

# Inequalities of Time Allocation among Male and Female Headed Household in Ibarapa East Local Government Area, Oyo State, Nigeria: The Welfare Implications

Amao Olufunmilola

Agricultural Economics Unit, Department of Agricultural Technology, Oyo State College of Agriculture, P.M.B  
10, Igboora, Oyo State, Nigeria  
E-mail: amaoolufunmi@yahoo.com

## Abstract

This study examines how male and female headed household in rural Area of Oyo state, Nigeria allocate their time to various activities in each day and the welfare implication. A time use survey was carried out among 240 headed households-174 male headed household and 66 female headed household using multistage random sampling from 10 villages. The objectives include the socio-economic characteristics of the respondent; the different activities people engage in during the day and the number of hours allocated; factors determining the number of hours allocated to each activity and gender disparity in time use. Analytical tools are descriptive statistics and regression model. Based on the findings for male headed household, the level of education and the number of hours allocated to paid work are statistically significant at 1%, for female headed household, level of education (1%) and secondary occupation (5%) are statistically significant. The more educated are able to manage their time more judiciously vis-à-vis a person with lower education. Male allocated more time to paid work and earn more while female headed household allocated more time to secondary occupation to make ends meet has the major economic supporter of their household and more time to unpaid work that has no financial compensation. Female headed operates smaller land holdings due to the challenge of social norms and values. Men enjoy leisure more than women because unpaid work (housework) has occupied their time. Based on the findings, unpaid work should not be gender biased, and FHH should be treated with passion under social norms and values. In addition, unpaid work should be monetized in System of National Account.

**Keywords:** time use, male headed household, female headed household and welfare.

Part of this study was presented (as a postal) at the 35th conference of International Association of Time Use Research in Rio de Jenerio, Brazil Between 7-9th August, 2013.

## INTRODUCTION

Time is a resource. It shows how people allocate their time to paid work, unpaid work and leisure. In gender studies, there has been a strand of literature called 'doubled burden', where a justified claim has been made that women's participation in the labour force has reduced their high quality leisure time. As emphasized in the policy research report of the World Bank (2001), gender differences in the allocation of resources can be observed on many dimensions including health, education, access to productive resources and the allocation of time to work and leisure. According to Blackden and Wodon (2005), the gender-based division of labour, which is characterized by the fact that men are engaged in productive activities while women bear the domestic tasks, is more significant in Africa.

Time allocation for the male and female headed households in developing economy, fully represents and portrays how each household allocates their time and their state of welfare. According to Duku et al 2011, poverty and vulnerability studies have revealed a gender dimension in contemporary literature, though not without debate. Studies have reported linkages between women on one hand and female-headed households (FHH) on the other hand with poverty and vulnerability. Buvinic and Gupta (1997) also revealed that FHH are overrepresented among the poor. This is also applicable to time use studies in the sense that FHH are time poorer than the Male Headed Household (MHH) especially in Africa.

In developing countries especially West Africa, being a woman has generally been equated with greater poverty and vulnerability, and higher workloads (Baden et al 1994; Awumbila 2006; Wrigley-Asante 2008). This means that a female household head, being a woman, and having the responsibility of a household head, would be more likely to be poorer, vulnerable, and time-constrained. FHH lack security and have limited access to land tenure which reduces incentives to invest in improving the land, resulting in lower productivity. Women are disadvantaged in many statutory and customary land tenure systems. They often have weak property and contractual rights to land, water and other natural resources. Even where legislation is in place, lack of legal knowledge and weak implementation often limits the ability of women to exercise their rights (Quisumbing and Pandolfelli, 2009).

According to Buvinic and Gupta, 1993; González de la Rocha, 1994b ; Moghadam, 1997; Paolisso and

Gammage, 1996 and Bridge, 2001; women-headed households were typecast as the 'poorest of the poor' on grounds of their allegedly greater likelihood of being poor, and of experiencing more pronounced degrees of indigence than male-headed units. These assumptions intermeshed with the notion that poverty was a major cause of female household headship (through forced labour migration of the male, conjugal breakdown under financial stress, lack of formal marriage and so on. (Fonseca, 1991).

In turn, female headship itself is regarded as exacerbating poverty since women are time- and resource-constrained by their triple burdens of employment, housework and childcare, because they are discriminated against in the labour market, because they are unable to enjoy the 'dual earner' status so vital to riding out the pressures attached to neoliberal economic restructuring, and because they lack the valuable non-market work provisioned by 'wives' in male-headed units (Folbre, 1994; Fuwa, 2000; ILO, 1996; Safa and Antrobus, 1992; UNDAW, 1991).

