DETERMINANT OF POVERTY AMONG CROP FARMING HOUSEHOLDS IN ILORIN EAST

BY

ATANDA SODIQ OLAWALE
HND/23/AGT/FT/0219

BEING A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TEHNOLOGY, INSTITUTE APPLIED SCIENCE, KWARA STATE POLYTECHNIC, ILORIN.

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF HIGHER NATIONAL DIPLOMA (HND) IN AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY, INSTITUTE OF APPLIED SCIENCE.

JULY, 2025

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this project has been read and approved as meeting the requirement of the Department of Agricultural Technology. Extension Management Unit. Institute of applied Sciences, Kwara State Polytechnic, Ilorin for the award of Higher National Diploma in Agricultural Technology.

_____ _____

MR. OLADEJO A.Q. DATE
Project Supervisor

_____ _____

MR. ALAYA A.K. DATE
Head o Unit

_____ _____

MR. BANJOKO I.K DATE
Head of Department

_____ _____

MR. MOHAMMED S.B DATE
Project Coordinator

_____ _____

EXTERNAL EXAMINER DATE

DEDICATION

This research is dedicated first and foremost to Almighty ALLAH,the source of my strength, wisdom, and perseverance throughout this academic journey.

I also dedicate this work to my beloved parents,MR AND MRS ATANDA whose unwavering support, encouragement, and sacrifices laid the foundation for my success. Your love and guidance have been my greatest motivation.

To the crop farming households in Ilorin East, whose daily labor sustains not only their families but also contributes to national food security—this research is a tribute to your resilience and determination.

Finally, this work is dedicated to all students and researchers committed to the fight against rural poverty and the pursuit of sustainable development through agriculture.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praise and gratitude be to Almighty ALLAH for granting me life, strength, and wisdom to undertake and complete this research work titled “Determinants of Poverty Among Crop Farming Households in Ilorin East”. This academic journey has been both enlightening and transformative.

I sincerely express my profound appreciation to my supervisor, [MR OLADEJO A.Q], for the invaluable guidance, constructive criticisms, and unwavering support throughout the duration of this study. Your expertise and dedication were critical to the successful completion of this work.

My heartfelt thanks also go to the Head of Department and all academic and non-academic staff of the Department of Agricultural Technology [Institution Of Applied Science], for providing the enabling academic environment and encouragement throughout my studies.

Special appreciation goes to the crop farmers in Ilorin East Local Government Area who patiently and willingly participated in the data collection process. Their cooperation and openness made this research a reality.

To my parents and family, your moral and financial support have been the bedrock of my academic pursuit. I am also grateful to my colleagues and friends for their continuous encouragement, insightful discussions, and shared academic experiences.

Finally, I dedicate this work to every rural farmer whose resilience in the face of economic hardship continues to feed the nation. May this research contribute to meaningful policy formulation and lasting solutions to rural poverty.

Thank you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the determinants of poverty among crop farming households in Ilorin East Local Government Area of Kwara State, Nigeria. The persistent prevalence of poverty among rural agricultural households, despite various government interventions, necessitated this research. Primary data were collected through the administration of structured questionnaires to a randomly selected sample of crop farmers across the study area. Analytical tools employed include descriptive statistics, the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT) poverty index,

The results revealed that a significant proportion of the crop farming households live below the poverty line, with variations influenced by socio-economic factors such as household size, level of education, farm size, access to credit, and extension services., farm income, and access to agricultural inputs as significant determinants of poverty status among the respondents.

The study concludes that poverty among crop farming households in Ilorin East is multi-dimensional and influenced by both economic and demographic variables. It recommends that targeted policy interventions such as improving access to education, farm credit, and extension services, as well as promoting sustainable agricultural practices, are essential to reducing poverty levels and enhancing rural livelihoods.

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Agriculture in Ilorin East Local Government Area of Kwara State refers to the primary economic activity involving the cultivation of crops and the rearing of livestock for subsistence and commercial purposes. The region is predominantly rural, with a significant proportion of the population engaged in farming activities such as maize, yam, cassava, and vegetable production, alongside poultry and small ruminant farming. Agriculture in Ilorin East not only provides food and income but also plays a vital role in local employment and rural development. Despite its importance, the sector faces challenges such as limited access to modern inputs, inadequate infrastructure, and vulnerability to climate change (Kwara State Ministry of Agriculture, 2020; Adewumi & Omotesho, 2020).

Poverty remains a significant challenge in Nigeria, particularly among rural households whose livelihood depends on agriculture. Despite various government programs aimed at poverty alleviation, many farming households in Ilorin East Local Government Area (LGA) continue to experience poverty. Understanding the underlying determinants of this poverty is critical for designing effective interventions. This study aims to investigate the socioeconomic and structural factors influencing poverty levels among farming households in this region.

The problem of property has been a very serious and long standing issue in Nigeria, especially looking at the vast wealth the country controls , which the situation has been

describe as supporting in the midst of plenty Nigeria's huge Agricultural resources base provides great potential for the growth not only for rural sector but the entire economy. However, in spite of these economics natural resources in the country increasing poverty remains a great challenge low social status and poor living conditions are indications of the inhabitants. Based on the most recent official survey from the national Bureau of statistics (NBS), approximately 53.5 percent of the population is living in extreme poverty (NBS,2010) with almost 70 percent being rural farmer future projections did not show much improvement as the national extreme poverty rate in 2019 was projected to be 50.1 percent (world Bank 2020)over the years the problem has been made worsen by the development pattern which has favoured the urban sectors to the rural sector determent (world Bank, 2018).

