AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, VOL. 11, No 3, pp 267 - 274, 2019
DOI: 10.15547/ast.2019.03.046

Gender analysis of educational inequality among rural children of school-age in Kwara State, Nigeria

R.O. Babatunde, A.E. Omoniwa*, M.N. Ukemenam

Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria

(Manuscript received 3 June 2019; accepted for publication 25 July 2019)

Abstract. *Educational inequality has been accepted widely as an indicator of wellbeing. However, in most developing countries, very little attention has been paid to it. This article examined the gender differences in educational inequality among rural children of school-age in Kwara state, Nigeria. Using a three-stage random sampling technique, 200 rural households were sampled for data collection. Analytical tools used are descriptive statistics, the Gini-coefficient and the Ordinary Least Square regression analysis. The result of the analysis showed educational inequality for boys and girls was 0.4 and 0.5, respectively. Educational inequality among children of school-age was significantly determined by the age of household heads, education status of the household heads, marital status, main occupation of the household head, household size, dependency ratio, farm size, cost of schooling, average time spent by children in farm work and asset-base of the households. It was therefore recommended that strategies that will promote mothers' education be put in place as well as the provision of accessible credit schemes. This can help in the hiring of labour for farm and non-farm businesses thereby increasing production, while providing the household with more funds to enroll their children in schools.*

Keywords: farm-work, rural children, education, non-farm cost, income

Introduction

Although education is widely acknowledged as a critical tool for human capital development, the national literacy rate in Nigeria is still very low. The educational sector is characterized by acute shortages of infrastructure and facilities at all levels. Nigeria is ranked 118th in educational attainment with a female to male ratio of 0.80 for literacy, 0.85 for primary school enrolment, 0.86 for secondary school enrolment and 0.55 for post-secondary school enrolment (Human Development Report, Nigeria, 2009). According to CBN (2000) the gender gap in literacy rate at the rural level between boys and girls was 18.3% in favor of the boys overall, indicating the existence of gender dimensions to educational attainment and development in Nigeria. Despite the fact that the Nigerian government today has made a strong commitment to the achievement of universal basic education, especially primary education, and despite a gradual expansion in access to schooling, large numbers of children continue to remain outside the school system. The major challenge, however, is that most of them are girls. Reports have it that in Northern Nigeria particularly, the gender gap remains very wide with the proportion of girls to boys in school ranging from 1 girl to 2 boys to 1 to 3 in some states (UNDP, 2009).

Education is important for human capital development which is essential to economic development of any society. When a populace is educated, it translates into a better living standard through increased accumulation of wealth/income, increased social status among others. This directly or indirectly influences socio-economic growth and development of the society. Equality in education is most desired because it will help individuals, especially the girl child who later becomes a mother, to positively influence herself, other people and her surroundings. Education is a cornerstone of sustainable rural development with primary education as its foundation. It improves the productive capacity of rural societies and their institutions. Education contributes to economic productivity and development in the sense that individuals acquire skills in school that enable them to be more productive. Hence, what these individuals learn in school makes them more likely to adopt new farming technologies and practices that are sure to increase their yield and invariably, their income and living standard. Education therefore helps individuals function more effectively in modern production organizations, socialize people into functioning effectively in modern society, thereby helping them gain off-farm employment that will supplement whatever income gotten from the agricultural activities they engage in (British Council of Nigeria, 2012).

According to UNESCO (2003), there are four main dimensions of gender equality in education and these are: equality of access, equality in the learning process, equality of educational outcomes and equality of external results. Equality of access implies that girls and boys are offered equitable opportunities to gain admission to formal, non-formal or alternative approaches to basic education. While equality in the learning process means that girls and boys receive equitable treatment and attention and have equal opportunities to learn. This can be in the form of exposure to the same curricula. Equality of educational outcomes on the other hand means that both genders enjoy equal opportunities to achieve their goals and outcomes which are based on their individual talents and efforts. To ensure fair chances for achievement, the length of school careers, academic qualifica-

*e-mail: omotade29@gmail.com

tions, and diplomas should thus not differ based on a person's gender. Mechanisms for evaluating individual achievements should also be free of any form of bias. Lastly, equality of external results is the situation where the status of men and women, their access to goods and resources and their ability to contribute to, participate in and benefit from economic, social, cultural and political activities are equal. This implies that career opportunities, the time needed to secure employment after leaving full-time education and the earnings of men and women with similar qualifications and experience are equal.