Female Headed Household is the absence of any steady male partner and the female is the primary economic supporter of the household. It is as a result of a variety of causes: widowhood, divorce and de facto headship, arising, for instance, from the illness of a spouse or his migration to an urban area to find work (Sara and Pramila, 2006). While MHH in this context refers to men being the major economic supporter of the household and most of them interviewed are married living with their wife/wives except some few cases that are widowers.

## 2. Background

Economists applying a neo-classical lens laid the foundation for new household economics (Becker, 1981; Koopman, 1991). They suggested that households were unified and therefore worked towards common goals, directed by a household head. As such, they could be understood as unit of production, consumption and exchange (Chant, 1997; Kabeer, 1994; O'Laughlin, 1995). Essentially, certain intimate relationships were taken and used to consider basic allocation activities.

Time use research investigates human activities inside and outside the paid economy. It also looks at how these activities change overtime. Time use survey data are important input policy analysis because they provide information on the allocation of time to household production of substitutes for market output, as well as on the allocation of time to leisure activities. (Ruuskaneen, 2004).

Becker summarized the idea of the 'benevolent...household head to ensure welfare maximization'. The 'benevolent head' represents the household and ensure that all members of the household are fairly and squarely cared for. (Folbre 1986; Kabeer, 1994 and Posel 2001).

According to resource theories, women and men have or acquired a different work characteristic, which implies that there are differences between the genders in levels of productivity in both paid and unpaid work (Becker, 1981; Browning, 1992). This is also applicable to male and female headed household in the developing economy; the level of productivity and commitment to paid work for male headed household is higher compared to female headed household.

Studies have reported linkages between women on one hand and FHH on the other hand with poverty, vulnerability and time constraint. Buvinic and Gupta (1997) reviewed empirical evidence on the relationship between female headship and poverty and concluded that gender-related differences and household structural factors caused FHH to be overrepresented among the poor. A note of caution has however been sounded in equating FHH with poverty and vulnerability (Lloyd and Gage-Brandon, 1993; Baden et al, 1994; Mookodi, 2000; Niehof, 2004; Awumbila, 2006). It is argued that FHH are not necessarily worse-off, and that certain categories of female heads are more likely to be poorer than other heads (Lloyd and Gage-Brandon, 1993; Baden et al, 1994; Mookodi, 2000; Niehof, 2004; Awumbila, 2006).

Moreover the need to recognize intra-household differences rather than the household as one unit has been advocated in many studies such as Baden et al (1994), Curry (1996), (Dossa et al (2008). It has been claimed that resources are not pooled or are not equally accessible within the household (Baden et al 1994; Awumbila 2006). In addition, it has been argued that the concept of 'headship' gives the impression of a sole income earner and decision maker, which may not be the case (Rosenhouse 1989; Dossa et al 2008; Mookodi 2000). Niehof (2004), on the other hand sees the household as the locus of livelihood generation for its members, with the responsibility of managing resources to meet their primary needs.

Theoretically, the activities of FHHs in rural areas should be: participation in small scale agriculture (because they are being deprived of their right to have access to much land and resources), very few of them in formal sectors, or informal sector such as petty trading, child care, household chores, social and cultural activities, voluntary activities and little time for leisure and recreation. On the contrary, male heads of households in rural areas are involved in large scale agricultural activities being assisted by their wives in harvesting and processes of agricultural products, other economic activities, socialization, and more time for leisure and recreation. Child care and household chores are performed predominantly by their wives; although, there are some evidences that some men also participate in household activities.

### **Who Constitute Male and Female-headed Households?**

It is helpful first to distinguish between de jure and de facto FHHs. De jure FHHs maintain their households alone, while de facto FHHs may include men who are unable or unwilling to work. Female-headed households may consist of elderly women (widowed or divorced) with no dependents, or younger women (divorced or never-married) with dependent children. FHHs may be permanent or transitory or embedded in a wider kin network of support. They may represent family breakdown or a conscious lifestyle choice. The majority of women in FHHs in developing countries are widowed, and very few are divorced or separated. In the developed countries most female-headed households consist of women who are never married or who are divorced. Perhaps because of flexible definitions of female headship, as well as inadequate data, estimates on the extent of FHHs tend to vary (Moghadam, 2005).

Male and female headed households are very important in studying time use in the population because they are the major economic supporter of the family and are in the best position to represent their households on how time and other resources are allocated in intra-household. This paper seeks to explore the linkages between household headships, characteristics of household head, how the household allocate their time to various activities each day as well as intrahousehold activities and income generated from their primary and secondary occupations to see the level of vulnerability as well as their welfare.