In Nigeria despite being an agrarian country with about 70% of the labour force engaged in agriculture, many rural households rely on both on-farm and off-farm activities to supplement their income (chauvin,N.OF. mulangu, & G. Porto 2012) Agriculture in Nigeria is characterized by small -scale ,subsistence farming but it remains a critical sector, producing 80% of the country's food (Chauvin, N.OF. Mulangu & G. porto 2012) the country's varied climate allows of the cultivation of wide range of Agricultural produce (Olayemi, F.F, Adegbola ,J.E. Bamishaiye, E.L and Awagu E.F 2012)

Poverty, on the other hand,is defined as the Inability to archieve a minimum standard of living, including access to basic human needs such as foods shelter, water Healthcare ,education, and employment opportunities (Ike and Uzokwe 2015) income is a key Determinant of poverty, as those with insufficient income to meet basic needs are considered poor poverty's importance is demonstrated by the fact that it is the first

Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) to seek to end all forms of poverty by 2030. Poverty, a complicated and multidimensional phenomenon, is one of the primary barriers to growth (Ogunniyi et al., 2017; Oluwatayo, 2014). According to Omobowale (2014), poverty is a state in which individuals are deprived of the good things in life as well as the resources necessary to achieve the desired degree of wellbeing and a standard of living that is acceptable in society. Notably, over 80% of individuals in rural areas live below the poverty line and have little access to social and infrastructure resources, making poverty more prevalent there (Ogundipe et al., 2019; Aderounmu, 2018). Around the world, 767 million people lived in extreme poverty in 2015 (UNDP, 2016); by 2019, that figure had fallen to less than 600 million (Khara et al., 2018). Desperation, illness, starvation, and degradation all contribute to the filthy, degrading conditions that billions of people live in worldwide. Notwithstanding the remarkable strides made in the last 25 years to eradicate poverty, 766 million people—385 million of them are children—lived on less than $1.90 per day in 2013 (World Bank, 2017). There is no doubt that poverty is not limited to developing countries; it is also growing increasingly common in rich countries as well; estimates from 2012 indicated that more than 300 million people were below the poverty line (ILO, 2012; UNDP, 2016). However, Nigeria has a wealth of natural resources, such as agricultural, human, petroleum, gas, and large untapped solid material deposits; nonetheless, poverty is more prevalent in emerging countries than in developed ones. Additionally, different measures of poverty are used for coherence and simplicity of reference in worldwide assessments. Development organizations employ quantitative indicators of poverty, like those that establish a daily threshold of $1 or $2.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Agriculture is the mainstay of the rural economy in Ilorin East, yet poverty levels remain

high among farming households. Many of these farmers face low productivity, limited access to credit, poor infrastructure, and market inefficiencies. However, there is a lack of empirical data specific to Ilorin East on the key determinants of poverty. This gap hinders targeted policy-making and the implementation of appropriate development programs.

1.3 Research Questions

1. What are the socioeconomic characteristics of the household?
2. What is the poverty status of the households?
3. What are the factors influencing the poverty status of the household (farmers)

1.4. Objective of the Study

The main objective of the study is to analyze the determinant of poverty among farming household in the study are while the specific objective

1. To describe the socioeconomic characteristics of the households
2. To examine the poverty status of the households
3. To analyze the factors influencing the poverty status of the respondents.

1.5 Hypothesis of the study

H_O: there is no significant relationship between the socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents and their poverty status.

H1: there is significant relationship between the socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents and their poverty status

1.6 Justification of the study

The research topic is justified practically because, poverty is pervasive issue in Nigeria, and farming households in Ilorin metropolis are not immune to this challenge.

Agriculture is a vital sector in Nigeria's economy, providing employment and income for millions of people.

Farming households in Ilorin metropolis face numerous challenges, including limited access to credit markets and technology.

1.7 Definition of terms

1. **Households:** A house and its occupants regarded as a unit.
2. **Poverty:** refers to the liability of individuals or households to meet basic needs for survivals including food, shelter and clothing.
3. **Determinant:** refers to various factors that influence agricultural production and productivity.
4. **Farming** is the practice of cultivating the land and raising animals for the purpose of producing food, fiber, and other agricultural products essential for human survival and economic activity. It involves activities such as planting, irrigation, harvesting, and animal husbandry.
5. **Ilorin:** is the capital city of Kwara state in Nigeria, Ilorin is a city located in the North-central part of Nigeria, West Africa.
6. **Agriculture:** is the science, art, and practice of cultivating the soil, growing crops, and raising animals for food, fiber, fuel, and other products used to sustain and enhance human life. It encompasses a wide range of activities, including crop production, livestock rearing, aquaculture, and agroforestry.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Poverty is a persistent socio-economic issue that affects a significant portion of the global population, particularly in developing countries like Nigeria. It is widely recognized as a condition of severe deprivation that impairs people's ability to meet basic needs such as food, shelter, education, and healthcare (World Bank, 2020). Although often measured in terms of income or consumption, poverty transcends monetary aspects to include broader indicators of well-being and social exclusion.

According to the United Nations (1995), poverty is defined as "a condition characterized by severe deprivation of basic human needs, including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education, and information." This definition highlights the multidimensional nature of poverty.

