Introduction

The household as a locus of biological and social reproduction is relevant to the lives of all individuals. The composition of the household including the ages, number and sex of members is central to any analysis of the household. Also crucial to the understanding of the behaviour of members of the household are the opportunities and constraints experienced by individual members. Gender influences not only perceptions of the household and relationship between members, but also the opportunities and constraints of individual members of the household. Socially constructed differences between men and women, cultural expectations and stereotypes of masculinity and femininity foster differences between men and women heading households.

In many societies, patriarchy is considered the norm. Based on this, headship of the household is associated with men. The social and cultural recognition of men as household head earns them support from individuals and institutions in this respect. This recognition is lacking for women heading households; whose households are perceived as deviation from the norm. Often with lower education, lower income and lower social status, women heading households usually do so from a disadvantaged position. In addition to these, there are assumptions of their inability to raise well-adjusted children especially where they have no partner. The expected mal-adjustment of children in female-headed households is assumed to manifest in several areas including their educational performance.

Do children in male-headed households have better educational performance than their counterparts in female-headed households or are there other factors influencing the educational performance of children? Are there differences in the opportunities and constraints of children in male and female–headed households which are actually indicative of wider gender inequities?

Explaining Gender Inequality: Diverse Perspectives

The increasing awareness of the centrality of gender in the lives of people has led to explanations on the differences between men and women. Scholars have sought to explain why virtually every society differentiates people on the basis of gender; why gender often forms the basis for the division of labour and why virtually every known society is based on male domination and women and men's tasks valued differently (Kimmel 2000:2). Arguments about gender differences have been rooted in biology, culture, materialist position and the patriarchal ideology.

Theories of social life date back to early history. Auguste Comte, the founding father of Sociology expressed a belief in the equality of beings, but it is an equality based on "the radical differentiation of functions and natures". According to him, "the husband obviously has the authority (Aron 1965:97)". Others have since elaborated Comte's views. Frederick Engels (1891) attributed the subordination of women to particular historical conditions, particularly the emergence of the monogamous family and the ownership of private property. He argued that in pre-historic times, women occupied a highly respected position among barbarians and savages of the lower, middle and upper stages and they continued to weld great power among the clans until the increase in men's wealth and their subsequent higher status led to the overthrow of 'mother right' and the institution of the monogamous family.

In his classical work, '*The Origin of the Family, Private property and the State'*, Engels observed that the economic oppression of the woman led to the inequality of man and woman. He argued that

in the majority of cases the man was expected to be the breadwinner of the family and that gave him a dominating position. The emancipation of women, in his view, would only be achieved if the entire female sex went into public industry (1949:74). A major limitation of Engel's view in relation to this study is that it ignores the cultural connotation which inhibits women from claming headship even if they were breadwinners. This apart, income does not necessarily free the woman from some socio-cultural expectations. The first Marxian approach to the explanation of inequality has its roots in the work of Engels. It attributes the subordination of women to the ownership of private property and also recommends female wage labour. The second and third Marxian perspectives attribute the position of women to the separation of wage labour and unpaid housework from which capitalism benefits and women's reproduction of the labour force and surplus value sustaining capitalism respectively.

Marxian theory has its shortcomings. One of these is that none of the approaches provided an adequate explanation for sexual inequality. Female subordination, critics argued, did not begin with private property but with the reproductive functions of men and women (Firestone in Haralambos 2000). The explanation here is that women, as a result of their reproductive functions, depended on men for survival and this dependence produced unequal power relationships and 'power psychology' which formed the basis for all future stratification systems.

Functionalists use the biological differences between men and women to justify gender inequality in the society. According to them, gender inequality "reflects the distribution by sex of traits required for group survival – toughness for men, nurturance for women – with the former being given greater weight in the public arena of political and economic activities (Hess et. al. 1993: 207)". Other arguments based on biological differences include that of the 'human biogrammar' through which men are programmed for public activities and women for domestic duties and the instrumental/expressive role argument of Talcott Parsons. Cross-cultural studies have however suggested that gender and sexuality are far more fluid than biological models would have us believe. Attempts to normalize or legitimate the unequal gender order through biology conceal the social and political formation of an unequal male order because gender difference is socially produced in order to sustain male dominance (Seidman 1994).

From the conflict perspective, inequality between men and women results from social and cultural arrangements and not nature. In other words, culture and cultural dictates rather than biological facts account for the supposed male superiority and female inferiority. According to this perspective, force or the threat of force or some unwritten social sanctions can be used to maintain gender inequality. In some cases, the power is legitimated in law, as when female are denied inheritance or barred from certain jobs (Hess et al. 1993: 208). In other cases, the threat is inter-personal, as in the fear of rape and assault which cause women to limit their own activities (Sheffield 1987 in Hess et al. 1993). In spite of its perceived shallowness, the conflict perspective might offer some explanations in relation to the differences between men and women heading households. The fact that headship is culturally defined may explain why the eldest male in a household is almost always designated head even when data identifying economic responsibilities show otherwise. Closely related to this, it can be argued that social and cultural expectations often dictate the behaviour of men and women with respect to the performance of household responsibilities.
Feminist theories of gender inequality argue that men and women are not only differently situated in society but are also unequally situated. Specifically, they argued that women get less of the material resources, social status, power and opportunities for self actualization than men who share their

social location – be it a location based on class, race, occupation, ethnical, religion, education, nationality or any other significant factor. The theory is useful in proffering explanations for differences in the social status, opportunities and access to material resources by men and women heading households. Unlike theorists of gender differences, theorists of gender inequality believe that it is possible to change the situation, which makes women less empowered than men (Lengermann and Niebrugge – Brantley 1993: 318).

The theory of gender and power also provides explanation for power imbalance between men and women. The social structural theory popularized by Robert Connell is based on existing philosophical writings of sexual inequality and gender and power imbalance According to the theory, there are three major social structures that characterize the gendered relationships between women and men: the sexual division of labour, the sexual division of power and the structure of the cathexis (Wingood and Diclemente 2000).

Blumberg's Theory of Gender Stratification and Gender and Development

Blumberg's stratification theory centres on the gendered control of income and its consequences. It proposes that male/female control of income is the most important dimension of the internal economy of the family in determining the distribution of family power and well-being (Blumberg and Pethan 1994:6).

Blumberg's theory is broad based hence only those propositions relevant to the explanation of men/women's responsibilities in relation to their income are mentioned. One of her propositions is that women's economic power relative to men (defined as control of key economic resources such as income, property and other means of production) is the most important and achievable (although not the sole) independent variable affecting gender stratification at a variety of nested micro and macro levels ranging from the couple to the state. She also argued that unless the woman is a household head, she may not get a dollar's worth of economic power for every dollar she brings into the family because of discount factors. Discount factors may operate at the macro level of the state and the micro level of family and community, and subtract or add pennies to that hypothetical dollar depending on whether they are negative or positive.

At the macro level, the greater the level of gender inequality, the greater the negative discount rate, and the less leverage a woman get from each dollar. At the micro level however, discount rates may be negative or positive depending on the gender ideology of each partner, as well as the prevailing gender ideologies of their class and ethnic group at the community level. If the ideology says that a woman should be an economic dependant, it will nibble away many cents of the potential leverage she gets from each dollar, since she never should have earned it in the first place. Also at the micro level, the relative commitment of each partner (the less committed one has more leverage by the principal of least interest), the relative attractiveness of each partner, the extent of their perceived need for the other's income and even their relative assertiveness may influence the discount rate (Blumberg and Pethan1994:6).

The theory proposed that for both genders, the more surplus controlled, the greater the economic power. Since hungry children cannot be denied food, it is likely that poor women do not get more leverage from the often-high proportion of resources that they provide. According to Blumberg, "the

greater a woman's net control of income, the greater her leverage in economic and welfare decisions. This means that she has more say in economic decisions such as buying or selling land or welfare decisions such as children's schooling, healthcare etc. Specifically, Blumberg hypothesized that where women have purse power either by out earning their husbands or heading their households, they tend to be more even-handed about educating girls as well as boys.

In a study which used random sample data from a household survey in Santiago, Chile, Blumberg found empirical support for the hypothesis. She found that while boys in male-headed households were significantly more likely to receive secondary education, in female-headed households or where women earned more than their spouses, this was not the case. The theory however says that mere work in economic activities (or even ownership of economic resources) does not translate into economic leverage in the family if the person derives no control of economic resources from that work.

