

ANALYSIS OF DETERMINANTS OF TIME POVERTY AMONG ARABLE CROPS FARMER IN OYO STATE NIGERIA: A GENDER PERSPECTIVE

¹Tolorunju E.T; ²China, M.A.H; ¹Oladeji S. O; and ³Adekola, O. A.

¹Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management. Federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta, Ogun State. P.M.B 2240, Abeokuta, Nigeria

²Department of Home Science and Management. Rivers State University. Port Harcourt.

³Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development. Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: tolorunjuet@funaab.edu.ng

Received 12th February 2024 Accepted 26th June, 2024

ABSTRACT

This study analysed the determinants of time-poverty among rural men and women. A Structured questionnaire was used to obtain primary data from 240 respondents drawn through a three-stage sampling technique from the study area. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics, Harvard Analytical Framework, Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (F-G-T), and Probit regression model. Findings revealed that majority of the respondents were married (84%), with a mean age of 54 years. The work profile showed that men participate mostly in the productive activities, while for women activities were found to be multifarious, spreading across reproductive and productive domains. The study found that on the average, rural women and men spent about 17 hours and 15 hours, respectively, on work activities on a daily basis which is above the 10.5 hours per day, internationally accepted threshold. The analysis reveals a stark gender disparity, with 84% of women classified as time-poor compared to only 23% of men. This gap is further highlighted by the time-poverty gap and severity measures, indicating women have less control over their time and experience a more unequal distribution of workload. The Probit regression model, showed that education, engagement in secondary occupation and motorcycle asset ownership influences the likelihood of time poverty among rural men, while, age and household size increases the likelihood of time poverty for the rural women. These findings highlight the importance of gender-sensitive policies to address time poverty among female farmers. By promoting education, reducing household burdens, and encouraging more equitable sharing of childcare and housework, interventions can empower women and improve their overall well-being.

Keywords: Arable crop, Gender, Farmers, Rural Households, Time-poverty.

INTRODUCTION

Gender dynamics play a pivotal role in shaping the socio-economic landscape (Bhattacharjee *et al.*, 2023), particularly in the context of agriculture, where traditional roles and responsibilities often differ markedly between men and women (Ndagano *et al.*, 2022). As societies strive for equitable development, understanding the nuanced relationship between gender differentials, time poverty, and agricultural productivity becomes imperative (Onwuka *et al.*, 2023). Time poverty, defined as the lack of discretionary time available to individuals (Sen, 2012), is a critical aspect that intersects with gender roles, impacting various dimensions of life, including economic productivity (Folorunso & Abiodun, 2018).

Time poverty, defined as the lack of sufficient time to fulfill basic needs and engage in valued activities (Adeyeye &

Oladele, 2021), is a growing concern, especially in developing countries where informal, labor-intensive economies predominate. In rural Nigeria, this burden falls disproportionately on women, who shoulder the double duty of productive farm work and unpaid domestic chores (Fadahunsi & Ogunlade, 2023). Studies reveal that while both men and women contribute significantly to farming activities, women's average work hours often exceed the internationally recognized time poverty threshold of 10.5 hours per day (Adeyeye, *et al.* 2021). Traditional patriarchal structures often relegate women to domestic responsibilities, limiting their access to productive resources and decision-making processes (Okemuta & Ademusuyi, 2022). This imbalance translates into longer work hours for women, as they juggle childcare, food preparation, and

household chores alongside farm work (Ibekwe-Egboh & Mbogba, 2023).

Recent studies (Adeyeye, *et al.*, 2021; Onwuka, *et al.*, 2023) paint a stark picture that rural Nigerian women spend significantly more time on both productive and domestic work (often regarded to as “double burden”) compared to men, often exceeding internationally recognized thresholds of time poverty. This “double burden” (Folorunso & Abiodun, 2018) leaves them with limited time for leisure, personal development, and participation in community and political life, further perpetuating gender inequalities.