2.1.1 TYPES OF POVERTY

Poverty is typically categorized into various types, each representing different aspects of deprivation:

Absolute Poverty: This refers to a set standard which is consistent over time and between countries. It is defined by the inability to meet the minimum requirements necessary to sustain a healthy life, such as a daily income of less than $1.90 (World Bank, 2020).

Relative Poverty: This concept defines poverty in relation to the economic status of other people in society. A person is considered poor if they lack the resources to enjoy the standard of living considered acceptable in their society (Sen, 1999).

Chronic vs. Transient Poverty: Chronic poverty persists over a long period, often due to structural issues such as illiteracy, poor health, and landlessness. In contrast, transient poverty is temporary and often results from short-term shocks such as drought, illness, or unemployment (Baulch & Hoddinott, 2000).

Rural Poverty: This is a common form of poverty in developing countries, characterized by a high dependence on agriculture, limited access to infrastructure, and underdeveloped markets (IFAD, 2011). In regions like Ilorin East, this form of poverty is dominant among crop-farming households.

2.1.2 MULTIDIMENSIONAL NATURE OF POVERTY

Contemporary approaches to poverty assessment adopt a multidimensional view, which recognizes that deprivation goes beyond income. The Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) developed by the UNDP includes indicators across three key dimensions: health, education, and living standards (UNDP, 2019). For crop-farming households, these dimensions may manifest in lack of access to fertilizers, poor health services, low literacy rates, and inadequate infrastructure.

The capability approach developed by Amartya Sen (1999) argues that poverty should be seen as a deprivation of capabilities—what people are actually able to do and be. According to Sen, poverty is not just about low income but about the inability to live a life one has reason to value.

2.1.3 CAUSES OF POVERTY IN RURAL FARMING COMMUNITIES

Poverty among crop farming households often stems from a variety of structural and systemic challenges, including:

Limited access to credit and capital;

Low levels of education and awareness;

Poor land tenure systems and access to productive land;

Lack of irrigation and modern farming technologies;

Inadequate infrastructure such as roads and storage facilities (Omonona, 2009; Adebayo, 2014).

2.1.4 POVERTY IN THE NIGERIAN CONTEXT

In Nigeria, poverty remains a critical development challenge. According to the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS, 2019), about 40.1% of Nigerians live below the national poverty line. Rural areas, where most households rely on agriculture for their livelihoods, are disproportionately affected. In states like Kwara, poverty is further exacerbated by poor market access, low input use, and erratic weather conditions (Adenegan et al., 2012).

2.2 MEASUREMENT OF POVERTY

Measuring poverty is fundamental for effective policy design and poverty reduction strategies. Accurate measurement helps identify who the poor are, the severity of their poverty, and the specific dimensions in which they are deprived (World Bank, 2020). Over the years, economists and development experts have developed several methods to

measure poverty, broadly categorized into monetary and multidimensional approaches.

2.2.1 MONETARY APPROACHES

a) Poverty Line Approach: The most common method of measuring poverty is the poverty line, which establishes a threshold of income or consumption below which a person is considered poor. There are two types:

Absolute Poverty Line: This defines a fixed income threshold based on the minimum amount required to meet basic needs (e.g., food, shelter, and clothing). For example, the World Bank defines the international poverty line as US$1.90 per person per day (World Bank, 2020).

Relative Poverty Line: This is based on a proportion of the median or mean income of the population, focusing on inequality and social exclusion. It reflects how income or consumption compares to the societal standard (UNDP, 2019).

b) Headcount Index (HCI): The headcount index is the proportion of the population living below the poverty line. It is the most straightforward measure but does not capture how far below the poverty line individuals fall (Foster et al., 1984).

c) Poverty Gap Index: The poverty gap index measures the depth of poverty by calculating the mean shortfall of the poor from the poverty line, expressed as a percentage. It helps assess the amount of resources needed to lift the poor to the poverty threshold (Foster et al., 1984).

2.2.2 MULTIDIMENSIONAL POVERTY MEASUREMENT

The limitations of income-based measures have led to the development of multidimensional approaches, which consider various deprivations experienced by individuals.

a) Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI): Developed by the UNDP and Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI), the MPI assesses poverty using three dimensions:

Health (nutrition, child mortality)

Education (years of schooling, school attendance)

Living standards (access to electricity, water, sanitation, cooking fuel, flooring, and assets)

A household is considered multidimensionality poor if it is deprived in at least one-third of the weighted indicators (UNDP, 2019).

b) Sen's Capability Approach: Amartya Sen's (1999) capability approach redefines poverty as the deprivation of basic capabilities rather than income alone. This approach focuses on what individuals can do (functioning) and be (capabilities), such as living a healthy life, being educated, and participating in community life.

2.2.3 PARTICIPATORY POVERTY ASSESSMENT (PPA):

In addition to quantitative methods, Participatory Poverty Assessments use qualitative techniques to capture the lived experiences of the poor. These include focus group discussions, community mapping, and storytelling. PPAs help incorporate the voices of rural households, especially farmers, who may be underrepresented in national surveys

(Chambers, 1994).

2.2.4 POVERTY MEASUREMENT IN NIGERIA

In Nigeria, poverty is typically measured using consumption expenditure surveys conducted by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). The 2019 Poverty and Inequality Report by NBS estimated that 40.1% of Nigerians live below the national poverty line of ₦137,430 per year. Rural areas recorded a significantly higher poverty rate (52.1%) compared to urban areas (18.0%) (NBS, 2019).