Another proposition of this theory is that men tend to spend income under their control differently from women who have provider responsibilities (even as providers of the last resort) with women focusing more on children's well-being and family subsistence. The policy implication of this is that where income from a developing project is channeled only to men as heads of families it is likely that families will lose benefits that would have come to them through women's more welfare-focused spending patterns.

Blumberg's theory may offer useful insights for this study. Although the relationship explained by Blumberg is between increased maternal income and better nourished children, it could be expected that the relationship will also hold for children's education. If women with provider responsibilities spend more on children's well-being and family's sustenance, then if they had more income, they could be expected to channel such income towards the education of their children perhaps through the employment of paid tutors or other persons whose services will enable the women to spend more time supervising their children's education. Blumberg's proposition that economic power increases as surplus controlled increases, may be used to explain the fact that if women had surplus income, they would have the economic power required to enhance the educational performance of their children. In addition to the earlier explanation, another way to do this is to concentrate on financially visible responsibilities which are not time consuming and employ the services of others for other responsibilities which are time consuming. The saved time is then spent on other income generating activities.

Female-Headed Households: Characteristics and Causes

The literature on gender, development and planning gives prominence to woman-headed households as households in need of special attention because of the observed relationship between female headship and poverty (Buvinic and Gupta 1993:24). However, identifying women-headed households is problematic. A major problem is the fact that respondents giving information in census or survey questionnaires almost always mention the eldest male as head. Also in many cases, the woman who, in fact, heads a household may not be recognized as such and may not name herself as such because of cultural prescription identifying men with household authority. The result of this is that most census data reflect the conventional assumption that a woman will be recognized as head only if she had no resident male partner.

The absence of a male partner is however not sufficient evidence of female headship, as many absent men still contribute to the economic sustenance of their households through remittance. In the same vein, the presence of a male partner does not always translate into male headship as reasons of health or economic incapability may hinder the man from performing the role of a breadwinner or prevent him from exercising authority.

Like the conventional approach, the economic approach which ascribes headship to the main supporter (chief earner) of the household (Youssef and Helter 1983 in Varley 1996) has its own problems, one of which is that women's contribution to household maintenance is likely to be overlooked if the definition of economic activity is based on paid production and does not include the activities such as the processing of primary product, housework and child rearing.

An important question is whether the proportion of female-headed households matters or whether the significance of female-headed households remains undiminished by their relatively small number. Although scholars have not answered the question on the significance of female-headed households, they have been unequivocal about their relatively small number. Bongaarts (2001:14) noted in his household surveys in different regions of the world that the majority of household heads were men but that the proportion of households headed by women was substantial in all regions: 13 percent in the Near East/North Africa, 16 percent in Asia, 22 percent in sub-Saharan Africa, and 24 percent in Latin America. He noted that in countries such as Ghana, Haiti, Kenya and Zimbabwe, the proportion exceeds one-third.

In Nigeria, the multiple indicator cluster survey of 1995 as presented by the Federal Office of Statistics showed that one in eight household heads (12.5%) was a woman. When disaggregated by sector, the figures were 16.2 percent for the urban and 12.1 percent for the rural (FOS 1996:33). The report published by the Federal Office of Statistics (FOS) confirmed Oyekanmi's (1993:35) earlier findings. She had found that 88.5 percent of household heads in Nigeria were male and 11.5 were females. She also found that household heads were likely to be married if they were males or to be widowed if they were females (1993:36). Statistics have underestimated the prevalence of female headship because of what Ono-Osaki (1991) describes as classical sex-based stereotypes, which condition its measurement. She also identifies the tendency to assign headship to any male member in a household as a problem. Schlyter (1989) confirms that the status of head of household is given to women in censuses only in the absence of a male spouse. She makes a distinction between *de jure* heads and *de facto* heads as she describes the former as unmarried, divorced or widowed women, and the latter as married women who live separated from their husband for prolonged periods.

In the same vein, Ono-Osaki (1991) sees male heads as *de jure* heads and in their absence, their households are *de facto* female-headed households. The implication of these views is that within any family unit where the man and the woman are still legally or traditionally married, headship of the family belongs to the man as a matter of right, his physical absence notwithstanding. It must however be mentioned that there are instances where the man keeps up appearances as *de jure* head but the woman is the unacknowledged head as far as decision-making and economic support of the family go.

The proportion of female-headed households in Nigeria appears to be rising steadily. The Nigerian Demographic and Health Survey (1999) shows that female-headed households have risen to 17 percent while male-headed households constitute 83 percent. When disaggregated by sector, urban areas still lead in the proportion of female-headed households with 19 percent, while rural areas record 16 percent

(NPC (Nigeria) 2000). The Nigerian Demographic and Health Survey (2003) indicate that male-headed households constitute 83.4 percent while female-headed households are 16.6 percent. The rural-urban distribution is 15 percent and 19 percent respectively (NPC (Nigeria) 2004).

Female-headed households are as different as the circumstances surrounding their emergence. Many scholars have observed the heterogeneous nature of female-headed households (e.g. Barros et al. 1997, Varley 1996, Kennedy and Peters 1992, and the Federal Office of Statistics 1996) and this heterogeneity may contribute to the problem of identification. In woman-maintained household, an absent male contributes so much to the maintenance of the household that the woman cannot be described as its economic mainstay. The woman in this case is described as a de facto head. She has only as much authority as the man delegates. She does not have the autonomy of the unacknowledged woman head whose male partner is only a symbolic head. However in the latter, an appropriate picture may not be given as the symbolic head may be identified as head. In the last category of woman-headed households, no male partner is present and the household is not dependent on the economic support of a man. Included in this category are widows, divorcees, never-married, but economically independent women, and other *de jure* heads. In spite of their heterogeneity, Barros et al. found that in the aggregate, female-headed households possess some characteristics significantly different from male-headed households. One of these is the tendency for the households to be over represented among the poor (Barros et al. 1997).

Different reasons have been given for the poverty of female-headed households. One of these is that female-headed households tend to have fewer wage earners and experience more discrimination in the labour market and inheritance patterns (Desai 1994). Another is the tendency of female heads to be less economically active and have less income earning capacity than their male counterpart (Barros et al. 1997). Female heads also tend to be less educated (Massiah 1983) and tend to have lower status than men. The vulnerability of female heads has also been attributed to women's past deficit in education and training, inadequate family laws and discrimination in economic policies and job opportunities (OAU 1992). The Beijing Platform for Action noted that "women's poverty is directly linked to the absence of economic opportunities and autonomy, lack of access to economic resources including credit, land ownership and inheritance, lack of access to education…and their minimal participation in the decision making process (U.N. 1995:22)".

It cannot be overemphasized that education is an empowering tool. It affects the status of women and impacts on the welfare of their children and families. The more education an African mother has, the more likely it is that her girl child will go to school and the greater the chances that she will engage in behaviour that will enhance her reproductive health (OAU 1992). Illiteracy and low education, which are common among African women, are indicative of their low status. Although young African women have better opportunities than their mothers had, cultural attitudes and poverty still keep many young women from entering or continuing formal and non-formal education.

Another characteristic of female-headed households is the lack of free time and leisure. For African women who work for about 16 to 18 hours daily, it is extremely difficult to spend time with their children or to have any leisure. Yet, it has been documented that free time is an essential resource for enhancing women's social, cultural, economic and political participation, and that women need leisure for reflection and renewal of their physical and emotional energies (OAU 1992) as well as supervision of their children's educational performance. As heads of households, women experience even more severe time constraints. They often combine housekeeping and other domestic work with income earning activities and supervision of children. However, the extent of the time constraint faced by a

female household head will depend on a number of factors including the number and the ages of children, the nature of her employment and her income level (which would determine her ability to engage paid domestic help). Female-headed households are likely to be smaller in size than male-headed households and are also likely to have smaller numbers of adults and children. The main cause of the smaller number of adults has been attributed to the fact that female heads very rarely co-reside with a spouse, while the majority of male heads live with their wives (Bongaarts, 2001).

