semester 2009(Unpublished Thesis)*
74. N-Agro manual (2017): N-Power (Agro) training manual for extension advisors. *National agricultural extension and research liaison services, pg. 260*
75. Nsikak-Abasi A. Etim and Edet J. Udoh (2013) ‘The Determinants of Rural Poverty in Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Management & Development, 3(2): 141-151,*
76. Nwachukwu, I.N. & C.I. Ezech (2007). Impact of Selected Rural Development Programmes on Poverty Alleviation in Ikwuano LGA, Abia State, Nigeria. *African Journal of Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development, 7(5): 1 – 17.*
77. Nwagwu .J. E. (2014): Unemployment And Poverty In Nigeria: A Link To National Insecurity *Global Journal of Politics and Law Research Vol.2, No.1, pp.19-35, March 2014*
78. Nweke, F. I., Spencer, D. S. & Lynam, J. K.( 2001):. The Cassava Transformation: Africa's best kept secret. Michigan State University Press, East Lansing. Volume 2. @fao.org
79. Nwibo .J N(2013): The menace of poverty in Nigeria and its causes and solution; An unpublished thesis submitted to the department of philosophy and religion, Faculty of Arts, Ebonyi state University
80. Obayelu, O. A. and Awoyemi, T. T. (2010) “Spatial dimension of poverty in rural Nigeria” *Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics Vol. 2(6): 231-244.*
81. Odame HH, Hafkin N, Wesseler G, Boto I 2002. *Gender and Agriculture in the Information Society*. International Service for National Agricultural Research Briefing Paper No.55. The Hague, The Netherlands: ISNAR.
82. Odusola, AF (2001). “Conceptual issues in poverty and poverty measurement” Paper presented at NCEMA Workshop on poverty alleviation policies and strategies, 15th-26th, October
83. Ogwumike (2001): Determinants of poverty among cassava farming households in Nigeria. *Journal of Development and Agricultural Economics Vol. 2(6): 231-244.*
84. Ogwumike and Akinnibosun, (2013),: Determinants of Poverty among Farming Households in Nigeria. Paper presented at NCEMA workshop on poverty reduction, Development policy centre, Ibadan, 3rd-21st August.
85. Okpachu, S. A.1, Madu, U. V. and Okpachu, G.A(2017), ‘Assessment of rural farm household poverty: Evidence from Potiskum Local Government Area of Yobe State, Nigeria’ *Sky Journal of Agricultural Research Vol. 6(2) 022 – 027*

86. Okunmadewa, F. (2001). Poverty Reduction in Nigeria. A Four-Point Demand. An Annual Guest Lecture. 20th Anniversary Lecture of “The House”, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
87. Olawuyi, S. O. and Adetunji, M. O. (2013), Assessment of Rural Households Poverty in Nigeria: Evidence from Ogbomoso Agricultural Zone of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Scientific Research & Reports* 2(1): 35-45
88. Ololade R.A. & Olagunju F.I. (2013): Determinants of Access to Credit among Rural Farmers in Oyo State, Nigeria *Global Journal of Science Frontier Research Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences* Volume 13 Issue 2, 2249-4626
89. Olorunsanya and Omotesho,(2014); A gender analysis of poverty profile of rural farming households in North Central, Nigeria *International Journal of Agricultural Economics & Rural Development - 4 (2): 125-135*
90. Omoare, A. M, Oyediran, W. O and Fakoya, E. O.(2015): Contributive Roles of Selected Cottage Industries towards Poverty Reduction in Odeda Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Developing Societies* Vol. 4(1) 21-25
91. Omonona, B.T., (2001). Poverty and its correlates among rural farming households in Kogi State, Nigeria. An Unpublished Ph.D thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics. Nigeria: University of Ibadan.
92. Omoregie, A.U. (2005): “The Export Drive for Cassava”. Implications for the Nigeria Economy, Proceedings of the 39th Conference of the Agricultural Society of Nigeria held at Ambrose Alli University Ekpoma, Edo State, Nigeria. *Pharmacology online* 1(5): 23-56
93. Omotola, J.S. (2008). Combating Poverty for Sustainable Human Development in Nigeria: The Continuing Struggle. *Journal of Poverty*, 12(4), 496-517.
94. Onu J.I. and Abayomi Z. (2009): An Analysis of Poverty among Households in Yola Metropolis of Adamawa State, Nigeria *J Soc Sci*, 20(1): 43-48
95. Oriola, E.O. (2009). A Framework for Food Security and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(1), 132-139.
96. Osinubi T.S (2003). “Urban Poverty in Nigeria: A case study of Agege Area of Lagos. State Nigeria”, Paper presented at the World Institute for Development Economics Research (WDER) conference, Finland
97. Osondu C. K. and Obike, K. C. (2015) focussed on the comparative analysis of poverty determinants among cassava producing households by gender of household heads in Umunneochi local government area of Abia state, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Agriculture, Food and Environment*. 11(4):52-60