Therefore, the broad objective of the study is to analyze the inequalities in time allocation of activities by male and female headed household and the welfare implications in Ibarapa East Local Government Area of Oyo State. The specific objectives are to examine the socio-economic characteristics of male and female headed household in the study area; to investigate the different activities they engage in during the day and the number of hours allocated to each activity; to examine the factors determining the number of hours allocated to each activities; to determine gender disparities in time use and the welfare implications.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **The Study Area**

The study was conducted in Eruwa, the administrative headquarters of Ibarapa East Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. Eruwa is approximately 72km South-West to Ibadan, about 60km North-East to Abeokuta and it is roughly 8km to Lanlate. It is bounded in the North by Iseyin Local Government Area, in the West by Ibarapa Central Local Government, Igboora and the South by Ogun State.

Eruwa is situated in the grass savannah with a number of streams flowing through it, like Oluweri and Agboti Streams. The department of geography of the University of Ibadan in 1980 estimated the annual rainfall in Eruwa with a total of 1,200mm per annum and the mean temperature ranges between 90<sup>o</sup>F in January to March and 70<sup>o</sup>F in June and August. The major occupations of the people in the town are farming and hunting. Cattle rearing are also practiced by the Fulanis in the area. Other occupations practiced by the people of Eruwa include trading, civil service e.t.c.

### **Method of Data Collection**

Primary data was used to collect the data using well structured and pre-tested questionnaire/interview schedule. The questionnaire has three major parts:

- Household Identification/ information on some household socioeconomic Characteristics and personal characteristics supplied by the household head (the study focused the household head).
- Individual diary (simplified time diary) record:  
Used for providing a diary of activities that the respondents spent during the 24hours that makes a day and to take account of day-to-day variations in activities and allocation of time to the activities (FOS, 1999). Wages/salary earned was also recorded.
- Use of time summary schedule:

A schedule used for summarizing, on daily basis, time spent by the respondents over various activities (paid work, unpaid work, and leisure) by major activity groupings using the United Nation (UN, 2003) document "Trial International Classification for Time-Use Activities". This is the document used in classifying and coding time-use activities. The document was adopted by (Federal Office of Statistics, 2000).

### **Study Sample**

Multistage sampling technique procedure was used for the study. The first stage involved the stratification of the Local Government Area into peril-urban (Eruwa) and rural areas (sub-villages of Eruwa). The second stage is the random selection of 5 areas in the peril-urban (Eruwa) and random selection of 10 villages (from more than 30 sub-villages) in the study area. The third stage is the random selection of 10 and 20 households from the peril-urban and the villages respectively and their household heads were interviewed. A total number of 240 headed households were chosen out of the 250 headed households surveyed in the study area.

### **Sampling Techniques**

The data collected for the study were analyzed using descriptive statistics and multiple regressions. The

descriptive analysis involved the use of frequency distribution, percentages, mean, and tables to explain the information. **Multiple Regression Analyses** were also used in the analysis.

The model:

$$X = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_4X_4 + B_5X_5 + B_6X_6 + B_7X_7 + B_8X_8 + B_9X_9 + e_i$$

Y = Wage (₦)

**Independent Variable**

- X<sub>1</sub> = Age
- X<sub>2</sub> = Sex
- X<sub>3</sub> = Age of Spouse
- X<sub>4</sub> = Religion
- X<sub>5</sub> = Education
- X<sub>6</sub> = Secondary Occupation
- X<sub>7</sub> = Hours for paid work
- X<sub>8</sub> = Hours for unpaid work
- X<sub>9</sub> = Hours for leisure
- E<sub>i</sub> = error term

**Measurement**

- Years
- 1 = Male, 0 = Otherwise
- Years
- 1 = Christianity, 0 = Otherwise
- Years
- 1 = farming, 0 = Otherwise
- Hours
- Hours
- Hours