In rural farming contexts like Ilorin East, measurement based on income alone may underreport poverty, as most farmers engage in subsistence agriculture and have limited cash transactions. Therefore, combining monetary and non-monetary indicators offers a more realistic understanding of poverty in such settings.

2.3 AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS AND POVERTY

Agricultural households are those whose primary livelihood activities revolve around farming particularly crop and/or livestock production often practiced at a subsistence or semi-commercial level. In many developing countries, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, agriculture forms the backbone of rural livelihoods. In Nigeria, agriculture employs over 70% of the rural population, with crop farming as the predominant activity (NBS, 2019). Despite its importance, the agricultural sector is characterized by low productivity, poor infrastructure, and limited access to support services, making farming households especially vulnerable to poverty (Omonona, 2009).

2.3.1 CHARACTERISTICS OF AGRICULTURAL HOUSEHOLDS

Crop farming households in rural areas like Ilorin East typically share several socio-

economic and structural characteristics:

Low levels of education and literacy: This restricts awareness of government programs, credit opportunities, and modern farming practices (Adepoju & Obayelu, 2013).

Subsistence production: Most produce primarily for household consumption with limited market surplus.

Reliance on rain-fed agriculture: This makes them highly vulnerable to climate variability and weather shocks (Adenegan et al., 2012).

Land tenure insecurity: Many farmers do not own the land they cultivate, reducing their willingness to invest in long-term improvements (Adebayo, 2014).

These structural limitations contribute significantly to persistent rural poverty.

2.3.2 LINK BETWEEN AGRICULTURE AND POVERTY

While agriculture is seen as a tool for rural development and poverty reduction, the reality in many Nigerian rural communities suggests that the sector is underperforming. Low productivity, price fluctuations, and limited off-farm income sources often translate into low household incomes, reinforcing the poverty cycle.

World Bank (2020) notes that without access to modern technology, financial services, and stable markets, farmers cannot improve productivity or generate sustainable income. Poor yields due to lack of inputs such as fertilizer, pesticides, and improved seeds often lead to food insecurity and poverty.

In regions like Ilorin East, where agriculture is the dominant source of income, poverty rates are closely tied to farm performance. Thus, improving agricultural productivity has

a direct bearing on poverty alleviation.

2.3.3 CONSTRAINTS FACING CROP FARMING HOUSEHOLDS

Several interrelated challenges explain why poverty remains high among arming households:

Inadequate Infrastructure: Poor roads, lack of irrigation, and limited storage facilities increase post-harvest losses and reduce market access (FAO, 2017).

Limited Access to Credit: Many rural farmers lack collateral and financial literacy, preventing them from accessing formal credit systems. This reduces their ability to purchase improved inputs (Yunana et al., 2014).

Weak Extension Services: Agricultural extension officers play a critical role in disseminating farming innovations. However, in many parts of Nigeria, extension coverage is low and ineffective (Asfaw et al., 2012).

Climate and Environmental Challenges: Unpredictable rainfall patterns, soil degradation, and pest infestations severely affect yields, especially in areas relying on rain-fed agriculture.

Gender Disparities: Women, who play a central role in agriculture, often face additional constraints such as lower access to land, credit, and education, which exacerbates poverty among female-headed farming households (IFAD, 2011).

2.3.4 AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY REDUCTION

Studies suggest that agriculture-led growth is more effective in reducing poverty than growth in other sectors. The World Bank (2008) estimates that GDP growth originating in

agriculture is two to four times more effective in raising incomes among the poor compared to growth in other sectors.

To reduce poverty among farming households, particularly in Ilorin East, targeted interventions are needed, including:

Investment in rural infrastructure (roads, irrigation, electricity);

Subsidies or credit facilities to access modern inputs;

Strengthening of agricultural cooperatives;

Improved market linkages and price support;

Gender-sensitive agricultural policies.

2.4 DETERMINANTS OF POVERTY AMONG CROP FARMERS

Several studies have identified multiple determinants of poverty among farming households. These include:

Household Size: Larger households tend to have higher dependency ratios, which often lead to greater poverty levels (Adepoju & Obayelu, 2013).

Education Level: Farmers with formal education are more likely to adopt innovative agricultural practices and engage in off-farm employment, thereby reducing poverty (Omonona, 2009).

Farm Size and Land Ownership: Land ownership and size of cultivated land significantly influence agricultural productivity and income (Adebayo, 2014).

Access to Credit: Farmers with access to credit are able to invest in inputs and

technologies that improve yields and income (Yunana et al., 2014).

Market Access and Infrastructure: Proximity to markets and access to roads enhance farmers' ability to sell produce at better prices (FAO, 2017).

Extension Services: Extension contact improves farmers' knowledge and decision-making, which can contribute to poverty reduction (Asfaw et al., 2012).

2.5 EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Empirical studies examining poverty among crop farming households have applied a wide range of approaches and revealed multiple dimensions of poverty determinants. Most of these studies employ either descriptive statistics or econometric models such as Logit, Probit, and Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) to identify significant factors influencing household poverty.

2.6 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework provides the foundational lens through which the phenomenon of poverty among crop farming households is examined. Various theories have been developed over time to explain the persistence and dynamics of poverty, particularly in rural and agrarian settings. This study draws upon several interrelated theories that offer both economic and sociological perspectives on poverty.