Female-headed families or households come into existence for various reasons including migration. In Africa, male migration makes a woman the chief decision-maker in her family's daily life though the absentee husband may still be responsible for the family's economic support. Women, as independent migrants seeking wage jobs in the cities, can also become household heads. Other reasons for the emergence of female – headed households include women's economic and educational advancement, or loss of male income. The Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) has affected women negatively through the impact of changes in income and prices, in levels and composition of public expenditures and in working conditions (Young 1993). SAP has also adversely affected women as home managers through the reduction or abolition of subsidies for food and other basic goods. As mothers their role has been made more difficult by reduced social services and an unintended consequence of SAP is that many poor urban women have mobilized themselves in defense of their family interests (Stromquist 1999:27). In Nigeria where social services are highly inadequate and sometimes non-existent, SAP further impoverished families and increased the burden of women as caregivers and homemakers. Spousal death also leads to female headship.

Another factor responsible for female headship is single motherhood. In this category are female adults who have never been married but have children whom they single-handedly raise. Others are teenage or adolescent mothers, but these do not form female-headed families in the sense in which it is being considered in this study, if they and their children are being supported by family members and do not form separate households.

Data and Methods

The main study from which this report is extracted took place in Badagry, Mainland and Surulere local government areas of Lagos State, Nigeria. It gathered both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data was obtained from a survey, while qualitative data was obtained through focus group discussions and in-depth interview with female heads. The survey which involved 456 households had 1260 respondents comprising 599 responsible adults and 661children, out of whom 209 participated in written tests. The adults who were either heads of households or spouses of heads were 281 males and 318 females. In terms of headship, 63.2% and 36.8% of sampled households were male and female-headed respectively. This presentation however focuses on data from the 209 household heads and their children who wrote the tests as well as the qualitative data.

Sampling Technique

The sample was selected using a multi-staged random sampling technique. The first stage involved the use of clusters i.e. local government areas. Badagry, Surulere and Mainland were selected randomly (using stratified followed by simple random technique). The study was designed to take place at two levels- the household and the school. The goal was to reach household heads and their children using the household and/or school as point of entry. The simple random sampling technique was used to select the urban local government area where the household would be the entry point. Surulere was picked, thus

making the school the point of entry in Mainland Local Government Area. Badagry, being the only rural local government, had both entry points. The second stage was a further use of clusters to identify major settlements. The third stage involved the selection of enumeration areas from the identified settlements. Two enumeration areas were randomly selected from each settlement based on descriptive information from the National Population Commission. A total of 10 enumeration areas were selected in each local government area.

The fourth stage was the listing of streets/quarters in each enumeration area followed by the selection of two streets or quarters through a simple random sampling technique. The streets were identified with the aid of a street map during the pre-study visit. The systematic sampling technique was used to select houses on each street. Beginning with the first house (on the left and right) every third house was selected for the study. In each house, as many qualified households as were female-headed were included in the study. This was a deliberate strategy to include as many female headed households as possible in the study because of the expected low incidence of female headship. However, only one male-headed household was selected where they were more than one. For the selection here, the accidental technique, a non-probability sampling technique was used, as the availability and willingness of respondents were important factors.

Where members of more than one household demonstrated these, the simple random sampling technique determined which household to include. For the selection of schools where tests would be administered on students, and which would be the next entry point into households, the non-probability sampling technique was used. Specifically, one co-educational public secondary school was purposely selected in one rural and one urban local government area (Badagry and Mainland). Senior secondary one was purposely selected as the class from which respondents would be drawn. This was important because since children selected at this entry point were to be administered with tests in selected subjects, homogeneity in terms of level of study and quality of school is important.

Selecting Children for Tests

The selection of children respondents was done through a random sampling technique. In Badagry, the selected school had 168 students in the three arms of senior secondary one. Two classes had 58 students each while the third had 52. Selecting 40% from each class, 23 students were selected from each of the class of 58 and 21 from the class of 52 through a simple random sampling technique to give a total of 67 students. In Mainland, the selected school had 375 students spread across its five arms with 75 students in each class. Also selecting 40% using the process discussed above, 30 students were selected from each arm to give a total of 150 students. The selected 217 students participated in the test meant to measure their educational performance.

Following the children's interview and the administration of test, their households were visited and the head of household (or a responsible adult who may be a spouse or partner) was interviewed. Headship was decided based on preliminary questions on who performed which responsibility in the household, who took major decisions and who exercised moral authority. Only 209 household heads could be interviewed from the 217 children's households. Only such household heads and their children are included in this presentation.

The Research Instrument

Three instruments were used for the study. The Household Head and Spouses' Questionnaire (HHSQ) was the instrument administered on heads of households or spouses/partners as the case may be. It had

97 questions. It sought to gather information on the socio-economic background of respondents including sex, age, marital status, educational level, residence pattern, income, occupation and time usage. Other questions were on the structure of household and household responsibilities. The Children's Questionnaire (CQ) was used for children in households and schools. It had 30 questions and sought to gather information on the background of the children including age, sex, class, ethnic group, residence pattern, birth placement, and perception of headship among others. Others were on the performance of household responsibilities and parental involvement in children's education.

The test papers also constituted a set of instrument. The English Test Questionnaire (ETQ) and the Mathematics Test Questionnaire (MTQ) evaluated the students' ability in the two important subjects. The subjects are compulsory for all students and without a credit in both they cannot obtain admission into tertiary institutions. The test in English language was divided into four sections of five multiple choice questions each to give a total of 20 questions scored over 100. It contained questions on synonyms, antonyms, idiomatic expression and lexis. The test in Mathematics was also divided into four sections of five multiple choice questions each to give a total of 20 questions scored over 100. Questions were asked in the areas of means, fractions, probability and simultaneous equations. In order to further obtain a content validation of these questions, assessors who were teachers of the chosen subjects were asked to evaluate each question and determine the extent to which it was a valid measure of the concept being tested. For the qualitative data collected from female heads of households, an interview guide was used. Conversation was however largely allowed to flow according to the context. The in-depth discussion was meant to gather information on the structure and organization of the respondents' household, the welfare of the household, respondents' time usage as well as the educational performance of their children and their general experience. For the focus group discussion, there was a moderator guide that suggested issues to be used to initiate or stimulate discussion at various points.

Obtaining Qualitative Data

Focus Group Discussions (FGD) and in-depth interview were conducted in Badagry and Surulere local government areas because as locations for the household level of the study, they were relatively familiar terrains; a factor which was expected to aid the conduct of the qualitative study. For the in-depth interview, only female heads were included. A major reason was to understand the phenomenon of female headship and the challenges faced by female heads of households. The non-probability method was used here as the respondents were selected based on information on their status provided by neighbourhood informants. Twenty-five female heads were selected for the in-depth interview. Ten focus group discussions were organized with 40% held in Badagry and 60% in Surulere. This presentation however includes only the in-depth interview.

.

RESULTS

Structure and Characteristics of Households

About two-thirds (69.4 percent) of the investigated households were male–headed while only one-third (30.6 percent) was female-headed. This confirms the predominance of male-headed households as documented in the literature (Bongaarts 2001). The study found a number of differences in the structure and characteristics of male and female headed households as presented in Table 1. The mean age of male household heads (47.88) was higher than that of their female counterparts (43.95). Female–headed households tend to be smaller than male-headed households as the mean number of persons who live in

male-headed households is 7.23 compared with 6.33 in female-headed households. The mean number of children in male–headed households is 5.17 whereas it is 4.64 in female-headed households. This confirms that female-headed households tend to have fewer children than male-headed households. Male household heads are predominantly married (88.3 percent) while more than half of female heads (56.0) have marital status other than married (e.g. widowed, separated or divorced). Even those who are married do not live with their partners. This validates an earlier finding by Bongaarts (2001) who attributed the smaller size of female-headed households to the fact that female household heads rarely co-reside with a spouse whereas the majority of male heads live with their wives. The limitation of their resources may also restrain female heads from taking in relations. The educational levels attained by male and female household heads are similar although more males (43.4 percent) than females (39.1 percent) have higher education. Female heads have lower income than male heads that also tend to have partners/spouses engaged in income generating activities unlike female heads who are predominantly without partners.