In the above equation, Y represents the wages of the household head and X<sub>1</sub>, X<sub>2</sub>, - - - X<sub>9</sub> represents the factors determining the number of hours allocated to each activity (paid and unpaid work) other measures include beta coefficients, coefficient of the multiple determination (R square), the adjusted R square, standard error of the regression estimate and F-ratio coefficients with respect to signs magnitude. Also, Chi-square analysis was used to test the hypothesis derived from the study at 1% and 5% level of significance.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

|       | <b>Variables</b>   | <b>MHH</b>   | <b>FHH</b>                                       |
|-------|--|--|--|
| 1.    | Age: 20-29<br>30-39<br>40-49<br>50-59<br>60-69<br>≥70<br><b>Total</b>  | 1<br>40<br>63<br>38<br>24<br>8<br><b>174(72.5)</b> | 2<br>10<br>31<br>12<br>9<br>2<br><b>66(27.5)</b> |
| 2.    | Sex  | <b>174(72.5)</b>                                   | <b>66(27.5)</b>                                  |
| 3.    | Educational Status:<br>No formal education<br>Primary education<br>Secondary education<br>Post secondary education<br><b>Total</b> | 15<br>133<br>22<br>4<br><b>174(72.5)</b>           | 7<br>47<br>10<br>2<br><b>66(27.5)</b>            |
| 4     | Marital Status:<br>Married<br>Widowed<br>Divorced/separated<br><b>Total</b>  | 120<br>49<br>5<br><b>174(72.5)</b>                 | 10<br>44<br>12<br><b>66(27.5)</b>                |
| 5.    | Religion:<br>Christianity<br>Islam<br>Traditional  | 150<br>23<br>1                                     | 56<br>10<br>-                                    |
| Total | <b>Total</b>   | <b>174(72.5)</b>                                   | <b>66(27.5)</b>                                  |

The mean (average) is in the parenthesis  
 Source: Field Survey 2007.

Table 1 above shows that 174 (72.5%) of the household head are male while 66 (27.5%) of the household head are female. Over 75% of the respondents stopped schooling at the primary school level and this has affected the proper management of time because the more educated a person is the more active in his time-use vis-a-vis a person with lower education. (Ruuskanen, 2004). More than half of the respondents are married while few are either widowed or divorced. Majority of the respondents are Christians while few are Muslims and traditional worshippers. Time use in intra-household activities is an activity that has no age limit. Pertaining to the age distribution of household head, table 1 reveals that majority of the farmers (99%) are within the range of

over 30 years and 69 years showing that the older generations are more involved in farming and located in the rural areas while the younger ones migrate to the city.

**Table 2(a): Summary of the Time Spent by Male and Female Headed Household on Paid Work, Unpaid Work and Leisure/Day**

|  | Male Headed |               | Female Headed |               |
|--|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|  | N           | Mean (hr)/day | N             | Mean (hr)/day |
| Average hours for paid work            | 174         | 9.2644        | 66            | 9.0379        |
| Average hours for unpaid work          | 174         | 1.8059        | 66            | 4.1212        |
| Average hours for leisure (plus sleep) | 174         | 12.1293       | 66            | 10.3833       |

Source: Field Survey 2007.

**Table 2(b) Summary of Different Activities Engaged in by the Respondents in the Study Area.**

|             |   |
|-------------|---|
| Paid work   | Farming, hunting, family and hunting processing, farming and processing, milling & processing, farming & Artisan, farming & technician, trading, farming & security, civil service & farming, farming pension |
| Unpaid work | Charity & Housework, housework, childcare, housework & childcare, housework, childcare & charity, union meeting, care for the old   |
| Leisure     | Games, listen to radio/T.V, organizational meeting, rest, relaxation, reading, visitation and sleeping.   |

Source: Field Survey 2007.

The table above shows that men spent longer time on paid work when compared to women i.e the average of 9.2644 hrs/day (men) versus 9.0379 hrs/day (women).

Female headed household spend longer time on unpaid work (housework, child care e.t.c.) than men i.e 4.1212 (women) versus 1.8059 (men). Unfortunately, these women are not compensated for the unpaid work. Male headed household have more time for leisure and sleep compared to female headed household i.e. average of 12.1293 (men) versus 10.3833 (women).

Therefore, it shows that women work longer than men when the time spent on domestic work is added to the hours they work outside the home (World Bank, 2001). Also, women's participation in the labour force has decreased their high quality leisure time. It is also noticed that not all men participate in housework.

**Table 3: Average Income from Paid Work of the Male and Female Headed Household**

|               | N   | Income from paid work |             | Month      |
|---------------|-----|-----------------------|-------------|------------|
|               |     | Minimum (₦)           | Maximum (₦) | Mean (₦)   |
| Male Headed   | 174 | 1,000                 | 40,000      | 12,465.517 |
| Female Headed | 66  | 5,000                 | 20,000      | 10,560.606 |

Source: Field Survey 2007.