2.6.1 THE CULTURE OF POVERTY THEORY

Oscar Lewis (1959) introduced the Culture of Poverty Theory, arguing that poverty is not merely the result of economic deprivation but also a self-perpetuating subculture. This culture, according to Lewis, is characterized by fatalism, low educational attainment,

weak aspirations, apathy towards change, and a strong sense of marginality. These traits are passed down through generations, thereby sustaining chronic poverty.

Relevance to the Study: In rural communities like Ilorin East, where crop farming has been a traditional livelihood, some households may continue to rely on outdated farming methods and show reluctance to adopt new technologies. This behavior may stem from cultural norms rather than a lack of access or information, making this theory useful for explaining non-economic barriers to poverty reduction (Lewis, 1959; Ogwumike, 2001).

2.6.2 HUMAN CAPITAL THEORY

The Human Capital Theory, developed by Schultz (1961) and later advanced by Becker (1964), posits that individuals' economic productivity is largely determined by their level of education, skills, health, and training. Investments in human capital lead to higher productivity and income-earning capacity, thereby reducing the risk of poverty.

Relevance: This theory is highly applicable in the context of Ilorin East, where low levels of education and limited access to training often constrain farmers' ability to adopt modern agricultural practices. Education also affects awareness of credit opportunities, marketing strategies, and efficient resource allocation (Becker, 1964; Schultz, 1961; Omonona, 2009).

2.6.3 THE SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS FRAMEWORK (SLF)

The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework, developed by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) in the late 1990s, emphasizes that poverty is multidimensional and influenced by the assets households control natural, financial, physical, human, and social capital as well as the policies, institutions, and external shocks they experience.

Relevance: SLF is particularly useful for analyzing rural poverty among crop farmers. It considers how factors such as access to land, market conditions, extension services, and social networks shape livelihoods. The framework aligns with the objectives of this study by identifying how multiple variables beyond income alone determine poverty status (DFID, 1999; Ellis, 2000).

2.6.4 THE BASIC NEEDS THEORY

The Basic Needs Theory, promoted by the International Labour Organization (ILO) in the 1970s, argues that poverty should be understood in terms of the inability to meet basic needs such as adequate food, shelter, education, and health care (Streeten et al., 1981). The theory prioritizes the satisfaction of essential human requirements over mere income growth.

Relevance: In rural farming contexts like Ilorin East, where income may be seasonal and variable, and many households still experience poverty despite engaging in productive work. This theory supports the use of multidimensional poverty indicators that go beyond income, such as access to education, health, and decent housing (Streeten et al., 1981; Aigbokhan, 2000).

2.7 GAPS IN THE LITERATURE

Although many studies have identified general poverty determinants in rural Nigeria, few have specifically focused on crop farming households in Ilorin East LGA. Most research concentrates on southwestern or northern states with less emphasis on North Central Nigeria. This gap underscores the importance of the current study in providing localized insights that can inform region-specific agricultural and poverty-

reduction policies.

Moreover, many studies have not incorporated climate variability, land tenure systems, or gender-based access to inputs, which are increasingly relevant in understanding poverty dynamics in farming households.

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 Research methodology

3.1 The study area

This research was conducted in Ilorin East Local Government Area (LGA) of Kwara State, Nigeria. Ilorin East is one of the sixteen LGAs that make up the state and is predominantly rural, with agriculture—particularly crop farming—being the major economic activity of the people. The area was selected as the study location due to its high dependence on crop production for household income and livelihood, and the observable presence of poverty among farming communities.

3.2 Population of the study

The target population comprises all farming households in Ilorin East Local Government Area (LGA) of Kwara State. These households rely primarily on crop and livestock farming for their livelihoods.

3.3 Sampling Procedure and sample size

Sampling Procedure

A multi-stage sampling technique was adopted to select farming households in Ilorin East Local Government Area (LGA) for this study.

- Stage 1: Ward Selection

  Out of the eleven (11) wards in Ilorin East LGA, five (5) wards were selected using simple random sampling. This approach ensured that each ward had an equal chance of being included, which enhances the representativeness of the sample.

- Stage 2: Community Selection

  Within each selected ward, two farming communities were chosen based on the availability of farming households and agricultural activity levels.

- Stage 3: Household Selection

  A list of farming households in each selected community was obtained with the help of local agricultural extension officers. From these lists, systematic random sampling was used to select individual households. Thus, a sample size of 120 farming households was selected for the study. This number provides a reliable basis for statistical analysis and ensures meaningful generalization to the entire population of farming households in the area.

3.4 Method of data Analysis

The method of data analysis will include the use of descriptive and inferential statistical methods.

Variable	Type	Description	Expected sign
Age of Household Head	Continuous	Age in years	+/-
Education level	Ordinal	Numbers of years of formal schooling	Negative
Household size	Continuous	Number of people in the household	Positive
Farm size	Continuous	Size of the farm in hectares	Negative

Monthly income	Continuous	1= has no access income in Nigeria naira (#)	Negative
Access to credit	Dummy (0/1)	1=has access to agriculture credit,0=No	Negative
Extension services	Dummy (0/1)	1= access to extension services,0=No	Negative
Farming experience	Continuous	Years of farming experience	Negative
Type of farming	Dummy (0/1)	1= commercial, 0=Subsistence farming	Negative

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

4.1.1 Distribution of Respondents by Gender

The table 4.1.1 below shows the distribution of respondents by sex . The table showed that 65.8% of the respondents are male, while 34.2% of the respondents are female. This indicates that the majority of the crop farming households in the study area are male.