Understanding the complexities of time poverty in rural Nigerian farming households through a gender lens is crucial for, it sheds light on the power dynamics within households and the underlying factors that contribute to women's disproportionate time burdens (Onwuka *et al.*, 2023). It also allows for a more nuanced understanding of its impact negative health outcomes, reduced educational attainment for children, and limited participation in economic activities, ultimately hindering household development and poverty reduction efforts (Onwuka *et al.*, 2023).

In Oyo state, Nigeria, where agriculture serves as the primary occupation and livelihood for a significant portion of the population, there is a pressing issue of time poverty among rural farming households (Adeyeye *et al.*, 2021; Ogunleye & Adewale, 2019).

As the backbone of the state's agricultural sector, rural farming households are confronted with the challenge of balancing demanding agricultural responsibilities with other aspects of life. The intensive nature of farming, coupled with traditional practices, creates a situation where farmers find themselves with insufficient time for non-agricultural pursuits (Olatunji & Shittu, 2021). This research aims to shed light on the complex interplay of gender, productive household decision making activities, time poverty, and agricultural livelihoods in rural Oyo state. By employing a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative data analysis with qualitative insights from household interviews, and therefore seeks to illuminate the gendered household productive activities and patterns of time use within the rural farming households in Oyo state Nigeria. Going by this aforementioned, this study

delves into providing answers to the following research objectives:

1. describe the socio-economic characteristics of the arable crop farmers in the study area,
2. investigate the gender profile of productive and reproductive activities,
3. examine the level of time-poverty among the respondents, and,
4. analyze the determinants of time-poverty among arable crop farmers in the study area.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Area

Oyo State is a Southwestern state in Nigeria. The capital of Oyo State is Ibadan, which is also the largest city in the state. Oyo State is situated in the Southwestern part of Nigeria, within the coordinates of approximately 7° 51' 0" N longitude and 3° 55' 58.8" E longitude (<https://geohack.toolforge.org>). It shares borders with several other Nigerian states, including Kwara to the North, Osun to the East, Ogun to the South, and Ondo to the Southwest. The western border of Oyo State is defined by the Republic of Benin. Agriculture is the significant economic activity of the rural dwellers in Oyo state. (<https://www.britannica.com>). The population of the state as at the last census was 5,580,894, with 2,802,432 males and 2,778,462 females with a population projection of 7,976,100 as at 2022 (https://citypopulation.de/en/nigeria/admin/NGA031__oyo).

Method of Data Collection, Sampling Procedure, Sample Size

Primary data was used for the study and was obtained through the use of a well-structured questionnaire administered to respondents who are the arable crop farmers in the study area complemented with oral interviews and focused group discussion.

A three-stage sampling procedure was used to select the respondents used for this study. The respondents were sampled from the 5 zones of the state. The first stage involved simple random sampling to select 25 LGAs out of the 33 LGAs in the state (this constituted about 75% selection from each zone, to get a good representation of the state). The second stage was the random selection of 5 communities in each of the selected LGA (these were the main rural farming

communities in the state), and the last stage involved the random selection of 2 arable crop farmers within each of the communities, and the sample selection gave a total of 250 respondents for this study out of which only 240 data sets were valid for data analysis (96% response rate).

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics:

Tables of frequency mean and percentages were used to describe the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents such as age, marital status, educational level, sex, income etc.

Harvard Analytical Framework was used to capture the gender profile of productive and reproductive activities. The Harvard analytical framework deals with gender dynamics within the household, for this study issues pertaining to the reproductive structure, and gender participation roles were investigated. The Harvard Analytical Framework is particularly well-suited for this study, as it offers a matrix for collecting data at the micro level to map the work and resource allocation of men and women, highlighting their distinct contributions and challenges (Ludgate, 1985; Anditi, *et. al.*, 2022). This framework aligns with my focus on understanding micro-level gender dynamics within the context of agricultural production and time allocation, where gender roles and responsibilities often diverge significantly (Onwuka *et. al.*, 2023; Folorunso & Abiodun, 2018). Additionally, the Harvard Framework's emphasis on disaggregating data by gender, and class allows for a more nuanced analysis of how various social factors intersect with gender and influence time poverty (Adeyeye, *et. al.*, 2021).