The table shows that male headed household earns more than female headed household women. Despite the fact that women work more for paid and unpaid work, their reward or income is lower. The occupation in which most women interviewed engaged in such as peasant agriculture and petty trading are characterized by low levels of productivity and low income. This is due to the fact that most of them are non-educated or primary schools drop-out which subject them to the type of occupation they are engaged in, as well as the problem of social norms where women do not have access to much personal land compared to men and also, they are the breadwinner of their family. Therefore, poverty is more pronounced among the female headed household. Whereas, male headed household are still supported financially by their wives.



**Table 4: Regression Model of the Factors Determining the Number of Hours Allocated to each Activity (Male Headed Household).**

| Variable             | Linear                     | Semi-Log                   | Double-Log                 | Exponential                 |
|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Constant</b>      | -389.0889<br>(0.9770)      | 8131.4013<br>(0.9770)      | 0.1531<br>(0.9770)         | 8.004<br>(0.0000)           |
| <b>Age</b>           | 143.6903<br>(0.7717)       | 0.43239<br>(0.0562)        | 0.1401<br>(0.0000)**       | 0.1159<br>(0.7845)          |
| <b>Age Sqr.</b>      | -2.1158<br>(0.6605)        | -0.216199<br>(0.562)       | -0.7006<br>(0.0000)**      | -0.1990<br>(0.6196)         |
| <b>Age Sp</b>        | -1.5578<br>(0.7648)        | -1483.2599<br>(0.8126)     | -0.1039<br>(0.8455)        | -0.1539<br>(0.9086)         |
| <b>Religion</b>      | -1600.1811<br>(2706)       | -1422.5091<br>(0.3460)     | -0.4397<br>(0.7325)        | -0.4687<br>(0.6994)         |
| <b>Education</b>     | 717.3339<br>(0.0000)*      | 3623.3733<br>(0.0002)*     | 0.3928<br>(0.0000)*        | 0.6087<br>(0.0000)*         |
| <b>S. Occupation</b> | -888.7132<br>(0.5389)      | -432.3398<br>(0.7641)      | 0.2711<br>(0.8254)         | -0.1247<br>(0.9150)         |
| <b>HR.Paid</b>       | 93.6188<br>(0.0184)**      | 3502.7324<br>(0.2683)      | 0.4416<br>(0.1026)         | 0.8366<br>(0.0083)*         |
| <b>HR. Unpaid</b>    | 0.1489<br>(0.9736)         | -599.7507<br>(0.5587)      | 0.1171<br>(0.1818)         | -0.9510<br>(0.7853)         |
| <b>HR. Leisure</b>   | -43.4216<br>(0.9157)       | -2069.0687<br>(0.1511)     | 0.2136<br>(0.8617)         | 0.3294<br>(0.3339)          |
| <b>*=Sig at 1%</b>   | R <sup>2</sup> =0.1949     | R <sup>2</sup> =1371       | R <sup>2</sup> =0.1349     | R <sup>2</sup> =0.2341      |
| <b>**=Sig at 5%</b>  | Adj.R <sup>2</sup> =0.1508 | Adj.R <sup>2</sup> =0.0897 | Adj.R <sup>2</sup> =0.0875 | Adj.R <sup>2</sup> =-0.1921 |

Note: Values in parenthesis represent the t-value of the coefficient

Source: Field Survey 2007.

**Table 5: Regression Model of the Factors Determining the Number of Hours Allocated to Each Activity (Female Headed Household)**

| Variables            | Linear                     | Semi-Log                   | Double-Log                  | Exponential                    |
|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Constant</b>      | 5344.0804<br>(0.6194)      | 8.5753<br>(0.0000)*        | 7.3483<br>(1.0000)          | 6315.5334<br>(Fixed Parameter) |
| <b>Age</b>           | 23.7123<br>(0.9526)        | 0.107239<br>(0.7682)       | -0.1502<br>(0.1660)         | 0.8540<br>(0.3063)             |
| <b>Age Sqr.</b>      | 0.1251<br>(0.9764)         | -0.9449<br>(0.8031)        | 0.7509<br>(0.1660)          | -0.4270<br>(0.3063)            |
| <b>Age Sp</b>        | -1.3992<br>(0.3229)        | -0.2373<br>(0.6166)        | -0.1583<br>(59410)          | 171.4492<br>(0.9597)           |
| <b>Religion</b>      | -2297.777<br>(0.1688)      | -0.01412<br>(0.3279)       | -0.1998<br>(0.2451)         | -3856.6060<br>(0618)           |
| <b>Education</b>     | 430.8831<br>(0.0010)*      | 0.3682<br>(0.0014)*        | 0.1908<br>(0.0105)**        |                                |
| <b>S. Occupation</b> | 1836.5155<br>(0.0339)**    | 0.1355<br>(0.0859)         | 0.1259<br>(0.2054)          | 1873.2228<br>(0.1023)          |
| <b>HR.Paid</b>       | 316.3944<br>(0.5116)       | 0.4760<br>(0.2684)         | 0.5961<br>(0.2215)          |                                |
| <b>HR. Unpaid</b>    | -324.4665<br>(0.4131)      | -0.2162<br>(0.5371)        | -0.6252<br>(0.7326)         | -1724.0497<br>(0.3352)         |
| <b>HR. Leisure</b>   | 133.459<br>(0.8129)        | 0.9443<br>(0.5803)         | 0.1192<br>(0.5023)          | 700.1482<br>(0.7138)           |
| <b>*=Sig at 1%</b>   | R <sup>2</sup> =0.3193     | R <sup>2</sup> =0.3104     | R <sup>2</sup> =-0.0730     | R <sup>2</sup> =-0.2116        |
| <b>**=Sig at 5%</b>  | Adj.R <sup>2</sup> =0.2099 | Adj.R <sup>2</sup> =0.1996 | Adj.R <sup>2</sup> =-0.2455 | Adj.R <sup>2</sup> =-0.3579    |