However, children's enrolment in schools is dependent on the parents decisions which are governed by the availability of cash (either in the form of income, credit, assets, or insurances), availability of labour (either hired or family labour) that will sufficiently substitute for the child's labour, the household size, the dependency ratio of the family, gender composition of the family, the child's personal characteristics, the level of the parents' education, their perception of the benefits of education among other factors (UNESCO, 2008). The slow progress experienced in closing the gender gap in education has also been attributed to traditional beliefs and practices which mostly stemmed from the culture of gender preference. This culture of gender preference is prevalent globally but deeply rooted in Asia and Africa. As observed by Ashaye (2004) there is an old Chinese proverb which states that *"eighteen goddess like daughters are not equal to one son with a hump"*. Also in rural India, a traditional song by women translates thus: *"Had I known that the foetus was that of a girl, I would have had a hot drink of chills and killed not only the foetus but also this life curse".* These cases efficiently illustrate the preference of a male child to a female child. This has led to low priority for girls' education thus affecting the girl-child's access to basic education. More so, the tradition of patriarchal inheritance has left some families wishing never to have girl-children as they are regarded as minor. Furthermore, the girl-child's role is believed to be in the home and not in offices and she is expected to look after her siblings. This limits their time to study and they may even have to miss school to complete their duties, this leads to their drop out from school. Whereas, boy-child may be given more time to study as most parents believe that the education will allow them to earn more in the future. Sometimes the girl-child is forced to marry at a very young age thus stopping her education (Akanbi, 2012).

Another foremost factor limiting female education is poverty. Economic poverty becomes a critical problem when it comes to coping with direct costs of education such as tuition fees, cost of textbooks, uniforms, transportation and other expenses. In households with many children, whenever these costs exceed the income of the family, the girls are the first to be denied access. The cost associated with children's education could either be direct (such as user fees, school uniforms and transportation among others) or indirect (opportunity cost). The financial costs are often high, making it difficult for poor parents to afford. Particularly in rural areas, where many of the children are involved in agricultural work or domestic duties (for example, fetching wood or water), sending them to school involves an opportunity cost to the household. There is usually a strong gender dimension to this choice as the girls often have more household responsibilities. The report of the 2010 Nigerian Education Data Survey (NEDS) revealed that one in three children of school age is not in school or had dropped out because of the cost. Although the cost of primary education varies widely across Nigeria, the NEDS data showed that average expenditure per household is about N7 691, while the costs per pupil can be as high as N5000 (13.62USD) (NPC, 2011). All these can lead to greater inequality in access. Moreover, there may also be fewer well-paying jobs available for educated girls than the boys, therefore discouraging enrolment (van der Berg, 2008).

The importance of developing girls' education cannot be overstated. Education generally has been recognized as a basic human right since the 1948 adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This might be as a result of the positive correlation existing between the enrolment of girls in school, gross national product and life expectancy (World Bank, 2012). The rapid socioeconomic development of any nation has been observed to depend on the class of women and their education in that country (Nussbaum, 2003). Education thus bestows on women a disposition for a lifelong acquisition of knowledge, values, attitudes, competence and skills (Aliu, 2001). Educating girls achieves greater results. When girls go to school, they tend to delay marriage, have fewer but healthier children, and contribute more to family income and national productivity. In fact, Summers (1992) concluded that educating girls quite possibly yields a higher rate of return than any other investment available in the developing world. Despite these facts, inequalities in primary and secondary enrolment rates though decreasing are yet to be eliminated (UNESCO, 2007).