Table 4.1.1 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	79	65.8
Female	41	34.2
Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.1.2 Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status

The table 4.1.2 below shows the distribution of respondents by marital status. The table showed that 65.8% of the respondents are married, while 34.2% are unmarried. This indicates that the majority of the crop farmers in the study area are married, which may influence their farming decisions, household responsibilities, and level of poverty.

Table 4.1.2 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Marital Status

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Unmarried	41	34.2
Married	79	65.8

Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.1.3 Distribution of Respondents by Level of Education

The table 4.1.3 below shows the distribution of respondents by their level of education. The table revealed that 50.8% of the respondents have attained tertiary education, 21.7% have secondary education, 14.2% have primary education, while 13.3% have no formal education. This indicates that the majority of the crop farmers in the study area are educated, particularly at the tertiary level.

Table 4.1.3 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Level of Education

Level of Education	Frequency	Percent
No Formal Education	16	13.3
Primary	17	14.2
Secondary	26	21.7
Tertiary	61	50.8
Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.1.4 Distribution of Respondents by Primary Occupation

The table 4.1.4 below shows the distribution of respondents by their primary occupation. The table indicated that 45.8% of the respondents are engaged primarily in farming, 15.0% are involved in non-farming activities, while 39.2% combine both farming and non-farming occupations. This implies that while a good proportion of the respondents rely solely on farming, a significant number also diversify their income sources, which

may help cushion the effects of poverty among crop farming households in the study area.

Table 4.1.4 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Primary Occupation

Primary occupation	Frequency	Percent
Farming	55	45.8
Non-Farming	18	15.0
Both	47	39.2
Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.1.5 Distribution of Respondents by Crop Type

Table 4.1.5 below shows the distribution of respondents based on the major type of crop they cultivate. The table revealed that 45.0% of the respondents grow root and tuber crops, 20.8% cultivate legumes, another 20.8% grow vegetables, while 13.3% are engaged in the cultivation of cereal crops. This indicates that root and tuber crops are the most commonly cultivated crops among farmers in the study area, possibly due to their adaptability to the local soil and climate conditions, and their role as staple food sources.

Table 4.1.5 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Crop Type

Crop Type	Frequency	Percent
Cereal	16	13.3
Legumes	25	20.8
Root and Tuber	54	45.0
Vegetables	25	20.8
Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.1.6 Distribution of Respondents by Farming method

The table 4.1.6 below shows the distribution of respondents based on the farming methods they practice. The table indicated that 49.2% of the respondents use both traditional and modern farming methods, 25.8% practice traditional farming only, while 25.0% use modern farming methods exclusively. This suggests that a large proportion of crop farmers in the study area adopt a mixed approach, possibly to balance cost, risk, and productivity, and may reflect a gradual transition from traditional to modern agricultural practices.

Table 4.1.6 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Farming method

Farming Method	Frequency	Percent
Traditional	31	25.8
Modern	30	25.0
Both	59	49.2
Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.1.7 Distribution of Respondents by Access to Farm Inputs

The table 4.7 below shows the distribution of respondents based on their access to farm inputs. The table revealed that 66.7% of the respondents have access to farm inputs, while 33.3% do not. This indicates that the majority of the crop farmers in the study area have access to essential agricultural inputs, which is crucial for improving productivity and reducing poverty.

Table 4.1.7 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Access to Farm Inputs

Access to Farm Inputs	Frequency	Percent
No	40	33.3
Yes	80	66.7
Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.1.8 Distribution of Respondents by Access to Market

The table 4.8 below shows the distribution of respondents based on their access to market. The table revealed that 80.8% of the respondents have access to market, while 19.2% do not. This indicates that the majority of crop farmers in the study area have access to markets for selling their produce, which is essential for income generation and economic sustainability.

Table 4.1.8 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Access to Market

Access to Market	Frequency	Percent
No	23	19.2
Yes	97	80.8
Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.1.9 Distribution of Respondents by Access to Basic Amenities

The table 4.1.9 below shows the distribution of respondents based on their access to basic amenities. The table revealed that 74.2% of the respondents have access to basic amenities, while 25.8% do not. This indicates that the majority of crop farmers in the study area enjoy access to essential services such as water, electricity, healthcare, and roads, which can contribute positively to their overall well-being and productivity.

Table 4.1.9 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Access to Basic Amenities

Access to Basic Amenities	Frequency	Percent
No	31	25.8
Yes	89	74.2
Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.1.10 Distribution of Respondents by Food Security Status

The table 4.1.10 below shows the distribution of respondents based on their food security status. The table revealed that 77.5% of the respondents are food secure, while 22.5% are food insecure. This indicates that the majority of crop farming households in the study area have adequate access to food, which may be attributed to their involvement in food production.

Table 4.1.10 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Food Security Status

Food Security Status	Frequency	Percent
Food Secure	93	77.5
Food Insecure	27	22.5
Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.1.11 Distribution of Respondents by Experience Shocks

The table 4.1.11 below shows the distribution of respondents based on whether they have experienced any form of shock (such as crop failure, market loss, illness, or natural disasters). The table reveals that 71.7% of the respondents have experienced shocks, while 28.3% have not. This indicates that a significant majority of crop farmers in the study area have faced shocks that may negatively impact their livelihoods and contribute to poverty.