Note: Values in Parenthesis represent the t-value of the coefficient.

Source: Field Survey 2007.

In the regression analysis, the exponential form is picked for MHH while linear form is picked for FHH because they have the highest R<sup>2</sup> value. For male headed household, the exponential form has the R<sup>2</sup> of

0.2341 and the adjusted  $R^2$  of 0.1921 and having two of the variables which are statistically significant at 1% i.e. the level of education and the number of hours allocated to paid work. The  $R^2$  implies that the variables jointly contribute 23.41% variations in the wage of the male headed household.

For FHH, the estimated linear form which proved to be the lead equation has the highest  $R^2$  of 0.3193 and adjusted  $R^2$  of 0.2099 and has two of the variables which are statistically significant i.e. level of education (1%) and secondary occupation (5%). The  $R^2$  implies that the variables jointly contributed about 31.93% variations in the wage of the FHH.

Since education is significant for male and FHH, this shows that people with a higher level of education are able to manage their time more judiciously and they have the better understanding on how to manage their time and to achieve a lot within a very short period of time in the study area. Also, they are able to record their activities better than the less educated or non-educated. This is confirmed by Ruuskaneen (2004) that as the wage rate of the more educated is higher and the more educated tend to have more capital, it is in their interest to do more activities in less time. The number of Hours for paid work of male headed household is significant and this shows that as the breadwinner of the household, men spend much more time on paid work and since they have free access to land through inheritance than their female counterpart. This is reflected in their earnings.

Secondary occupation of the FHH is significant and this shows that their primary occupations is not enough to cater for their household and are forced to engage in other source of income to make ends meet and still, poverty is more pronounced among them. This is confirmed by some researchers that FHHs have become an easily identifiable group on which to target poverty alleviation measures. However, the efficacy of such targeting has been widely questioned (Kennedy and Haddad 1994, Blackden and Bhanu 1999, Quisumbing et al 2001, Chant 2003). This is also confirmed by a study carried out by World Bank, 2000 on paid work and unpaid work in Australia, France, Japan, Latria and Netherlands that women's total time worked generally exceeds men's when paid work and unpaid work are combined. Other variables i.e. age, age of spouse, religion, hours for unpaid work, hours for leisure, secondary occupation for male headed household and paid work for female headed household are positive that is they also influence wages but not significant.

### **Conclusions/Recommendation**

This paper focus on time allocation to different activities by MHH and FHH in rural area of Ibarapa East local government area of Oyo State, Nigeria, the study reveals that paid work/farm work, unpaid work/ housework and leisure (including sleep) constitute time use. In addition, total hours spent by female headed household on paid work and unpaid work (when time spend on house work and child care is added ) is more than the total hours spent by male headed household on paid and unpaid work. Unfortunately, women are not compensated financially for child care and housework.

There is also a marked gender difference in the time spent in active leisure. Men spend more time in out-of –house active leisure categories and women spend more time than men in social activities within and between households like housework and child care which has reduced their time for leisure. The summary of the multiple regression analysis shows that the level of education (for both male and female headed household), paid work (for men) and secondary occupation (for women) are statistically significant to the total number of time spent and their wages. Summarily, men are more advantaged than women in time allocation.

This implies that the educated male and female headed households are able to manage their time better and they are able to swap from one activity to another hence; they earn more in the study area. The male headed households spend more time on paid work and influence their wages positively. While the female headed household combine secondary occupation with household chores in order to boost their income as the bread winner of the family.