Nigeria has the largest population of any African country with 162.5 million people. Of this magnitude 49% are female representing about 80 million girls and women. Also, 54 million of these 80 million women live and work in rural areas, where they provide 60-79% of the rural labour force. In Nigeria, there exists statistics indicating gross imbalances against girls in enrolment, attendance and completion rates at all levels of education. It, therefore, means that as long as inequality exists, the rights of millions of children, especially girls, are being violated continuously (FGN, 2005).

Several studies including that of Lloyd (2005) were of the opinion that the economic returns to education at the secondary and tertiary levels are high (particularly for younger women). More so, the gap between the returns to higher and lower levels of schooling is constantly widening, thus putting an increasing premium on secondary and tertiary schooling for later success in the labour market. In addition to increased economic returns, Pande et al. (2005) also suggested that female schooling at the secondary level is more consistently and strongly associated with increased decision-making and mobility for women than schooling at the primary level. All this motivates the conduct of this study, the purpose of which was to make gender analysis of educational inequality among rural children of school-age in Kwara State, Nigeria.

Material and methods

Study area

The study was conducted in Kwara State in the north-central geopolitical zone of Nigeria. Nigeria is made up of 36 states and is divided into 6 geopolitical zones for political, agricultural, industrial and educational planning. Kwara State as a whole has a population of 2.4 million people out of which 70% be classified as rural dwellers (KWSG, 2006). The state was specifically chosen based on the availability of important information for the sampling framework such as village lists and details on farm/ households systems. Also, because of the considerable socioeconomic heterogeneity as Kwara State is regarded as the gateway between the northern and southern regions of Nigeria and has a good mixture of the three major ethnic groups in the country. And also as a result of the poor level of education in the state which invariably affects the well-being of rural dwellers in the state. In Kwara State, there are over 220 public secondary schools, over 1000 primary schools, three Colleges of Education, one Polytechnic and one College of Arabic and Legal Studies and of recent a University. All these are directly managed by the state government (Ijaiya, 2004).

According to the CWIQ (2006), adult literacy in the state was 57% with adult males (68 %) more literate than adult females. Also, a higher percentage (66%) of these adult literate were found in the urban areas with the remainder in the rural areas. Youth literacy was found to be 80% % with the urban area having 89% and rural area 73%. Gender analysis of youth literacy showed that more male (88%) were literate than their female counterpart. Also, the primary school net enrolment in the state was 79% with the urban areas contributing the largest (82 %) share and the rural areas contributing about 76%. However, primary school completion rate was given as 13% with children in urban areas (19%) having a higher rate than those in the rural areas (10%). The secondary school net enrolment rate in the state was 48% with males accounting for 50% and females 45% and the urban areas had a higher rate (55%) than the rural areas (43%). Secondary school completion rate for the state was 18% with that of urban areas (28%) also higher than rural areas (11%).

Sampling technique and data collection

A three-stage random sampling technique was used to select the 200 sampled rural households from which primary data was collected and analysed. In the first stage, two out of the 16 Local Government Areas (LGAs) within the state were randomly selected. In the second stage, five villages were randomly selected from each of the two LGAs, making a total of 10 selected villages. In the final stage, 20 households were randomly selected in each of the 10 villages to give a total of 200 rural households. The data was collected from the selected households through a face to face interview and a structured questionnaire in some cases. Data collected include household socio-economic characteristics, information on living conditions, assets of the household, farm size, production activities, types of off-farm activities, farm income and off-farm income. Others include the educational attainment of household members and the cost implication of children's schooling among others. Thereafter, the STATA 13 software was used in analysing the data collected.

Analytical techniques

The analytical tools used are the descriptive statistics, Education Gini coefficient and the Semi-Log function of the Ordinary Least Square (OLS) Regression analysis.

Descriptive analysis

The descriptive analyses used include measures of means, standard deviation and frequency distribution. The descriptive analysis provides means as a measure of central tendency and standard deviation as a measure of variability. This was used to analyse the socioeconomic characteristics 200 sampled rural households and the educational distribution of the 1028 children of school-age that are resident within the sampled households.