Time-poverty Measurement:
Understanding time poverty, a state of insufficient leisure and rest due to extensive work hours, requires analyzing and measuring individual time use (Ngai *et al.*, 2021). This concept suggests an inverse relationship between work commitments (paid and unpaid) and leisure time, with higher work hours leading to increased vulnerability to time poverty (Browning *et. al.*, 2020). Unlike traditional poverty analysis, measuring time poverty offers a potentially simpler approach by directly observing individual work hours (Sen, 1999).

This study utilizes two key approaches to analyze time poverty. Firstly, it establishes two relative time poverty lines based on the median of the total individual weekly working hours distribution (Ngai *et al.*, 2021). Secondly, the study employs the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT) technique to create a time poverty line based on per capita weekly time use. This FGT line is set at two-thirds (2/3) of the mean per capita weekly time-use (MPCT). The FGT line allows for the decomposition of time poverty measures across different population groups.

Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (F-G-T) was used to estimate the level of time-poverty among the arable crop farmers. The poverty including the headcount (P_0), poverty gap (P_1), and squared poverty gap (severity) (P_2), where the parameter α takes the values of 0, 1, and 2, respectively, to analyze poverty as expressed in the following equation.

Poverty measure:

$$P_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^q \left[\frac{z - y_i}{z} \right]^{\alpha} \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

This study adapted the F-G-T poverty measures (P_0), (P_1), and (P_2), to analyze time-poverty, as expressed in the following equations.

Time-poverty headcount (P_0) was measured by: $H = \frac{q}{n} \dots \dots \dots (2)$

Time-poverty gap (P_1):
 $PG = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^q \left[\frac{z - y_{ij}}{z} \right] \dots \dots \dots (3)$

Time-poverty severity (P_2):
 $SPG = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^q \left[\frac{z - y_i}{z} \right]^2 \dots \dots \dots (4)$

Where:

- P_{α} = weighted poverty index;
- n = total number of individuals;
- y_{ij} = total working hours of individual i in sub-group j ;
- z = estimate time-poverty line ($\frac{2}{3}$ of mean per capita weekly time-use (MPCT));
- $z - y_{ij}$ = is the proportionate shortfall/surplus from the time-poverty line
- q = number of the sampled individuals that are time-poor;
- α = the aversion to time-poverty, where the parameter α takes the values of 0, 1, and 2, respectively,

The F-G-T technique was also utilized to create a time-poverty line (z), which was set at two-thirds of mean per capita weekly time-use (2/3 MPCT). The estimated time-poverty line for this study is given as 15.83hrs for the men and 17.03hrs for women.

Heteroscedastic Probit Regression Model

This was employed in assessing the factors that affect the time-poverty status of arable crop farmers in the study area. Probit model is one of the binary regressions that the regressand is always dichotomous in nature. The heteroscedastic probit model which is estimated by maximum likelihood method proposed by Adedoyin *et al.*, (2023) which was adopted for this study can be expressed implicitly as follows:

$$\pi_i = \Phi\left(\frac{X_i\beta}{\exp(z_i\gamma)}\right) = \Phi\left(\frac{X_i\beta}{\sigma_i}\right) \dots\dots\dots 5$$

Where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is a normal distribution, z_i is a matrix of explanatory variables and γ is a vector of parameters. Loglikelihood for heteroscedastic probit model can be expressed as follows:

$$\log L = \sum_i \left(y_i \log \Phi\left(\frac{X_i\beta}{\exp(z_i\gamma)}\right) - (1 - y_i) \log \left[1 - \Phi\left(\frac{X_i\beta}{\exp(z_i\gamma)}\right)\right] \right) \dots\dots\dots 6$$

Marginal effect for heteroscedastic probit model calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\partial \Pr(y_i = 1)}{\partial X_k} = \Phi\left(\frac{X_i\beta}{\exp(z_i\gamma)}\right) = \Phi\left(\frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{\exp(z_i\gamma)}\right) \dots\dots\dots 7$$

Equations 5-7 presented the implicit form of the probit model to be estimated, can be explicitly expressed as:

Prob. of Time Poor/Time non-poor (Y^*) = $\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \dots + \beta_9 X_9 + \varepsilon \dots\dots (8)$

The results using time-poverty based on total work time on primary activities as a dependent variable are considered for this study.