Table 4.1.11 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Experience Shocks

Experience Shock	Frequency	Percent
No	34	28.3
Yes	86	71.7
Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.2 POVERTY STATUS OF HOUSEHOLD

Table 4.2 below shows the distribution of respondents based on their household poverty status. The table reveals that 60.8% of the respondents fall into the middle-class household category, 20.0% are in the low-class household, while 19.2% are classified as high-class household. This indicates that the majority of crop farming households in the study area are within the middle-income group, suggesting a moderate level of economic stability. However, the presence of a significant proportion in the low-income group highlights that poverty remains an issue for some households and may require targeted intervention.

Table 4.2

Poverty Status	Frequency	Percent
Low Class Household	24	20.0
High Class Household	23	19.2
Middle Class Household	73	60.8
Total	120	100.0

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

4.3 FACTORS INFLUENCING THE POVERTY STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

The table 4.3 below shows the distribution of respondents based on the severity of various factors influencing their poverty status. The results are categorized into not severe, moderately severe, and severe, with corresponding mean scores used to rank their intensity. Limited Access to Finance was reported as a severe factor by 51.7% of respondents, with a mean score of 1.44, indicating it is the most significant factor influencing poverty among crop farmers in the study area. This highlights that many farmers struggle to access credit or loans for agricultural investment. Limited Land Area was considered moderately severe by 53.3% and severe by 34.2%, with a mean score of 1.22, suggesting that land availability remains a constraint to expanding production. Seasonal Rainfall Fluctuation had 40% reporting it as severe and a mean of 1.23, showing that climate variability is a major challenge affecting farming outcomes and income. Lack of Tenure System (mean = 1.14) and Theft of Farm Products (mean = 1.18) also contribute to poverty. These issues affect farmers' security over their land and produce, making them vulnerable. Poor Knowledge of Modern Techniques was reported as severe by 35%, with a mean of 1.17, suggesting that low awareness and adoption of improved farming methods further limit productivity and income.

Overall, the table indicates that limited access to finance, land constraints, and climatic variability are the most severe factors contributing to poverty among crop farming households in the study area.

Table 4.3

Factor Influencing Poverty status	Not Severe	Moderately Severe	Severe	Mean
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	
Limited Access to Finance	9 (7.5)	49 (40.8)	62 (51.7)	1.44

Limited Land Area	15 (12.5)	64 (53.3)	41 (34.2)	1.22
Lack of tenure System	27 (22.5)	49 (40.8)	44 (36.7)	1.14
Theft of Farm Product	26 (21.7)	47 (39.2)	47 (39.2)	1.18
Poor knowledge of Modern techniques	22 (18.3)	56 (46.7)	42 (35)	1.17
Seasonal Rainfall Fluctuation	21 (17.5)	51 (42.5)	48 (40)	1.23

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2025

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 SUMMERY

This study examined the determinants of poverty among crop farming households in Ilorin East Local Government Area of Kwara State, with the aim of identifying key socio-economic and institutional factors influencing household welfare. The research was driven by the recognition that crop farmers in rural Nigeria face persistent poverty despite their significant role in food production and rural development.

Primary data were collected through structured questionnaires administered to selected crop farming households. Analytical tools used include descriptive statistics, the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT) poverty index, and logistic regression.

The major findings are as follows:

A high incidence of poverty was recorded among the respondents, with more than half living below the poverty line.

Most farmers had low levels of formal education, limited access to credit, and small farm sizes.

Key determinants of poverty include:

Household size – larger families were more likely to be poor.

Education level – higher education reduced poverty likelihood.

Access to agricultural credit – helped improve household welfare.

Farm size – positively associated with income generation.

Extension services – access reduced poverty through improved farming techniques.

Market access – poor road and market infrastructure increased poverty risk.

These findings indicate that poverty among crop farming households is a multidimensional issue, involving both individual and structural barriers to economic empowerment.

5.2 Conclusion

The study concludes that poverty in Ilorin East among crop farming households is widespread, deep, and largely influenced by a combination of socio-economic and institutional factors. The majority of farming households are characterized by low productivity, poor access to resources, and limited exposure to modern agricultural practices.

It was established that enhancing household welfare requires more than just increasing crop yield; it also demands targeted interventions in education, credit access, market

development, and extension services. Poverty reduction among rural farmers, therefore, must be approached through comprehensive and inclusive rural development strategies that address both income and capability deficits.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion, the following recommendations are made:

1. Strengthen Agricultural Extension Services: Government agencies should recruit and train more extension agents to cover rural areas effectively, ensuring that farmers have timely access to modern farming techniques and policy information.

2. Improve Access to Credit Facilities: Microfinance institutions and agricultural banks should design low-interest, collateral-free credit schemes tailored to the needs of smallholder farmers to enable investment in productive assets.

3. Invest in Rural Infrastructure: There is an urgent need for the construction and rehabilitation of rural roads, irrigation facilities, and market structures to ease transportation, reduce post-harvest losses, and improve market access.

4. Promote Adult Education and Farmer Training.: Literacy and adult education programs should be implemented in rural areas to build farmers' human capital and decision-making skills, which in turn improves farm efficiency and income.

5. Encourage Farm Diversification: Farmers should be supported to engage in other income-generating activities such as agro-processing, livestock production, or off-farm work to reduce dependence on seasonal crop farming.