Male and female household heads in the study spend comparable time on their income generating activities but female heads spend more time on domestic duties than their male counterparts. Table 1 shows that the representation of female heads increases as the number of hours spent on domestic duties increases. More than half of female heads(57.9 percent) spend above three hours on domestic duties while close to half of male heads(46.9 percent) have no domestic duties. This is sufficient reason for female heads not to have as much leisure as their male counterparts. Household heads in the study are predominantly rent paying tenants (67.6 and 64.1 percent of male and female heads respectively pay rent). The majority occupies multiroom apartments in which a household or family lives in one or more rooms. Multi room residences are often characterized by crowding and sharing of facilities. More female headed households (56.3 percent) live in these residences compared with 43.4 percent of male-headed households. The reverse is the case with larger accommodation where there is more privacy and households have more spatial autonomy in terms of grounds available for their use. More male-headed households (31.1 percent) live in such residences compared with 28.1 percent of female-headed households. More male–headed households (25.5 percent) compared to female-headed households (15.6 percent) occupy blocks of flats which are characterized by exclusive use of facilities and are more expensive than multiroom apartments. There is a wider gap in terms of the ownership of means of transportation with three quarters (75 percent) of female heads owing no means of transportation compared with over half (55.9)of male heads.

Responsibilities of household heads

A consideration of the responsibilities of household heads shows that household heads are responsible for tangible, financially measurable responsibilities as well as less tangible and less measurable responsibilities which often tend to be more time consuming. Male heads of households however tend to have more support than female heads for the tangible responsibilities. Table 2 shows that household heads predominantly bear responsibility for house rent, school fees, hospital bills, electricity bills, purchase of children's school books and uniforms and attendance of parents teachers' meetings. For these various responsibilities, between 20 and over 38 percent of male heads indicated that the responsibilities were performed with their spouses. However only between 11 and 17 percent of female heads performed these responsibilities with their partners. Joint involvement of male heads and partners is more dominant than heads' sole involvement in the purchase of children's other clothing, supervision of school work and hospital runs. These responsibilities were solely borne by female heads in their households. The table also shows greater involvement of female heads in time consuming

responsibilities such as school runs and laundry. There are gendered patterns in some responsibilities as the table shows that household shopping and cooking are done predominantly by spouses of male heads and female heads. Activities such as fetching of water, washing of dishes and other cleaning tasks are done predominantly by older children and relatives. What is apparent in terms of household responsibilities is that female heads of households often bear tangible responsibilities borne by male heads but because they are often without partners, they also bear non-tangible responsibilities borne by spouses of male heads.

Gender of Household head and children's educational performance

The result of the tests administered on children whose household heads are being investigated shows that the assumption that children in a particular household would perform better than those in other households is not true for all circumstances. Table 3.1 shows the distribution of children respondents by mean scores in English Language, Standard Deviation and Standard Error by type of household. Although the table shows that children in male-headed households have a mean score of 51.00 in English language while those in Female-headed households have a mean score of 51.63, the t-test for equality of means (see Table 3.2) shows that the mean difference of –63 is not statistically significant at 95% interval. We assume equal variances because of the lack of statistical significance ($p>0.05$).

Table 3.3, which shows the distribution of children by mean scores in Mathematics, Standard Deviation, and Standard Error by type of household, also shows differences in the mean scores. Children in male-headed households have a mean score of 49.24 in Mathematics, while those in female-headed households have 54.30. Table 3.4 however shows that the mean difference of –5.06 is not statistically significant. The table also shows that the variances in the scores for Mathematics are equal for children in both households because of the lack of statistical significance ($p>0.05$). The decision rule is to assume equal variances if the probability value is not statistically significant.

Although not statistically significant, the data shows that for both school subjects, children in female-headed households have higher mean scores than those in male-headed households. The meaning of the result is that the differences in the academic performance of the children respondents are not serious enough to permit a prediction that children in one household perform better than those in the other. However it is surprising that the children of female-headed households did not perform more poorly but rather tended towards a higher (although not significant) performance. This supports our thesis that merely being a male or female head does not translate into ability or inability of one's children for excellent performance. This debunks the stereotype that children in female-headed households will exhibit maladjustment in their educational performance.

It underscores the argument that certain support factors may interact with the gender of household head to make conditions different for children in his or her household. It is important to consider other factors dependent on the household, which may affect the educational performance of children. Some of these factors include children's regularity at school, amount of time children have to do homework, adults' supervision and discussion of children's studies, children's access to books and materials needed in school and parent's ability to pay school fees and other dues. Others are parents' level of education, income, time spent at work, time spent on domestic duties and time spent with children.

Household head's level of education and children's educational performance

According to the literature on educational performance, one of the important variables in parental background, which often affects children's performance, is their level of formal education. Parents with

a high level of education tend to attach greater value to education than parents with low or no education. The higher value often translates to a willingness to commit more resources into children's education and provide other forms of support, which can enhance children's educational performance. Oloko (2003) noted that relatively educated parents tend to protect their children from work or provide remedial lessons for them while highly educated parents employ young domestics but keep their own children in school.

This study shows a positive relationship between parents' level of education and children's educational performance measured by their scores in the tests. Table 4.1 shows that the higher the level of parental education, the higher the mean scores of children in both English and Mathematics. The computed analysis of variance (ANOVA) shows that the difference in the scores of the children for English by parent's level of education is significant ($F=4.818$, $df=3$, $p<0.01$). That of Mathematics is also significant ($F= 2.960$, $df=3$, $p<0.05$). The relationship is however stronger for English than for Mathematics as reflected in the p values (See Table 4.1).

When the tests' scores were further disaggregated by sex of parents by level of education, similar patterns emerged. The scores of children in both subjects increased as the level of education of their parent increased. The study underscores the importance of formal education for women, because except for those who had no formal education, Tables 4.2 and 4.3 show that the scores of children whose mothers were the responsible adults were higher at every level of education than those of children whose fathers were the responsible adults. For both male and female responsible adults, the gaps in the scores of children were wider between those whose parents had no formal education and those who had primary education than they were among those whose parents had some measure of education (primary, secondary or higher). However, when the mean scores were disaggregated by education and sex of responsible adult, only the differences in the mean scores in Mathematics were significant ($F=4.372$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$).

Other factors and children's educational performance

Adult's supervision

Adult's supervision is a support factor for children in all households. When parents or guardians take time to supervise children or wards in the areas of school home work and their studies in general, the children stand to benefit. Supervision is an indication of adults' interest in children's education and it fosters children's understanding of what had been taught in school especially when the supervising adult has sufficient education to assist the child. It is also possible for older siblings or paid persons to supervise children's studies.

The research shows that the performance of children is influenced by whether or not they had people to supervise their studies. Regardless of the type of household in which children reside, supervision of their academic activities tends to give them an edge over those who do not experience such a support factor. We note however that a lower proportion of children in female-headed households (78.1%) enjoy supervision compared with male-headed households (91.0%) although more female heads had indicated that they supervised their children's studies. In English Language (Table 5.1), children who had supervision in male and female-headed households had mean scores of 51.55 and 53.58 respectively compared with children who lacked such supervision with mean scores of 45.38 and 44.64 respectively. The difference in the scores of children in female-headed household is significant with $F=4.442$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$. This shows that supervision is important to the performance of children in these households. In

other words, a lack of adult supervision is a crucial reason for poor performance among children in female-headed households. In Mathematics (Table 5.2), we note a lack of statistical significance in the difference in the scores of those who had supervision and those who did not in both households.

The lack of statistical significance however does not mean a lack of sociological significance. The higher scores of children with supervision in both households show that children's performance is enhanced by further supervision whether it is given by any of the parents, older siblings or paid persons such as tutors. In the in-depth interview with female heads, it was acknowledged that supervision was beneficial to children. Parents, who could, preferred to supervise their children while those who could not for reasons of work or lack of time encouraged older siblings to do so. Teachers were also engaged to take children in after-school lessons where parents could afford the fees.The fact that more female heads take direct charge of the supervision of their children's school work as shown in Table 2 is a source of strength for children of such households. This singular reason may explain why children in female-headed households consistently have higher scores than those in male-headed households even though the differences in such scores may not be statistically significant. Table 2 shows that a little over one quarter of male heads supervised their children's work directly while a similar proportion said they did so with their spouses. In female-headed households, close to half supervised their children's work. Though more children in male-headed household (91.0%) compared with female-headed households (78.1%) (Tables 5.1 and 5.2) claimed that they enjoyed supervision; it is important who does the supervision. The fact that about one-third and close to half of those who give supervision in male and female-headed households respectively are older siblings, relations and others in the household means that household heads may not be able to guarantee the effectiveness of such supervision. It is however arguable that such supervision is better than no supervision at all.