Education Gini coefficient

Education Gini, is similar to the Gini coefficient widely used to measure distributions of income, wealth, and land. It ranges from 0 which represents perfect equality to 1 which represents perfect inequality. Education Gini coefficient is usually calculated using enrolment, financing and/or attainment data. It measures the ratio to the mean (average years of schooling) of half of the average schooling deviations between all possible pairs of people. The mathematical representation is given as:

$$E = [N / (N - 1)]*[(1/\mu) \sum_{i=2}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (p_i / y_i) - (y_i / N) \cdot p_j] = [N / (N - 1)]*E_L \quad (1)$$

Where,

E = education Gini based on educational attainment distribution;

E_L = education Gini based on educational attainment distribution, large population;

μ = average years of schooling for the concerned population;

p_i and p_j = the proportions of population with certain levels of schooling;

y_i and y_j = years of schooling at different educational attainment levels;

N is the total number of individuals in the sampled population.

n = number of levels/categories in attainment data, and n=7 for this study;

Expanding the equation above, we have;

$$E = [N/(N - 1)]*[(1/\mu) p_2(y_2-y_1)p_1 + p_3(y_3-y_1)p_1 + p_3(y_3-y_2)p_2) + \ldots + p_7(y_7-y_1)p_1 + p_7(y_7-y_2)p_2 + p_7(y_7-y_3)p_3 + p_7(y_7-y_4)p_4 + p_7(y_7-y_5)p_5 + p_7(y_7-y_6)p_6] \quad (2)$$

Where:

p_1 = proportion of population with no schooling;

p_2= proportion of population with partial primary education;

p_3= proportion of population with complete primary education;

p_7 = proportion of population with complete tertiary education;

y_1 = years of schooling for an individual with no schooling, $y_1 = 0$;

y_2 = years of schooling for an individual with partial primary education;

y_7 = years of schooling for an individual with complete tertiary education.

The formula for calculating the years of schooling at the seven levels of education are:

Illiterate: $y_1 = 0$;

Partial-Primary: $y_2 = y_1 + 0.5Cp = 0.5Cp$;

Complete-Primary: $y_3 = y_1 + Cp = Cp$;

Partial-Secondary: $y_4 = y_3 + 0.5Cs = Cp + 0.5Cs$;

Complete-Secondary: $y_5 = y_3 + Cs = Cp + Cs$;

Partial-Tertiary: $y_6 = y_5 + 0.5Ct = Cp + Cs + 0.5Ct$;

Complete-Tertiary: $y_7 = y_5 + Ct = Cp + Cs + Ct$.

Where:

Cp is the cycle of the primary education (6 years);

Cs is the cycle of the secondary education (6 years); and

Ct is the cycle of the tertiary education (4 years).

Also, the Average Years of Schooling (AYS) and the Standard Deviation of Schooling (SDS) are calculated using the respective formulae below:

$$AYS = \mu = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i y_i,$$

$$SDS = \sigma = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i (y_i - \mu)^2}.$$

Ordinary Least Square

To examine the determinants of education inequality among the children, the Ordinary Least Square regression analysis using the semi-log function was employed. The OLS regression model is given typically as:

$$Y = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i + U, \quad i = 1, 2, 3\ldots 13,$$

Where:

Y = Gini coefficient;

β = vector of unknown coefficients;

X_i = independent variables (vector of characteristics of the i^{th} individual).

The independent variables are defined as follows:

X_1 = Age of Household head (years);

X_2 = Marital status (1= Married, 0 = otherwise);

X_3 = Religion;

X_4 = Household size (Adult Equivalent);

X_5 = Value of Household Assets (N);

X_6 = Dependency ratio;

X_7 = Educational level of Household head (years);

X_8 = Mother's Education (years);

X_9 = Primary occupation of household head (Farming =1, 0 otherwise)

X_{10} = Children's Cost of schooling (N);

X_{11}= Mean children's farm hours (per week);

X_{12} = Distance to school (km);

X_{13} = Total Household income (N);

U = Error term.