Where:

Y^* = Time poverty (1= time poor, 0 otherwise)

X_1 = Age (years)

X_2 = Education (years)

X_3 = Household size (no. of adults)

X_4 = No. of children dependents (0-3 years)

X_5 = No. of elderly dependents (60 years and above)

X_6 = Engagement in secondary occupation (Yes =1, otherwise 0)

X_7 = Farming experience (years)

X_8 = Income (naira)

X_9 = Asset ownership

X_{91} = Ownership of mobile phone (Yes =1, otherwise 0)

X_{92} = Ownership of motorcycle (Yes =1, otherwise 0)

X_{93} = Ownership of farm land (Yes =1, otherwise 0)

X_{94} = Ownership of house (Yes =1, otherwise 0)

ε = Error term

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-Economic Characteristics of The Arable Crop Farmers in the Study Area

Table 1 shows the summary of the distribution of household socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents in the study area. The table indicates that the majority (83.1%) of respondents are within 41-60 years old. The inference drawn from this result is that farmers in the study area are still in their productive years. But this calls for attention has younger gender folks have drifted away from agricultural activities in pursuit of other livelihood activities, leaving the farming activities to the older gender groups in the study area, and this might lead to lower productivity as their age increases. Moreover, result on years of farming experience indicates that while males (55%) dominate overall with 16 years and above, there's a significant percentage of females (45.8%) with farming experience, particularly in the lower years of experience, and these years of farming experience shows a reflection of the ages of the farmers, as a higher farming experience is indicative of increase in age of the respondents. Also majority (84.2%) of the respondents are married, with a household size of between 6-10 persons (69.2%), and farm size of more than three hectares of land (53.3%). The presence of larger household members shows that the farming respondents can enjoy the use of family labour on their large farm sizes, and therefore have more output from their farm production, without the use of hired labour for their farming activities.

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of the Respondents

Socio-economic Characteristics	Disaggregated Household characteristics			
	Male		Female	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Age (years)				
≤30	2	1.7	4	3.3
31- 40	7	6.1	15	12.2
41- 50	49	40.6	65	54.2
51 – 60	47	39.4	35	28.9
61 – 70	9	7.5	2	1.7
≥71	6	4.7	0	0
Total	120	100	120	100
Farming Experience (years)				
≤5	0	0	6	5.0
6 - 10	15	12.5	22	18.3
11 - 15	39	32.5	37	30.8
≥16	66	55	55	45.8
Total	120	100	120	100
Pooled Household characteristics				
Household size (no. of persons)				
≤5	66	27.5		
6-10	166	69.2		
11-15	8	3.3		
Total	240	100		
Farm Size (Hec)				
≤1	46	19.2		
1.1-2.0	22	9.2		
2.1-3.0	44	18.3		
≥3.1	128	53.3		
Total	240	100		
Marital Status				
Married	202	84.2		
Widowed	22	9.2		
Single	6	2.5		
Divorced/separated	10	4.2		
Total	240	100		

Gender Profile of Productive and Domestic Activities.

Table 2 shows the gender distribution of productive and domestic activities within the household in the study area. Particularly noteworthy are the striking differences between adult females & males and young girls & boys across various tasks. In productive activities, adult females are notably underrepresented compared to adult males. This discrepancy suggests that women are less likely to participate in income-generating activities and agricultural work, potentially limiting their economic empowerment and contributing to time poverty through reduced financial resources. Conversely, in

reproductive activities, adult females are overwhelmingly dominant across almost all tasks compared to adult males. The results show that women are generally the ones who handle household chores, which might cause time poverty when they balance these responsibilities with other obligations. Women's disproportionate participation in reproductive activities and their low engagement in productive, income-generating activities might result in large time deficits and heightened susceptibility to time poverty. Women bear a greater burden and have less prospects for personal economic gain as a result of the unequal distribution of labor within the household.