Government programs in Nigeria like Agricultural Development Programme, FADAMA, Women in Agriculture Programmes and other programs that are directly in contact with farmers and rural dwellers should introduce the importance of time-use as well as importance of leisure and even what to do at leisure time that are productive in informal education. The Government and Non Governmental Organizations need to empower more vulnerable people, especially women heads of household and women in general. Poverty alleviation programmes should benefit the female-headed household as well as the male-headed ones.

Provision of a reliable water supply and promotion of affordable alternative fuel technologies would also cut down on the burden of women to enhance adequate attention for their paid job.

Unpaid work should not be gender biased, and FHH should be treated with passion under social norms and values. In addition, unpaid work should be monetized in System of National Account.

More work is needed to be done on female headship to access resources and the consequential effects on the ability to improve the household's position. Only when such links are documented can poverty alleviation measures be effectively and efficiently targeted.

## REFERENCES

- Awumbila M 2006 Gender equality and poverty in Ghana: implications for poverty reduction strategies. *GeoJournal* 67: 149-161.
- Baden S, Green C, Otoo-Oyortey N and Tessa Peasgood T 1994 Background paper on gender issues in Ghana. Report prepared for the West and North Africa Department, Department for Overseas Development (DFID), UK. Report No 19
- Becker Gary (1991). *A Treatise on the family- Enlarged Edition*
- Becker, G. (1981) - *A Treatise on the family*. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass
- Becker, Gary (1965). A Theory of the Allocation of Time, *Economic Journal*, Vol. 75, No.299, pp.493-517.
- Blackden Mark C and Wodon Quention (2005): Gender, Time use and Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa; The World Bank working paper No.73
- Blackden, C. Mark and Chitra Bhanu (1999) *Gender, Growth and Poverty reduction. Special Program of Assistance for Africa*. 1998 status report on poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa, World Bank: Washington
- Buvinic, M., and G. R. Gupta. 1997. Female-headed households and female-maintained families: Are they worth targeting to reduce poverty in developing countries? *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 45 (2): 259–280.
- Buvinic, Mayra and Gupta, Geeta Rao (1993) 'Responding to Insecurity in the 1990s: Targeting Woman-headed Households and Woman-maintained Families in Developing Countries'. Paper presented at the International Workshop 'Insecurity in the 1990s: Gender and Social Policy in an International Perspective', London School of Economics and European Association of Development Institutes, London, 5-6 April.
- Buvinic, Mayra. 1991. "The vulnerability of households headed by women: policy questions and options for Latin America and the Caribbean." Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, United Nations.
- Chant, Sylvia (1997) *Women-Headed Households: Diversity and Dynamics in the Developing World*, Macmillan
- Chant, Sylvia (2003) 'New Contributions to the Analysis of Poverty: Methodological and Conceptual Challenges to Understanding Poverty from a Gender Perspective', CEPAL, \.N. Women's Development Unit, Santiago:Chile
- Curry J 1996 Gender and livestock in African production systems: An introduction. *Human Ecology* 24: 149-160.
- Dossa L H, Rischkowsky B, Birner R and Wollny C (2008) Socioeconomic determinants of keeping goats and sheep by rural people in southern Benin. *Agriculture and Human Values* 25 (4): 581-592.
- Duku S, L.L Price, H Tobi and A Van Der Zijpp (2011): Influence of male and female headship on the keeping and care of small ruminants: the case study of transitional Zone of Ghana in Research Methodology Department of Social Sciences, Wageningen, the Netherland Livestock Research for Rural Development 23(1) 2011.
- Federal Office of Statistics, 2000. Time Use in Nigeria: A pilot Study. FOS, Lagos.
- Folbre, N (1986b) Cleaning house: New perspectives on household economic development. *Journal of Development Economics* 22, 5-40.
- Folbre, N. (1986a) Hearts and Spades: Paradigms of household economics. *World Development* 14(2), 245-255.
- Folbre, Nancy (1994) *Who Pays for the Kids? Gender and the Structures of Constraint* (London: Routledge).
- Folbre, Nancy. 1991. "Women on their own: global patterns of female headship." in Rita S.
- Fonseca, Claudia (1991) 'Spouses, Siblings and Sex-linked Bonding: A Look at Kinship Organisation in a Brazilian Slum', in Elizabeth Jelin (ed.) *Family, Household and Gender Relations in Latin America* (London: Kegan Paul International/Paris:UNESCO) 133-60.
- FOS, 1999. Poverty profile for Nigeria: A Statistical Analysis of 1996/97 National Consumer Survey. Federal Office of Statistics, Abuja, pp: 96.
- Fuwa, Nobuhiko (2000) 'The Poverty and Heterogeneity Among Female-headed Households Revisited: The Case of Panama', *World Development*, 28:8, 1515-42.
- Gallin and Anne Ferguson eds. *The Women and International Development Annual*, Vol.2. Boulder CO: Westview Press.
- González de la Rocha, Mercedes (1994a) *The Resources of Poverty: Women and Survival in a Mexican City* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- International Labour Organisation (ILO) (1996) 'All Women are Working Women: The Feminisation of Poverty' (Geneva: ILO) (<http://www.ilo-mirror.cornell.edu>).
- Kabeer, N (1994) *Reversed Realities: Gender hierarchies in Development Thought*. Verso, London
- Kennedy, Eileen and Lawrence Haddad (1994) 'Are pre-schoolers from female-headed households less malnourished? : A comparative analysis of results from Ghana and Kenya', *Journal of Development Studies*, April, pp.680-695
- Kennedy, Eileen and Lawrence Haddad (1994) 'Are pre-schoolers from female-headed households less