Results and discussion

Socioeconomic characteristics

From the distribution according to socioeconomic characteristics in Table 1, it can be ascertained that most of the household heads are still agile with the highest percentage (33%) of them falling between the age ranges of 36-45 years. Only 8% of them were above 65 years of age. It also shows that most (53.5%) of the households have household sizes of between 1-5 AE, while only 0.5% have household size of over 15AE. This indicates that a majority of the respondents (107 respondents) have a household size of at most 5. The years of schooling for mothers were between 0 and 15 years with the highest level of education attained been NCE. Therefore, as seen also in Table 1, 50% of the mothers had no formal education which is typical of rural women and only 3% of them had attained tertiary education. In between these extremes, it was found that 38% of the mothers had primary education. The household assets were estimated to range between ₦41600 (113.35USD) and ₦4382 000 (11940.05USD). The assets measured include the naira value of their productive assets (such as land, tractors, hoe, cutlass, warehouses, generator, fridge among others), houses, household items (such as mattress, bed, fan, cushion, iron, stove among others), animals, transportation asset (such as car, motorcycle and bicycle) as well as communication assets (such as phone, television, radio among others). From Table 1, 33% (66 households) have assets above ₦550 000 (1498.64 USD), while only about 1% had assets below ₦50000 (136.24USD). This implies that the majority of the households have large assets. The estimated total income of the households constitutes both farm income, off-farm income for all members of the household engaged in any other form of paid activity outside the household farm and remittances. The total monthly income was found to be within the ranges of ₦1672.96 (4.56USD) to ₦30729.17 (83.73USD).

Table 1. Distribution according to socioeconomic characteristics

Socioeconomic characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Gender of Household head		
Male	198	99.0
Female	2	1.0
Gender of children		
Male	610	59.3
Female	418	40.7
Age of Household head (years)		
25-35	47	23.5
36-45	66	33.0
46-55	49	24.5
56-65	22	11.0
>65	16	8.0
Age of children (years)		
≤5	202	19.7
6-10	288	20.0
11-15	236	30.0
16-20	181	17.6
>20	121	11.7
Marital status		
Married	195	97.5
Divorced	1	0.5
Widow(er)	4	2.0
Religion		
Christianity	19	9.5
Islam	181	90.5
Educational level of household head (years)		
0	47	23.5
1-6	54	27.0
7-12	54	27.0
>12	45	22.5
Mother's education (years)		
0	100	50.0
1- 6	76	38.0
7-12	18	9.0
>12	6	3.0
Household size (Adult Equivalent)		
1-5	107	53.5
6-10	92	46.0
>10	1	0.5
Primary occupation of Household head		
Farming	171	85.5
Others	29	14.5
Secondary occupation of household head		
None	40	20.0
Farming	29	14.5
Fishing/Hunting	19	9.5
Artisans	112	56.0
Household assets (₦)		
<50.000	1	0.5
51000-150000	8	4.0
151000-250000	22	11.0
251000-350000	40	20.0
351000-450000	29	14.5
451000-550000	34	17.0
>550000	66	33.0
Total Household Income (₦/month)		
<10000	141	70.5
10001-20000	55	27.5
>20000	5	2.0
Total Household Expenditure (₦/month)		
<10,000	171	85.5
10001-20000	28	14.0
>20000	1	0.5

Source: Field Survey, 2014; Number of observation = 200 households and 1028 children of school-age

Distribution of children by enrolment in school

Of the total population of children (1028) resident within the 200 sampled households only 878 (85.4%) children were found in school, of which 545 (53%) were boys and 333 (32.4%) were girls. Therefore, from the total boys' population, 89.3% of boys were found to be in school, while from the total girls' population, 79.7% of girls were in school. Table 2 gives the breakdown of the children enrolled in school and those not enrolled in school respectively according to their gender: about 62% of the total children enrolled in schools are boys, while the girls in school account for only 38%, while 150 children (14.6%) out of the total 1028 children are not to be in school. Of this population, boys are about 43%, while girls made up 57%. This shows that more boys than girls are enrolled in schools in Kwara State, Nigeria. This finding is consistent with those of UNESCO (2008), Lincove (2009) and Nmadu et al. (2010) for similar studies.