Table 2: Gender distribution of Productive and Domestic Activities

	Adult Female	Adult Male	Young Girls	Young Boys
Productive Activities				
Self-employment	15%	70%	5.83%	8.33%
Farming activities	67.5%	91.67%	30%	44.17%
Secondary activities	35%	85%	12%	35%
Domestic Activities				
House cleaning	97.5%	22.5%	97.5%	42.5%
Caring for the sick/elderly	95%	30.83%	67.5%	23.33%
Child care	95%	9.17%	38.33%	5.83%
Clothes washing	97.5%	6.67%	85.83%	44.17%
Fire wood collection	35.83%	10.83%	90%	89.17%
Participation in community activity	40%	90.83%	12.5%	29.17%
Food preparation and processing	99.17%	2.5%	90%	28.33%
Buying food from the market	82.5%	28.33%	63.33%	20.83%
Water fetching	45%	2.5%	96.67%	90%
Hunting	0%	70%	0%	32.5%

Activities and Time Resource Allocation Distribution

Table 3 shows the distribution of mean weekly time spent on different and simultaneous activities. The result shows that while women spend more mean time (47.77, 51.5 and 80.08hrs) than their men counterparts (30, 20 and 36.32hrs) on reproductive activities like caring for the sick/elderly, child care and food cooking /processing, they have less weekly resting/sleeping time (387.02) when compared to their male counterparts

(448.33). However, men engage more of their weekly time, about 65.45 and 38.5hrs on productive activities like farming activities and secondary activities than women with average weekly mean time of 60 and 12.02hrs respectively. Summarily, women spend more weekly mean time, 17.03hr than men, 15.83hr. The table reveals that women are more involved in domestic/care activities using more of their time, while the men have more time for leisure and productive activities in the study area.

Table 3: Distribution of Mean Weekly Time Spent on Different and Simultaneous Activities

Activities	Men	Women
A. Domestic/Care work Activities		
Caring for the sick/elderly	30	46.77
Hunting	37.25	0
Child care	20	51.5
Clothes washing	22.06	54.14
Firewood collection	14.39	51.42
Food cooking /processing	36.32	80.08
Water fetching	14.52	51.47
Buying food	8.6	67.58
House cleaning	12.87	42.85
Total	196.01	445.81
B. Leisure Activities		
TV/Radio watching	60	23.02
Exercise	32.71	18.85
Resting/sleeping	448.33	387.02
Praying	71.45	45
Total	612.49	473.89
C. Labour / Productive Activities		
Farming activities	65.45	60
Self-employed activities	37.38	30
Secondary activities	38.5	12.02
Total	141.33	102.02
Total mean time (A + B + C)	949.83	1021.72
Total mean time (hr)	15.83hr	17.03hr

Level of Time-Poverty Among the Respondents

Table 4 compares the time-poverty headcount index, time-poverty gap, and time poverty severity between male and female categories. According to the poverty head count, which estimates the number of respondents living below the time poverty level, just 23% of men and 84% of women are time poor.

In terms of the poverty gap, which is the difference between working time and the time poverty line, it was discovered that the gap is significantly larger for the female group (53%) than for the male group (10%), which could be attributed to the female group's daily unpaid employment.

The severity of time-poverty, which is the inequality among the time-poor and it indicates the distributionally-sensitive measure of time poverty, is also worse off for the female group (48%), this can also be attributed to the overlapping burden of simultaneous work for the women with respect to household size than for the male group. This points out the need for efficient allocation of time resources of the time-poorest persons in the gender groups owing to the fact that they are the group most disadvantaged by the initial imbalance in time allocation. As the group most harmed by the initial imbalance in time distribution, this highlights the necessity for the time-poorest members of the gender groupings to have their time resources allocated efficiently.

Table 4: Decomposition of Time Poverty Among the Respondents

Poverty Estimates	Male	Female
Time Poverty Headcount (P_0)	0.2367	0.8439
Time Poverty Gap (P_1)	0.1034	0.5324
Time Poverty Severity (P_2)	0.0193	0.4816

Determinants of Time-Poverty Among the Respondents in the Study Area

Table 5 shows the effects of various factors on the probability of being time-poor, for both men and women in the study. The marginal effects are measured as the change in the probability of being time-poor. The focus of this study is on the results for the time-poor measure based on total work time in primary activities, with the following explanations.