It is instructive that more female heads than males indicated that they supervised and inspected their children's schoolwork. This could be because of the expectation expressed by the interviewees that women should take charge of their children's affairs because they are often blamed for their failure. The fact that their children's failure will fulfill societal expectation was a major reason why female heads in in-depth interview expressed concern for their children's studies.

Regular school attendance

Regular school attendance prevents children from missing lessons taught in school and enhances their chances of good performance. Children who miss school due to illness, truancy or other reasons cannot be in the same state of preparedness for class test or examination as children who are regular in school. Table 6.1 shows that for English Language and in male-headed households, children who do not miss school have higher Mean scores (52.86) than those who miss school (47.87). The same pattern is visible in female –headed households with 53.22 and 49.44 for those who do not miss school and those who do respectively. In male-headed households, this difference in the scores of those who miss school and those who do not is statistically significant ($p<0.05$), while in female-headed households, it is not.

The scores in Mathematics (Table 6.2) also show that children in female-headed households have higher mean scores (54.30) than those in male-headed households (49.29). When considered on the basis of whether or not they miss school, children in female-headed households have higher scores in each category. As it obtained in English, the difference in the mean scores in Mathematics is significant for

children in male-headed households ($p<0.05$) whereas it is not significant ($p>0.05$) for children in female-headed households. It is possible that the difference in the number of those who miss school and those who do not (37.2% and 62.8% respectively in male-headed households) and 42.2% and 57.8% in female-headed households could have influenced the level of significance. More children miss school in female than male – headed households. This suggests that female-headed households are households in need of attention. Where such households lack support factors, the education of the children can be negatively affected.

Going by Oloko (1993)'s finding that due to irregular school attendance, children miss class tests with consequent low scholastic achievement, it means that if children in female-headed households had more regular attendance they were likely to have performed even better. Deprivation in female-headed households can affect children's school attendance. The study has shown that children participate actively in housework. If this is done without the best interest of the children, it can affect their school attendance with implications for their performance.

Availability of time for home work

It is essential that children have time to play and explore, but it is also important that they have time to study. The pattern discernible in Table 7.1 allows an inference that the more time children have to study and do their homework, the better their educational performance. In male-headed households, children who had as much time as they needed to do their homework had the highest mean score in English (53.09), followed by those who had barely enough time (51.77). Those who had very little time had the lowest mean score (42.60). The Analysis of Variance ($F= 6.239$, $df=2$, $p<0.05$) shows that there is a statistical significance. The same pattern is discernible in the scores of children in Mathematics (Table 7.2) with students who had as much time as was needed having a mean score of 52.53 while those who had barely enough time and very little time had 47.90 and 39.20 respectively with $F=5.572$, $df=2$, $p<0.05$.

Although the mean scores for children in female-headed households were higher than those in male-headed households in both subjects, the pattern discerned in the scores of children in the latter is absent in the former. In each subject, there is no statistical significance in the scores of the students. This however does not diminish the importance of sufficient time dedicated to their homework in the performance of children in female-headed households. The fact that children in female-headed households are fewer can actually influence the statistical significance.

Access to books

The access of children to books and other materials needed in school is often dependent on their parents' capacity to provide these. If children get sent out of school or cannot participate in class because they do not have required materials, they will not be able to give their best performance.

In both male and female-headed households, Table 8.1 shows that children who lacked access to books and other materials needed for their academic work have lower mean scores than those who did not suffer such lack. There is however no statistically significant difference in their scores.

Although Table 8.2 shows that a statistical significance ($F=7.374$, $df=1$ $p<0.05$) is only obtained for Mathematics among children in male-headed households, the pattern discernible in the scores of children in both households and in both subjects indicates that access to books and other materials can influence the performance of children. The lack of statistical significance does not diminish the finding because of the use of triangulation in the study. In the in-depth interview with female heads of households they acknowledged their inability to buy books and other necessary materials for their

children. Although this lack may be higher among children in female-headed households it is not peculiar to them. Children may experience a lack in terms of books and other materials, regardless of the type of household, if their parents are poor or if they do not prioritize education. The implication of this is that the economic empowerment of parents is a major step in eradicating the deprivation of children especially with regard to providing for their educational needs. Household heads with financial support are better equipped to provide for their children's needs than those who lack this support.

Parents' Ability to pay Fees

Parents' ability to pay school fees and other dues (and pay on time) influences the number of times children get sent out of school or the number of times they are barred from receiving lessons. This way, it indirectly influences their educational performance. As it was with English Language, Table 9.2 indicates that children whose parents had no difficulty paying their school fees and other dues recorded higher mean scores than those whose parents had difficulty. This time however, statistical significance exists only in the scores of children in male-headed households ($F=6.099$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$).

The closeness in the scores of children in male-headed households in English and that of children in female-headed households in Mathematics could be responsible for the lack of statistical significance in each case. The qualitative data however confirm that a relationship does exist between parents' ability to pay fees and children's performance. The in-depth interview revealed that limited resources constrain female heads to send their children to low quality schools or withdraw them. This is related to Oloko (2003)'s observation that reasons for dropping out of school either at the primary or secondary level were associated with finance and health. She noted that incidental expenses such as uniform, transportation and school material tests were often unaffordable for parents. The finding further confirms that the economic empowerment of parents is a primary influence of the quality of education that their children will receive.

Challenges of female household heads: In-depth Interview Analysis

The analysis of the in-depth interview with female household heads shows that the 25 women interviewed became household heads because of circumstances rather than by choice. Widows constituted the single largest group (13) followed by divorced women (4). There were three women in polygynous relationships and three were separated from their spouses while two had never been married. The women perceived headship as a male responsibility but opined that circumstances could thrust household headship on a woman. These circumstances include spousal death, divorce, separation or in the words of one interviewee, "when a woman has no husband but has children and has to provide for them". Another middle-aged interviewee in clear reference to what she sees as a consequence of polygyny said "when a man has many wives, nobody tells a woman that she has to work hard to provide for her own children. The man is for everybody but the children are for her".

Economic sustenance of their households was a priority issue for the interviewees. A common submission of all of them is the need for them to work hard to be able to provide for their children. The economic problem was most severe among *de jure* heads (widows, divorced and separated women) who did not enjoy spousal support. Though de facto heads (women who lived apart from their spouses because of polygyny or economic migration) admitted that they received financial support from their absent spouses, this was generally considered inadequate, hence the need for them to augment.

The economic situation of female heads was particularly difficult if they had many children or had children in school. School fees and levies and the provision of books and other materials needed in school constitute a challenge for female household heads. Some indicated that they had to change their children to schools with minimal demands. The situation was however less difficult for those who had grown-up children who supported them financially. It was the opinion of widows in particular that their economic situation would have been better with their husbands alive. Other categories of interviewees especially those who had one problem or the other with their spouses did not think so. Although they conceded that it was better for spouses to run a household together, they noted that a man's presence does not always guarantee economic support for the woman and her children. A woman who had been married for close to 20 years before her separation said "If a woman has no husband, at least she knows she does not have. It is better than living with a man and struggling as if you live alone"

Another issue of concern common to female heads was that of discipline and authority in the household. Though many of the women felt that they were in control and had no problem of respect from their children, they believed that their children would have respected their fathers more and recognized their authority. There was a strong perception among the interviewees that children feared their fathers more. Many of the interviewees equated a child's ability to perform household tasks as good home training. As in the issue of economic support, more than other categories of women, the widows expressed more sentiments that their spouses would have been better figures of moral authority. The quality of the relationship between other categories of women and their estranged partners or their experience with them could have made them less sentimental. Generally however, the interviewees believed that fathers and mothers have complementary qualities which they bring into their relationship with their children and that parents have more influence on children of their sex. Udegbe (1997) had earlier referred to the assumption in parenting that parents often have stronger influence on children of the same sex than those of opposite sex.