Table 2. Distribution of children enrolled in school

Gender	Enrolled in school		Not enrolled in school	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Male	545	62.1	65	43.3
Female	333	37.9	85	56.7
Total	878	100	150	100

Source: Field Survey, 2014

Distribution of children by level of education

Table 3 shows that 544 children (62% of the total school children population) were found to be in primary school, 57% (310 children) are boys and about 43% (234 children) are girls. 260 children (29.6%) were found to be in secondary school, of which 71.4% (186 children) are boys, while about 28% (74 children) are girls. 74 children (8.4%) were found to be in tertiary, of which about 66% (49 children) were boys, while about 34% (25 children) were female. It can be seen that in all levels of schooling, greater male enrollment was recorded.

Table 3. Distribution of enrolled children by years of schooling and gender

Years of schooling interval	Frequency and Percentage		Total
	Male	Female	
0-6 years	310 (57.0)	234 (43.0)	544 (62.0)
7-12 years	186 (71.4)	74 (28.6)	260 (29.6)
13-16 years	49 (66.2)	25 (33.8)	74 (8.4)
Total	545	333	878

Source: Field Survey, 2014

Table 4 also shows that out of the 544 primary school children, 426 (78.3%) are yet to finish their primary education, while 118 (21.7%) have completed their primary education. In the secondary school section, 159 children (61%) out of the 260 in secondary schools have not completed their secondary education, while about 39% (101 children) have completed their secondary education. For the higher levels of education, 40 (54%) were still in school, while 34 (46 %) children have completed their tertiary education. In all levels of education as depicted in the Tables 3 and 4, it can be seen that the completion rate of boys is higher than that of the girls showing some level of inequality in their educational pattern. The results on Tables 3 and 4 show a very marginal improvement when compared with those recorded by UNESCO, (2000) where it was reported that only 52% of school-age children are enrolled in primary schools, USAID (2005) where it was stated that 40% of children do not attend primary schools and Agboola and Ofoegbu (2010) that reported 8% attendance at higher education levels in Nigeria.

Table 4. Distribution of enrolled children by level of education and gender

Sex	Frequency and Percentage						
	Partial primary	Complete primary	Partial secondary	Complete secondary	Partial tertiary	Complete tertiary	Total
Male	244 (57.3)	66 (55.9)	119 (74.8)	67 (66.3)	22 (55.0)	27 (79.4)	545
Female	182 (42.7)	52 (44.1)	40 (25.2)	34 (33.7)	18 (45.0)	7 (20.6)	333
Total	426	118	159	101	40	34	878

Source: Field Survey, 2014; Note: The figures in bracket are the percentages

As revealed in Table 5, the overall educational inequality is 0.3, for boys the value is 0.4, while for girls the value is 0.5. Comparing the values for the boys and girls, it can be said that the value for boys justifies that there is educational inequality amongst the male and female children in the selected households with the male children having more advantage than the female children. This is further confirming the results in Tables 3 and 4. This is not too different from the report of Ganicott (2008) and NNBS (2009) for related studies.

Table 5. Gini decomposition of educational inequality by gender

Gender	Average years of schooling	Gini coefficient
Boys	6.64	0.354553
Girls	5.63	0.492507
Total	8.15	0.317853

Source: Data Analysis, 2014

Determinants of educational inequality among children

The result in table 6 shows that educational inequality among children in Kwara State, Nigeria is significantly determined by the age of household heads ($p<0.01$), education of the household head ($p<0.05$), marital status ($p<0.01$), household size ($p<0.01$), dependency ratio ($p<0.01$), cost of schooling ($p<0.01$), average time spent by children in farm work ($p<0.01$) and the value of household assets ($p<0.05$). This implies that as household heads get older, they seem to want their male children to get educated and get gainfully employed because they believe it is these male children that will take care of them in their old age. This can be attributed to the general belief that the girl child will end up in her husband's house and may likely be of no use to her family after marriage. This has led to more boys been sent to school than girls.