The findings from this study revealed that for the men, education, engagement in secondary occupation, and motorcycle asset ownership influences their time poverty, whereas for their female counterpart, age, household size, number of dependents, as well as farm land ownership as different significant levels.

Age-wise, the women were found to be less time-rich than their male counterparts ($p < 0.05$). This study discovered that a woman's likelihood of being time poor rises by 12% with her age. This could be because women have greater obligations to their families as they get older. This is consistent with earlier time-poverty research showing that, due to varying household sizes, women's domestic obligations grow as they age (Dinkelmann and Ngai, 2022).

The level of human capacity in terms of education demonstrates that men were more likely to be non-poor than women. This suggests that when men's education levels rise, the likelihood of them being time-poor decreases by approximately 11%.

The variable of household size have a significant positive effect on the time poverty of the women ($p < 0.05$), it was observed that as the household size increases, the probability of women to be time poor also increases by 17%. This follows the fact that while traditional gender roles often position women as the primary caregivers within the household, the impact of household size on chore burden is complex as opined by Bianchi, *et al.*, (2021) and Adeyeye, *et al.*, (2021).

Additionally, the research findings indicate that females are more likely to

experience time poverty than males when they have dependents who require additional care, including both underage children and elderly individuals. This indicates that as the number of dependents rises, the time poverty of women increases by 21% for underage children and 18% for the elderly. This finding aligns with other research indicating that an increased number of dependents leads to a higher level of time poverty among women (De Vreyer and Lambert, 2020; Adeyeye *et al.*, 2021; Olawuyi *et al.*, 2022).

But it was observed that the presence of children helps to reduce the probability of being time-poor by 1.3% by for the men. Though the sign of this variable is negative, this may be as a result of men's minimal participation in household work, than that of the women which increases with the presence of children by 21%. This finding is in agreement to the study of Arora (2015), which reports that presence of children helps to reduce the probability of being time-poor for men.

It was further observed that engaging in other secondary occupation have the probability of the men being poor ($p < 0.01$), than the women in the study by 19%. This implies that any further increase in the involvement of the men in other labour-income generating activities will increase their being time poor by 19%. Engaging in a secondary economic activity is strongly linked to a higher chance of experiencing time poverty. This association is particularly significant for men, which aligns with the finding that around 85% of those with side hustles in this study were men. This finding is consistent with the findings of Nadi, *et al.*, (2021); Ngai, *et al.*, (2021), Bittman and Whillans (2023).

In this study, the ownership of motorcycles was found to be the only significant economic variable for men ($p < 0.05\%$). However, this finding contradicts the expectation for women, as it is generally assumed that women's economic empowerment can enhance their decision-making power within the household. This

suggests that when men have greater access to economic assets, there is a 7.4% higher likelihood of experiencing time poverty. This is because they need to spend more time using the assets to generate additional income as a

secondary occupation. However, the ownership of assets does not have a significant impact on women. This is corroborated by a case study conducted in Nigeria by Adeyeye *et al.* (2021) and Olawuyi *et al.* (2022).

Table 5: Result of Probit Regression Model for Gender Time-Poverty

Variables	Male		Female	
	Marginal effects	Sign.	Marginal effects	Sign.
Constant	-	-	-	-
Age	0.1025	0.0012	0.1239**	0.0388
Education	-0.1194**	0.0975	-0.0645	0.1312
Household size	-0.4806	0.2226	0.1691**	0.0424
No. of children dependents	-0.0131**	0.0165	0.2132**	0.0039
No. of elderly dependents	0.2141	0.0407	0.1823**	0.0217
Engagement in secondary occupation	0.1872***	0.0008	0.1034	0.1264
Farming experience	1.7184	0.4210	0.0053	0.3621
Income	1.6238	0.1119	1.3105	0.5264
Ownership of mobile phone	0.1925	0.1293	-0.3331	0.1721
Ownership of motorcycle	0.0740**	0.0394	-0.0195	0.1382
Ownership of farm land	0.0382	0.1839	0.0819	0.1641
Ownership of house	0.1022	0.1286	0.0263	0.1082
Log-likelihood		-147.89		-151.65
chi2 (12)		69.73		38.53
Prob>chi2		0.0000		0.0001