- malnourished? : A comparative analysis of results from Ghana and Kenya', *Journal of Development Studies*, April, pp.680-695
- Koopman, J. (1991) Neoclassical household models and modes of household production: problems. In the analysis of African Agricultural households *Review of Radical Political Economics* 23(3-4), 148-173.
- Lloyd C B and Gage-Brandon A J 1993 Women's Role in Maintaining Households: Family Welfare and Sexual Inequality in Ghana. *Population Studies* 47: 115-131.
- Moghadam, V.M (2005): The feminization of Poverty and Women's Human Rights: Social and Human Sciences Papers in Women's Studies/Gender Research NO 2. UNESCO
- Moghadam, Valentine (1997) The Feminisation of Poverty: Notes on a Concept and Trend. (Normal: Illinois State University, Women's Studies Occasional Paper No.2).
- Mookodi G 2000 The complexities of female household headship in Botswana. Pula: Botswana Journal of African Studies 14 (2): 148-164.
- Niehof A 2004 The significance of diversification for rural livelihood systems. *Food Policy* 29: 321-338.
- O'Laughlin, (1995) 'Myth of the African family in the world of development' in D. F. Bryceson(Ed) *Women Wielding the Hoe: Lessons from Rural Africa for Feminist Theory and development Practice*. Berge Publishers, Oxford and Washington DC, PP. 63-91.
- Parsons, T., and R.F. Bales (1955). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. Free Press.
- Population Council/International Center for Research on Women. 1988-1989. "The determinants and consequences of female-headed households." Notes from Seminars I, II, III, IV. Washington, D.C.: Population Council.
- Posel, D.R. (2001) Who are the heads of household. What do they do, and is the concept of headship useful? An analysis of headship in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa* 18(5), 651- 670.
- Quisumbing, Agnes, Lawrence Haddad and Christine Pena (2001) 'Are women over-represented among the poor? An analysis of poverty in 10 developing countries', *Journal of Development Economics* (66) pp.225-269
- Rosenhouse, S. 1989. *Identifying the poor: Is headship a useful concept?* Living Standards Measurement Study Working Paper 58. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Ruskaneen, Olli-Pekka. (2004). An Econometric Analysis of Time Use in Finnish Households. Doctorate Thesis, Helsinki School of Econometrics.
- Safa, Helen and Antrobus, Peggy (1992) 'Women and the Economic Crisis in the Caribbean', in Lourdes Benería and Shelley Feldman (eds) *Unequal Burden: Economic Crises, Persistent Poverty and Women's Work* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press) 49-82
- Sara Horrell and Pramila Krishnan (2006). Poverty and Productivity in Female-Headed Households in Zimbabwe, Faculty of Economics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB3 9DD
- United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women (UNDAW) (1991) 'Women and Households in a Changing World', in Eleanora Barbieri Masini and Susan Stratigos (eds) *Women, Households and Change* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press) 30-52
- World Bank (2000) 'World Development Report 2000/01: Attacking Poverty'. New York, Oxford University Press for World Bank
- World Bank (2001). *Engendering Development, A World Bank Policy Research Report*, World Bank and Oxford University Press.
- Wrigley-Asante C 2008 Men are poor but women are poorer: Gendered poverty and survival strategies in the Dangme West District of Ghana. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift - Norwegian Journal of Geography* 62(3): 161-170.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

### CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

**Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

### MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

### IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