Also, a unit increase in the education of household heads results in more education of boys than girls (increased educational inequality). Since most of the households are headed by men and most of the mothers have no formal education, it can therefore be inferred that they have little influence on the education of their children. Hence the fathers have the sole responsibility of deciding who goes to school and who remains at home. This male dominated decision making role will most likely favour the education of the male children in the household. Also, as household size increases, the household head might tend to personally select the children to be enrolled in school and this is commonly based on personal choice and the relevance he places on the child education.

Furthermore, when the cost of schooling increases, only a few children benefit from schooling which in most cases are the male children as parents would want to make "worthwhile investments". Meanwhile, household heads who are primarily farmers, additional increase in farm size, number of dependants and value of household assets will reduce inequality between male and female children. This is implying that as households engage more in farming by acquiring more land and assets, the labour of the male children will be in much demand, hence restraining their enrolment into schools, thus creating opportunities for the female children to get enrolled into schools.

Table 6. Determinants of educational inequality among children using Semi-Log function (n=1028 children)

Variables	Total Education Gini	Boys' Education Gini	Girls' Education Gini
Age of household head (years)	1.124*** (3.84)	0.613*** (3.68)	0.510** (2.25)
Marital status	0.291*** (3.35)	0.165*** (3.32)	0.127* (1.88)
Religion	0.097 (1.15)	0.006 (0.12)	0.091 (1.39)
Household size (Adult Equivalent)	0.825*** (3.36)	0.120 (0.86)	0.075*** (3.71)
Value of Household Assets (₦)	-0.192** (-2.18)	0.102** (-2.01)	-0.317* (-1.78)
Dependency ratio	-0.334*** (-3.41)	-0.117** (-2.10)	-0.217*** (-2.87)
Educational level of Household head (years)	0.007 (1.07)	-0.003 (-0.84)	0.010** (2.01)
Mother's education (years)	0.006 (0.77)	0.002 (0.53)	0.003 (0.60)
Farm size (ha)	-0.200* (-1.66)	-0.158** (-2.31)	-0.041 (-0.45)
Primary occupation of household head (Farming = 1, 0 otherwise)	-0.140* (-1.66)	0.017 (0.35)	-0.1123* (-1.89)
Children's cost of schooling (₦)	0.271*** (2.68)	0.126** (2.19)	0.145* (1.85)
Mean children's farm hours	0.027*** (4.42)	0.023*** (6.81)	0.003 (0.70)
Distance to school (Km)	-0.144 (-0.92)	0.019 (0.22)	-0.163 (-1.35)
Total household income (₦/month)	-0.062 (-0.39)	0.046 (0.51)	-0.107 (-0.88)
Constant	-2.529*** (-2.60)	-1.918*** (-3.47)	-0.611 (-0.81)
R^2	0.650	0.632	0.445
F	13.29	12.32	5.74

Source: Survey data, 2014

Note:

i) *, **, *** Coefficients are significant at the 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

ii) The dependent variable is the Gini coefficient for all children, only boys and girls only.

For boys, educational inequality was significantly determined by age of the household heads ($p<0.01$), household assets ($p<0.05$), dependency ratio ($p<0.01$), costs of schooling ($p<0.05$) and average hours spent by children on farm work ($p<0.01$). The factors that significantly determine educational inequality for the girls are the age of the household head ($p<0.05$), household size ($p<0.01$), dependency ratio ($p<0.01$) and education of household head ($p<0.05$).

These results are consistent with those of Walter and Briggs (1993), Burney (1995), Bhalotra and Heady (2003), Awoniyi et al. (2011) and Onwuameze (2013) where the significant relationship between educational inequalities and the value household assets and household size were validated. The significant effect of the primary occupation of the household head can be supported with the findings of Ravallion and Wodon (2000), Ray (2003) and World Bank (2004). So also, for the results educational level of household head (Onwuameze, 2013), Total household income (van der Berg, 2008; Reardon, 2011; British Council of Nigeria, 2012) for the effect of the children's cost of schooling.