, *, represents level of significance at 5% and 1% respectively.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study concludes that cassava farming is predominantly male-dominated, with women bearing a greater burden of unpaid labour than men. Furthermore, compared to their male counterparts, females are required to complete multiple tasks within a single time segment, which exacerbates time poverty for women. Moreover, education, participation in non-agricultural endeavours, and ownership of motorcycle assets were determinants of time-poverty for males, whereas for women, age, household size, and the number of dependents were influential factors in time-poverty.

This study suggests implementing policies that promote women's education and give assistance for dependents. Additionally, it recommends establishing childcare and eldercare services to alleviate the dual responsibilities faced by women. Furthermore, the study proposes the provision of labour-saving facilities to assist women in managing their many roles. Similarly, it is important to encourage male engagement in various revenue-generating activities and asset ownership. This has the potential to generate additional income, alleviate the pressure on women, and enhance gender well-being and overall productivity.

REFERENCES

- Adedoyin, F. A., Ajisegiri, C. O., & Adeoye, I. B. (2023). Gender differences in time allocation and agricultural productivity in rural Nigeria. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 32(4), 507-524.
- Adeyeye, I. A., & Oladele, O. I. (2021). Gender differences in time-poverty among rural households in Southwest Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development in the Tropics and Subtropics*, 122(1), 1-12.
- Adeyeye, O., Fabusoro, E., Sodiya, C., & Fapojuwo, O. (2021). Gender differences in time-poverty among rural households in Southwest Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development in the Tropics and Subtropics* (JARTS), 122(2), 193-205. doi:https://doi.org/10.17170/kobra-2021071343235-149.
- Afeku, R., & Adams, O. (2023). From poverty to time poverty: Exploring the lived experiences of women in rural farming communities in Ghana. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 32(3), 345-362.
- Ajibola, A. O., & Adeola, R. A. (2022). Assessing the Impact of Time Poverty on Rural Households in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 88, 79-90.
- Anditi, C., Musango, J. K., Smit, S., & Ceschin, F. (2022). Addressing gender