The interviewees believed that it was ideal for children to be brought up by both parents but they had no doubt that a woman could bring up children alone successfully. They observed that this may entail some difficulties but noted that the woman needs to be determined and firm. In the words of a widow " women can bring up children on their own if they are strict, good disciplinarians that do not accept any nonsense… and would scold a child as and when due". The education of children was considered very important by the women such that in discussing their children none failed to mention the issue. In spite of the primacy of the economic sustenance of the woman's household, it was a common submission that women needed to create time to supervise their children's studies or get others to do so. They believe that financial constraints may hinder children's education and they all try to prevent this especially because of the assumption that they will be held responsible for how their children turn out. An interviewee put it succinctly when she said "I don't want my children to fail in life because they will say it is because their father and I did not stay together". The resolve that their children will not fail thereby fulfilling society's expectation of the maladjustment of children brought up by mothers only is at the root of the women's commitment to their children. This is not surprising as the women (except widows who enjoy some sympathy) contend with negative social beliefs that portray them as non-conformists for not being married or remaining in their marriages.

The need to give maximum attention to their children was a common reason why widows did not remarry. In various ways the widows expressed the view that remarriage would create problems for them rather than help them. A widow said "I don't have any partner because I have enough

responsibility to think about". The perception of marriage as an avenue for procreation must have influenced the widows' outlook as they wondered why they should have remarried when they had enough children. This is aside the opinion that a husband will require their attention and cause them to have less time for their children.

Implications for development

The concept of development has changed both in its definition and scope. In development programming, issues of equity and equality in the distribution of the gains from developing efforts have been the focus in recent years. The realization and consensus that human beings are at the core of development led to the concept of human development. This concept emphasizes the enlargement of people's choices through the expansion of their human capabilities and functioning. The three essential capabilities for human development are for people to lead long and healthy lives, to be knowledgeable and to have a decent standard of living (UNDP 2004:13).

The right to education is one of the fundamental rights of a person. Knowledge, one of the dimensions of human development is measured by enrolment rates at all levels of education and adult literacy level. There is a positive correlation between education and development. The more developed a society, the more access people have to education and vice-versa. The significance of education is such that it influences the other two dimensions of human development. Education, through the prevention of diseases and sicknesses, can ensure long and healthy life, as well as provide access to a decent standard of living. Given its significance, men and women should have equal access to education at all levels. In principle, there is equal access to education for male and female but gender inequality manifests through the greater priority attached to male education in general. Gender inequality is a hindrance to human development in so far as it disempowers people from attaining these capabilities. The manifestation of gender inequality in one sector has implications for other sectors. The perception of female education as being of secondary importance relative to their traditional role of child bearers contributed to the low priority for female education. Ironically, maternal education improves the health of infants and children and ensures a better quality of life for household members. The education of women is closely associated with child mortality. The under-five mortality rate is more than twice as high for children of illiterate mothers as for children whose mothers have completed middle school (UNDP 2005:20).

This study also underscores the importance of education as a development issue. The benefits of education are not limited to the immediate recipient but can be multiplied through the impact on the family of the recipient. Educated parents tend to show more interest in their children's education and they are empowered to support their children's education. They tend to place a high premium on their children's education and are in a better position to guide them than uneducated parents. Education is particularly important for mothers who spend more time with children and tend to have much influence on them. The study shows that children's educational performance increases with the level of education of their parents. Mothers' education in particular affected their children's education. Female household heads also show a commitment to their children's education through their supervision of their children's school work. Their ability to supervise their children depends among other things on their level of education. If they had more time and more economic resources, they would be able to give their children better supervision. The implication of this is that there is the need to empower household heads if their children must access knowledge, which is an important measure of human development.

The ability of household heads to provide support for their children's education affects and is affected by the country's level of progress towards the achievement of the first three Millennium Development

Goals (MDGs) namely to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; achieve universal primary education and promote gender equality and empower women. Nigeria is yet to achieve any of these three goals but attitude towards female education is changing and recent trends in enrolment into primary schools in Nigeria show consistent increase for both male and female. Primary school enrolment rate is however higher for boys (56%) than that of girls (44%). Completion rates for boys have been higher than that of girls. At the secondary level, enrolment rate is higher for males than females (National Planning Commission 2005: 14, 19-20).

Education can liberate from poverty and foster social mobility so to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, education must be prioritized. For female headed households which tend to be poorer, education and the acquisition of skills can help household heads to provide for their households, especially their children. The study shows that children's access to books and materials and regularity in school depend on the ability of the head of household to provide necessary assistance. Contrary to the stereotype that children in female-headed households are likely to have poor educational performance, the study shows that these children can perform just as well as children in other households. With the commitment of female heads of households, if their children could attend school more regularly and have all the essential materials, they would perform better than other category of children. This means that female-headed households are households in need of attention if their children must have opportunities for self actualization.

References

Aron, R. (1965): ***Main Currents in Sociological Thought***; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Barros, R; Fox, L & Mendunca, R (1997) "Female Headed Households, Poverty and Welfare of Children in Urban Brazil" **Economic Development and Cultural Change** Vol. 45, Number 2, Jan. 1997, pp. 231-257.

Blumberg, R. L. and Kathreen Pethan (1994): 'The Intersection of Family Gender and Economy in the Developing World', ***International Year of the Family***, Occasional Paper Series No. 9, 1994; Vienna: United Nations.

Bongaarts, J., (2001): Household size and composition in the Developing World. Population Council Working Papers Series. No. 144.

Buvinic, N. and Gupta, G. R. (1993): 'Responding to insecurity in the 1990s: Targeting woman-headed and woman-maintained families in developing countries'. Paper presented at the International Workshop on ***Insecurity in the 1990s: Gender and Social Policy in an International Perspective;*** April 1993, London: London School of Economics and European Association of Development Institutes.

Desai, S (1994) "Women's Burden: Easing the Structural Constraints" in Sen, G;Germain, A and Chen, L (eds) 1994 Population Policies Reconsidered: Health, Empowerment and Rights (Harvard Centre for Population and Development Studies and International Women's Health Coalition. New York.

Engels, F. (1972): ***The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State***; Pathfinder (translated by Reed, Evelyn) First published 1884; Hottingen-Zurich: Zodiac/Brian Basgen.

Federal Office of Statistics (1996): 'The Nigerian Household 1995' Summary of results from the ***National Integrated Survey of Households*** (NISH); Lagos: Federal Office of Statistics, Federal Government of Nigeria.

Haralambos, M., Holborn, M. and Heald, R. (2000): ***Sociology: Themes and Perspectives,*** London: HarperCollins Publishers Limited.

Hess, B; Merkson, E and Stein, P. (1993): ***Sociology*** 4th edition, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Kennedy, E & Peters, P (1992): 'Household Food Security and Child Nutrition: The Interaction of Income and Gender of Household Head', ***World Development*** Vol. 20, Number 8, 1992.

Kimmel S. M with Amy Aronson (2000): ***The Gendered Society***, New York: Oxford University Press.

Lengermann, P. M. and Niebrugge – Brantley, J. (1993): 'Contemporary Feminist Theory' in Ritzer, G**.** (1993): ***Contemporary Sociological Theories*** 3rd edition, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Massiah, J (1983): ***Women as Heads of Household in the Caribbean Family Structure and Feminine Status***, UNESCO: Essex.

National Population Commission (Nigeria). 2000. ***Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey*** *1999.* Calverton, Maryland: National Population Commission and ORC/Macro.

National Population Commission (NPC) (Nigeria) and ORC Macro. 2004. ***Nigerian Demographic and Health Survey*** 2003. Calverton, Maryland: National Population Commission and ORC Macro.

National Panning Commission (2005) ***Nigeria: Millennium Development Goals*** 2005 Report. Abuja: NPC

OAU (1992): 'Africa's Women and Girl Children: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage' in Africa's Children Africa's Future. Background sectoral paper prepared by the OAU and UNICEF for the ***OAU International Conference on Assistance to African Children***. Dakar, Senegal. 25 – 27 Nov. 1997.

Oloko, S.B.A. (1993): 'Children's Street Trading in Nigeria as Adaptation and Maladaptation to Socio-Economic Circumstances' ***International Journal of Behavioural Development*** Vol. 16, No. 3, September, pp. 465-482.

Olusanya, P. O. (1985): ***A Handbook of Demographic Research Methods for African Students***, Lagos: Olu-Nla Publications.

Ono-Osaki, K (1991): 'Female Headed Households in Developing Countries: By Choice or By Circumstances' ***Demographic Household Survey,*** World Conference 1991, United Nations: Population Division, pp. 1603-1616.