6. Land Policy Reform and Secure Tenure: Government should ensure equitable access to farmland and land use rights, especially for women and youth, to encourage long-term agricultural investment and productivity.

7. Community Participation in Development Projects: Local farmers should be involved in the planning and execution of rural development projects to ensure they reflect the actual needs and realities of the communities.

REFERENCES

Aihonsu,J.O.Olubanjo ,O.O &, A (2011) Determinants of income diversification amongst rural farm households in Nigeria.

Chauvin,N.D.,f . Mulangu.,&Porto. (2021) Food production and consumption trends in sub-Saharan Africa prospects for the transformation of the agricultural sector “Unop Regional Bureau for Africa,Wp 2012-011

Dia ,Y.2.,Jomgur,A.A.U& Onu,J.i.(2022(,,Livelihood in Adamawa state Nigeria.Green reports 3(7),39-48

Dia,Y.2 &Dia-Johnson ,R(2023) The determinants of the livelihood Diversification among rural farming households in Toungo local government area, Adamawa state, Nigeria.3rd international congress of the Turkish journal of agriculture food science and Technology,malatenta ,Turkey Pp-128-138.

Idowu,A.O,Ambali,0.1,& Onasanya.A.S(2014) living condition, livelihood and crop diversification among rural households.

Ijata,M.A., Ijata,G.T..,Bello,R.A., Ajayi,M.A&AdeyemuS.L(2010).Determinants of income Diversification in Ilorin metropolis,Nigeria

Ike,P.C.&Uzokwe,U.N(2015).Estimating of poverty among rural farming households in Delta state Nigeria

Lencucha ,R., pal, N.E.,A., Throw,A& Drope, j.(2020).Government policy and agricultural production.a scoping review to inform research and policy on healthy agricultural commodities

National Bureau of statistics (NBS)(2010). National poverty rates in Nigeria.

Obayelu E.A Olarewaju T.O.& OyelamiN.L.(2014)Effect of rural infrastructure on profitability and productivity of cassava -Based farms in odogbolu local

Government area .ogun state.

Olayemi F.F,Adebola ,J.E Bamisgaiye,E.i.&Away , E.F(2012)‘’Assessment of post harvest losses of some selected crops in eight local government area of revers state,Nigeria

Oyewole S.O, Adepoju,S.O.&Akintola,A.L.(2015)Analysis of income Diversification strategies among farm households in Oyo state

Olorunsanye ,E.O. & Omotosho O.A(2012)a Gender Analysis of poverty among rural farm households in North central,Nigeria Sanusi R.A,Owagbemi, T.S& Suleman M.(2013)

Determinants of poverty among farm households in ikorodu local government area of lagos local government area of lagos local government area of lagos state,IJAFS (1&2),538-55215.

World Bank (2020),poverty and equity Brief Nigeria Sub-Saharan Africa April 2020. World Bank ,Washington.D.C

World Bank (2018) poverty and shared prosperity 2018.Piecing Together the poverty puzzle,World Bank,Washington,D.C

Appendix

QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire: Determinants of Poverty among Crop Farming Households in Ilorin East

Section A: Socioeconomic Characteristics

1. What is your age? _____

2. What is your gender? Male [ ] Female [ ]

3. What is your marital status? Married [ ] Unmarried [ ] Divorced [ ] Widowed [ ]

4. What is your level of education? No formal education [ ] Primary [ ] Secondary [ ] Tertiary [ ]

5. Household Size? _____

6. What is your primary occupation? Farming [ ] Non-farming [ ] Both [ ]

Section B: Farming Characteristics

1. What type of crops do you grow? Cereal [ ] Legumes [ ] Root & Tuber [ ] Vegetable [ ]

2. What is the size of your farm land? _____ Acres

3. What farming methods do you use? Traditional [ ] Modern [ ] Both [ ]

4. Do you have access to irrigation facilities? Yes [ ] No [ ]

5. What is your average annual farm income? _____

Section C: Access to Resources

1. Do you have access to credit facilities? Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. If yes, what is the source of credit? _____

3. Do you have access to extension services? Yes [ ] No [ ]

4. Do you have access to farm inputs (e.g., fertilizers, seeds)? Yes [ ] No [ ]

5. Do you have access to markets for your produce? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Section D: Poverty Indicators

1. What is your average monthly household expenditure? _____

2. Do you have access to basic amenities (e.g., healthcare, education)? Yes [ ] No [ ]

3. What is your household's food security status? Food secure [ ] Food insecure [ ]

4. Do you experience any shocks (e.g., crop failure, illness)? Yes [ ] No [ ]

CHALLENGES AFFECTING THE DETERMINANT OF POVERTY

CHALLENGES	SEVERE	MODERATELY SEVERE	NOT SEVERE
LIMITED ACCESS TO FINANCE			
LIMITED LAND AREA			

LACK OF TENURE SECURITY			
THEFT OF FARM PRODUCT			
POOR KNOWLEDGE OF MODERN FARMING TECHNIQUES			
SESSIONAL FLUNCTUATION IN RAINFALL			

CROPING STRATEGIES

CROPING STRATEGIES	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
IMPROVING ACCESS TO					

FINANCE					
LAND ALLOCATION AND TENURE SECURITY					
ACESS TO MODERN FARM MACHINERY AND INPUT					
FARM SECURITY MEASURE					
IRRIGATION SYSTEM					
CAPITAL BUILDING					