- dimensions in energy innovations: A gender analysis framework for informal urban settlements in Africa. *Energy Research & Social Science*, (88) 102476.
- Arora, D. (2015). Time-Use Analysis in Rural Mozambique: Insights into Time Poverty Among Men and Women. *Review of Social Economy*, 73(2) 196–221,
- Bhattacharjee, D., Kumar, U., & Mishra, B. (2023). Gender dynamics and economic development: A cross-country analysis. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 46(8), 1106-1124.
- Bhavnani, R. R., & Rosenfeld, J. (2022). Gender and time poverty in India: A scoping review. *Gender & Development*, 30(1), 21-41.
- Bianchi, S., Thompson, W., & Sayer, L. (2021). Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(1), 1-19.
- Bittman, M., & Whillans, A. (2023). "Always-on" culture at work: The effects of digital connectivity on burnout and wellbeing. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 37(1), 16-33.
- Browning, M., Chiappori, P. A., & Weiss, Y. (2020). *Economics of the Family*. Cambridge University Press.
- De Vrejer, P., and Lambert, S. (2020). Inequality, poverty and the intra-household allocation of consumption in Senegal (policy research working paper). Vol. 9121. *Développement, Institutions & Analyses de Long Terme* (DIAL). Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Dhakal, S., Prasai, S., & Thapa, S. (2021). Gendered time-poverty and food security: Evidence from rural Nepal. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 48(2), 365-388.
- Dinkelman, Taryn, and L. Rachel Ngai. (2022). "Time Use and Gender in Africa in Times of Structural Transformation." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 36 (1): 57-80. doi:10.1257/jep.36.1.5
- Elson, D. (2021). Recognize, Reduce, and Redistribute Unpaid Care Work: How to close the gender gap. *New Labor Forum* (26)2, 52-61 Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications
- Fadahunsi, A., & Ogunlade, I. (2023). Gender roles and women's time allocation in small-scale agricultural households in Nigeria. *International Journal of Rural Development*, 26(1), 31-42.
- Fernandes, A., da Silva, P. H., & Zeitlin, A. (2023). Beyond time use: Capturing work intensity and its implications for gender equality in agriculture. *World Development*, 163, 106144.
- Folorunso, O. A., & Abiodun, A. A. (2018). Gender, time poverty and household food security in rural Nigeria. *African Journal of Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development*, 18(2), 12112-12122
- Hodzi, R., Nyasha, J., & Chikwanha, P. (2022). Time poverty and economic vulnerability in rural Zimbabwe: A gendered perspective. *Gender & Behaviour*, 18(2), 225-242.
- https://citypopulation.de/en/nigeria/admin/NGA031__oyo
- <https://www.britannica.com>
- Ibekwe-Egboh, N. C., & Mbogba, E. N. (2023). Impact of time poverty on women's agricultural productivity and household outcomes in rural Nigeria. *Gender & Behaviour*, 17(1), 3040-3052
- Lam, H. Y., de Vera, R., Rivera, A. S., Sy, T. R., Cheng, K. J. G., Farrales, D. B., Lopez, J. C. F., & Miguel, R. T. D. (2019). Describing the Health Service Delivery Network of an Urban Poor Area and a Rural Poor Area . *Acta Medica Philippina*, 52(5). <https://doi.org/10.47895/amp.v52i5.316>
- Ludgate, W. (1985). A woman's place is in the fields: Gender roles in agricultural production and economic development in the Gambia. *Women in International Development Working Papers*, 46.
- Nadi, F., Nimoh, F., Antoh, E., Anaman, R. (2021). Gender Inequality in Livestock Asset Ownership: Implication for Food Security in the WA West District, Ghana. *Journal of*

- Agribusiness and Rural Development*, 4(62): 447-455.
- Ndagano, B., Chiwanga, G. O., & Nyanga, P. O. (2022). Gender differentials in land access and control: Implications for household food security in rural sub-Saharan Africa. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 24(3), 1963-1984.
- Ngai, S. L., Wong, C. M., & Lam, S. F. (2021). Time poverty and its correlates among older adults in Hong Kong. *Journal of Population Research*, 38(3), 239-259.
- Ogunleye, A. J., & Adewale, J. G. (2019). The Role of Agriculture in the Economic Development of Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 10(5), 99-107.
- Okemuta, O. O., & Ademusuyi, A. A. (2022). Gender, agriculture and household food security in rural Nigeria: Implications for policy. *International Journal of Agricultural Policy and Research*, 10(4), 117-125.
- Olatunji, A. S., & Shitu, O. L. (2021). Exploring the Time Use Patterns of Rural Households in Agriculture: A Case Study of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Agriculture*, 11(3), 209.
- Olawuyi, S. O., Adesiyi, O. I., Olawuyi, T. D., Oyeleye, A. O., (2022): Gender Differentials of Time-Use Poverty and Sustainable Use of Time Resources by Farmers in South-West Nigeria. Volume 18 (06) ISSN: 18158129 E-ISSN: 18151027 (Cross Ref).
- Onwuka, C. I., Okoye, C. V., & Umeh, V. C. (2023). Gender dimensions of time poverty and food security among rural households in Southeast Nigeria. *African Journal of Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development*, 23(1), 19345-19362.
- Quisumbing, A. R., Kumar, N., Behrman, J. A., Crookston, B. T., Dearden, K. A., & Engle, P. (2020). The Way Forward for Gender-Responsive Research and Policy in Agriculture: An Assessment of the Literature. *World Development*, (135) 105055.
- Sabinet African Journals. (2017). Gender, time poverty and health outcomes among rural households in southwest Nigeria. *African Journal of Food, Agriculture and Nutrition*, 11(8), 4558-4568.
- Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. *Oxford University Press*.
- Sen, A. (2012). Gender and Cooperative Conflicts. In *The Oxford Handbook of Women and the Economy*, Oxford University Press.