Oyekanmi, F. A. D (1993): 'Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Household and Respondents: Migrants and Non-Migrants' ***Nigeria Migration and Urbanization Survey,*** 1993. NISER, Ibadan.

.Schlyter, A. (1989): ***Women Householders and Housing Strategy: the case of George, Zambia***, Gaule: The National Institute of Building Research.

Seidman, S. (1994). Contested Knowledge: Social Theory in the Post Modern Era (3rd edition). Blackwell: USA pp236-254

Stromquist, N. P. (1999): 'The Impact of Structural Adjustment Programmes in Africa and Latin America' in Heward, C. and Bunwaree, S. (eds.) (1999): ***Gender, Education and Development***; pp. 17-32; London: Zed Books Ltd.

UNDP (2005) ***Summary Human Development Report 2005; International Cooperation at a Crossroads: Aid, trade and security in an unequal world.*** New York: UNDP

UNDP Nigeria (2004) ***HIV and AIDS: A Challenge to Sustainable Human*** Development***. Human Development Report Nigeria 2004***. Abuja: UNDP.

United Nations (1995): **Draft Platform for Action, Fourth World Conference on Women**, 4-15 September 1995, Beijing, China.

Varley, A. (1996): 'Women Heading Households: Some more Equal than others?' ***World Development*** Vol. 24, Number 3, March 1996.

Wingood, G.M. and Diclemente, R.J. (2000). Application of the Theory of Gender and Power to Examine HIV-Related Exposures, Risk Factors and Effective Interventions for Women. ***Health Education and Behaviour***, Vol. 27, No. 5, 539-565. 2000: Society for Public Health Education.

Young, K. (1993): ***Planning Development with Women: Making a World of Difference;*** London: Macmillan.

TABLE 1: CHARACTERISTICS AND STRUCTURE OF MALE AND FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS

Characteristic	Male-headed Household N = 145	Female-headed Household N= 64
Mean age of head	47.88	43.95
Mean age at first marriage	27.50	22.05
Mean no of persons in household	7.23	6.33
Mean no. of children in household	5.17	4.64
Percentage distribution of heads by marital status		
Married	88.3	42.2
Divorced	2.8	3.1
Separated	3.4	20.3
Widowed	2.8	32.9
Never married	2.0	
Cohabiting	.7	1.6
Percentage distribution of heads by highest level of education		
No formal education	4.1	3.1
Primary education	15.9	18.8
Secondary education	34.5	39.1
Higher Education	43.4	39.1
Percentage distribution of heads by income		
>N10, 000	29.0	42.2
N10, 000-N20, 499	31.0	31.2
N20, 500-N30, 499	17.9	12.5
N30, 500-N40, 000	7.6	6.3
<N40, 000	14.5	7.8
Percentage distribution of heads by whether spouse works for an income		
Yes	86.2	40.6
No	2.8	3.2
Not applicable	11.0	56.2
Percentage distribution of heads by time spent on domestic duties daily		
No domestic duties	46.9	7.8
>1 hour	9.7	10.9
1-2hours	30.3	23.4
<3 hours	13.1	57.9
Percentage distribution of heads by time spent at income generating activities		
>7 hours	11.0	14.1
7 hours	14.5	12.5
8-9 hours	40.0	37.5
<9 hours	34.5	35.9
Percentage distribution of head's status in residence		
Owner-occupier	26.2	31.2
Rent-paying tenant	67.6	64.1
Non-paying tenant	6.2	4.7
Percentage distribution of type of residence		
Multi-room apartment	43.4	56.3
Block of flat	25.5	15.6
Others with own grounds E.g. detached houses, Bungalow etc	31.1	28.1

Percentage distribution of heads by ownership of means of transportation		
Car	26.9	18.8
Motorcycle	13.5	3.0
Bicycle	.7	
Bus	3.0	3.2
None	55.9	75.0

TABLE 2: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MALE AND FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS BY RESPONSIBILITIES

Responsibility	Self	Spouse	Self & spouse	Self & older children	Older children & relatives	Paid persons
Rent						
Male-headed	67.0	12.7	20.3			
Female -headed	70.1	18.9	11.0			
Payment of sch. fees						
Male-headed	67.6	4.8	26.2	1.4		
Female –headed	62.5	7.8	21.9	7.8		
Payment of hospital bills						
Male-headed	57.9	5.5	33.8	2.8		
Female –headed	64.1	10.9	17.1	7.9		
Payment of electricity bills						
Male-headed	81.4	6.9	11.0	.7		
Female –headed	71.9	14.1	12.5	1.5		
Purchase of school uniforms						
Male-headed	47.6	11.0	38.6	2.8		
Female –headed	78.1	6.3	12.5	3.1		
Purchase of school books						
Male-headed	57.9	6.2	34.5	1.4		
Female –headed	71.9	9.4	17.2	1.5		
Purchase of children's other clothing						
Male-headed	38.7	9.7	48.8	2.8		
Female –headed	71.9	13.9	14.2			
Supervising children's school work						
Male-headed	26.9	11.0	27.6	4.1	30.4	
Female –headed	43.8	3.1	10.9	11.0	31.2	
Hospital runs						
Male-headed	31.7	19.3	33.8	12.4	2.8	
Female –headed	57.8	7.8	6.3	18.7	9.4	
Taking children to school						
Male-headed	22.1	22.8	11.3	38.9	4.9	
Female –headed	37.5	3.1		46.9	12.5	
Picking children from school						
Male-headed	15.2	14.7	8.0	52.4	9.7	
Female –headed	34.4	1.7		51.4	12.5	

Owns laundry						
Male-headed	13.8	26.9	6.9	46.9	5.5	
Female –headed	45.3	4.7		43.8	6.2	
Attendance of PTA meetings						
Male-headed	51.7	18.6	26.2	3.5		
Female –headed	62.5	10.9	9.4	17.2		
Cooking meals						
Male-headed	9.0	56.6	3.4	24.1	6.9	
Female –headed	56.3	9.4	1.6	28.0	4.7	
Washing dishes						
Male-headed	2.1	8.2	2.1		78.6	9.0
Female –headed	4.7	3.0		3.2	76.6	12.5
Fetching water						
Male-headed		4.3	2.3	2.3	75.9	13.2
Female –headed	6.3	3.1		1.6	70.3	18.7
Cleaning house						
Male-headed	2.8	7.6	2.5	2.8	70.4	13.9
Female –headed	4.5	1.6		4.5	79.7	9.7
Shopping						
Male-headed	21.3	46.2	13.1	1.4	15.9	
Female –headed	62.5	7.8	10.9	6.3	11.0	1.6

Table 3.1: Distribution of children respondents by mean scores in English Language, Standard Deviation (SD) and Standard Error by type of household headship

	Type of Household Headship	N	Mean Score	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total score for English test	Male headed	145	51.00	13.66	1.13
	Female headed	64	51.63	14.40	1.80

Table 3.2: T-test for equality of means in English Language

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance		t-test for equality of means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig (2 tailed)	Mean Difference
Total score for English test	Equal variances assumed	.003	.959	-300	207	.765	-.63

Table 3.3: Distribution of children respondents by mean scores in Mathematics, Standard Deviation (SD) and Standard Error by type of household headship

	Type of Household Headship	N	Mean Score	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total score for Mathematics test	Male headed	145	49.24	18.37	1.53
	Female headed	64	54.30	17.55	2.19

Table 3.4 T-test for equality of means in Mathematics

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance		t-test for equality of means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig (2 tailed)	Mean Difference
Total score for Math test Equal variances assumed	.396	.530	-1.859	207	.065	-5.06

Table 4.1 Distribution of children respondents by mean scores in English Language and Mathematics, S.D., Std. Error of Mean and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) by Parents' Highest Level of Education

Parent's Highest level of Education		**Children's Total Score For English**	**Children's Total Score Mathematics**
No formal Education	Mean Score N Std. Dev. Std. Error of mean	35.63 8 12.082 4.272	35.00 8 13.628 4.818
Primary Education	Mean Score N Std. Dev. Std. Error of mean	47.94 34 14.777 2.534	47.34 34 17.591 3.017
Secondary Education	Mean Score N Std. Dev. Std. Error of mean	52.43 76 13.626 1.563	51.32 76 16.028 1.839
Higher Education	Mean Score N Std. Dev. Std. Error of mean	52.74 91 12.987 1.361	53.02 91 19.859 2.082
Total	Mean Score N Std. Dev. Std. Error of mean	51.19 209 13.861 .959	50.79 209 18.233 1.26

ANOVA: English F=4.818, df=3, p<0.01 Mathematics F=2.960, df=3, p<0.05

Table 4.2: Distribution of children respondents by mean scores in English, S.D and ANOVA by sex of parent by level of education

Sex of Parent	Highest level of Education	Mean Score	N	Std. Dev.
Male	No formal education	35.83	6	13.934
	Primary education	47.50	22	15.943
	Secondary education	51.74	46	12.702
	Higher Education	52.27	64	12.753
	Total	50.62	138	13.662
Female	No formal education	35.00	2	7.071
	Primary education	48.75	12	12.990
	Secondary education	53.50	30	15.09
	Higher Education	53.85	27	13.708
	Total	52.31	71	14.271
Total	No formal education	35.63	8	12.082
	Primary education	47.94	34	14.777
	Secondary education	52.43	76	13.626
	Higher Education	52.74	91	12.987
	Total	51.19	209	13.861

ANOVA=.699, df=1, p>0.05

Table 4.3: Distribution of children respondents by mean scores in Mathematics, S.D and ANOVA by sex of parent by level of education

Sex of Parent	Highest level of Education	Mean Score	N	Std. Dev.
Male	No formal education	33.67	6	14.376
	Primary education	45.91	22	18.234
	Secondary education	48.91	46	16.122
	Higher Education	51.09	64	20.538
	Total	48.91	138	18.657
Female	No formal education	30.00	2	14.142
	Primary education	50.00	12	16.787
	Secondary education	55.00	30	15.425
	Higher Education	57.59	27	17.671
	Total	54.44	71	16.915
Total	No formal education	35.00	8	13.628
	Primary education	47.35	34	17.591
	Secondary education	51.32	76	16.028
	Higher Education	53.02	91	19.859
	Total	50.79	209	18.233

ANOVA – F=4.372, df=1, p<0.05

Table 5.1: Distribution of respondents by mean scores in English Language, S.D. and ANOVA by type of household headship by adults' supervision of children's studies

Male Headed Household	Does anyone supervise and discuss your studies with you?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	132 (91.0%) 13 (9.0%) 145	51.55 45.38 51.00	13.41 15.47 13.66
	F= 2.436, df=1,	**P>0.05**		
Female Headed Household	Does anyone supervise and discuss your studies with you?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	50 (78.1%) 14 (21.9%) 64	53.58 44.64 51.63	14.83 10.46 14.40
	F= 4.442, df=1,	**P<0.05**		

Table 5.2: Distribution of respondents by mean scores in Mathematics, S.D. and ANOVA by type of household headship by adults' supervision of children's studies

Male Headed Household	Does anyone supervise and discuss your studies with you?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	132 (91.0%) 13 (9.0%) 145	49.96 41.92 49.24	18.56 15.07 18.37
	F= 2.286, df=1,	**P>0.05**		
Female Headed Household	Does anyone supervise and discuss your studies with you	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	50 (78.1%) 14 (21.9%) 64	56.00 48.21 54.30	16.87 19.18 17.55
	F= 2.195, df=1,	**P>0.05**		

Table 6.1: Distribution of respondents by mean scores in English Language, S.D. and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) by type of household headship by children's school attendance

Male Headed Household	Do you sometimes miss school?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	54(37.2%) 91(62.8%) 145	47.87 52.86 51.11	14.36 12.96 13.66
	F=4.629, df=1,	**P<0.05**		
Female Headed Household	Do you sometimes miss school?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	27(42.2%) 37(57.8%) 64	49.44 53.22 51.63	12.27 15.75 14.40
	F=1.072, df=1,	**P>0.05**		

Table 6.2: Distribution of respondents by mean scores in Mathematics, S.D. and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) by type of household headship by children's school attendance

Male Headed Household	Do you sometimes miss school?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	54(37.2%) 91(62.8%) 145	42.87 53.02 49.24	15.31 19.06 18.37
	F=11.068, df=1,	**P<0.05**		
Female Headed Household	Do you sometimes miss school?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	27 (42.2%) 37 (57.8%) 64	53.52 54.86 54.30	17.14 18.05 17.55
	F=. 091, df=1,	**P>0.05**		

Table 7.1: Distribution of respondents by mean scores in English Language, S.D. and ANOVA by type of household headship by amount of time children have to do their homework

Male Headed Household	How much time do you have to do your homework?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	As much time as needed Barely enough time Very little time Total	89 (61.4%) 31 (21.4%) 25 (17.2%) 145	53.09 51.77 42.60 51.00	12.60 13.64 14.66 13.66
	F= 6.239, df= 2,	**P<0.05**		
Female Headed Household	How much time do you have to do your homework?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	As much time as needed Barely enough time Very little time Total	39 (61.0%) 15 (23.4%) 10 (15.6%) 64	52.67 53.33 45.00 51.65	15.15 14.84 9.13 14.40
	F= 1.277, df= 2,	**P>0.05**		

Table 7.2: Distribution of respondents by mean scores in Mathematics, S.D. and ANOVA by type of household headship by amount of time children have to do their homework

Male Headed Household	How much time do you have to do your homework?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	As much time as needed Barely enough time Very little time Total	89 (61.4%) 31 (21.4%) 25 (17.2%) 145	52.53 47.90 39.20 49.24	18.23 15.90 18.52 18.37
	F= 5.572, df= 2,	**P<0.05**		
Female Headed Household	How much time do you have to do your homework?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	As much time as needed Barely enough time	39 (61.0%) 15 (23.4%)	55.13 57.33	16.76 17.51

	Very little time Total	10 (15.6%) 64	46.50 54.30	20.15 17.55
	F= 1.266, df= 2,	**P>0.05**		

Table 8.1: Distribution of respondents by mean scores in English Language, S.D. and ANOVA by type of household headship and children's access to books and materials needed in school

Male Headed Household	Do you often lack books and materials needed in school?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	68 (46.9%) 77 (53.1%) 145	48.82 52.92 51.00	13.88 13.26 13.66
	F= 3.302, df=1,	**P>0.05**		
Female Headed Household	Do you often lack books and materials needed in school?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	27 (42.2%) 37 (57.8%) 64	48.89 53.62 51.63	11.29 16.16 14.40
	F=1.705, df=1,	**P>0.05**		

Table 8.2: Distribution of respondents by mean scores in Mathematics, S.D. and ANOVA by type of household headship and children's access to books and materials needed in school

Male Headed Household	Do you often lack books and materials needed in school?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	68 (46.9%) 77 (53.1%) 145	44.93 53.05 49.24	16.15 19.45 18.37
	F= 7.374, df=1,	**P<0.05**		
Female Headed Household	Do you often lack books and materials needed in school?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	27 (42.2%) 37 (57.8%) 64	56.48 52.70 54.30	17.48 17.66 17.55
	F=.721, df=1,	**P>0.05**		

Table 9.1: Distribution of respondents by mean scores in English Language, S.D. and ANOVA by type of household headship by parents' ability to pay school fees or other dues

Male Headed Household	Is it difficult for your parents to pay your fees and other dues?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	60 (41.4%) 85 (58.6%) 145	48.58 52.71 51.00	12.83 14.05 13.66
	F= 3.252, df=1,	**P>0.05**		
Female Headed Household	Is it difficult for your parents to pay your fees and other dues?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes No Total	26 (40.6%) 38 (59.4%) 64	46.54 55.11 51.63	11.90 15.05 14.40
	F=5.886, df=1,	**P<0.05**		

Table 9.2: Distribution of respondents by mean scores in Mathematics, S.D. and ANOVA by type of household headship by parents' ability to pay school fees or other dues

Male Headed Household	Is it difficult for your parents to pay your fees and other dues?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes	60 (41.4%)	44..83	17.39
	No	85 (58.6%)	52.35	18.51
	Total	145	49.24	18.37
	F= 6.099, df=1,	**P<0.05**		
Female Headed Household	Is it difficult for your parents to pay your fees and other dues?	N	Mean Score	S.D.
	Yes	26 (40.6%)	52.88	19.60
	No	38 (59.4%)	55.26	16.19
	Total	64	54.30	18.37
	F=.280, df=1,	**P>0.05**		