Conclusion

It can be concluded from the analysis that 85.4% of the children from the sampled households were enrolled, out of which only 32.4% were girls which showed that inequality still exist. Nevertheless, age of household heads, education level of the household head, marital status, cost of schooling, household size and average time spent by children doing farm work are some of the factors significantly determining educational inequality among the rural children of school-age. Others include the primary occupation of the household head, dependency ratio, farm size, and value of household assets. Therefore based on these findings it was recommended that: Parents in the rural areas should also be educated on the importance of sending their children to school, particularly their girl child. This is because such investments would not only improve the livelihood of the children in the short run, but will also enable them to compete intellectually with their urban counterparts in future employments. It will also help them in making educated decisions on how to

effectively and efficiently manage their farms, increase productivity and hence income, thereby contributing to the development of their local community and Nigeria at large.

References

Agboola BM and Ofoegbu FI, 2010. Access to University Education in Nigeria: A Review. http://20.132.48.254/PDFS/ED511051.pdf.

Akanbi GO, 2012. Gender inequality in basic education in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Conspiracy of culture, poverty, wars and HIV/AIDS. European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 12, 1 (special issue), 574-586.

Aliu S, 2001. The Competitive Drive, New Technologies and Employment: The Human Capital Link. A Paper presented at the Second Tripartite Conference of Manpower Planners, Chelsea Hotel, Abuja.

Ashaye A, 2004.What's beautiful in a boy. This Day, 10, 3498, 27, March 20.

Awoniyi OA, Omonona BT and Falusi AO, 2011. Determinant of Educational Inequality among Rural Households in Nigeria. Report and Opinion, 3, 18-24.

Bhalotra S and Heady C, 2003. Child farm labour: The wealth paradox', The World Bank Economic Review, 17, 197-227.

British Council of Nigeria (BCN), 2012. Gender in Nigeria Report; Improving the Lives of Girls and Women in Nigeria-Issues, Policies and Action.

Burney NA, 1995. Determinants of child school enrolment: evidence from LDCs using choice theoretic approach. International Journal of Social Economics, 22, 24-40.

CBN, 2000. Annual Report and Statement of Accounts 31st December, 2000.

CWIQ, 2006**.** Nigeria Core Welfare Indicators Survey: Third Edition.

Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN), 2005. Nigeria Millennium Development Goals 2005 Report. National Planning Commission, FGN, Abuja.

Gannicott K, 2008. Kwara State Education Sector Analysis; second draft March, 2008.

Human Development Report, 2009. FAO, Rome, Italy.

Ijaiya NYS, 2004. Re-engineering educational quality management for quality education in Kwara State, Nigeria. International Journal of Educational Management (IJEM), 3.

Kwara State Government, 2000. Educational Statistics Ilorin: Planning, Research and Statistics Department, pp. 3-9.

Lincove JA, 2009. Determinants of schooling for boys and girls in Nigeria under a policy of free primary education. Economics of Education Review, 28, 474-484.

Lloyd C, 2005. Growing up global: The changing transitions to adulthood in developing countries. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Population Commission (NPC), 2011. Nigerian Education Data Survey Report. Abuja.

Nigerian National Bureau of Statistics (NNBS), 2009. Profile of Women and Men in Nigeria. At: www.nigerianstat.gov.ng.

Nmadu G, Avidime S, Ogunntude O, Dashe V, Abdulkarim B and Mandara M, 2010. Girl child education: Rising to the challenge. African Journal of Reproductive Health, Special Issue 14, 107-112.

Nussbaum M, 2003. Women's education: A global challenge sign. Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 29, 325-355.

Onwuameze NC, 2013. Educational opportunity and inequality in Nigeria: assessing social background, gender and regional effects. Thesis for PhD, University of Iowa, USA. http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/2598

Pande R, Malhotra A and Grown C, 2005. Impact of investments in female education on gender equality. Paper presented at the XXV IUSSP International Population Conference, Tours, France. Report, Institute of Education.

Ravallion M and Wodon Q, 2000. Does child labour displace schooling? Evidence on behavioural responses to an enrolment subsidy. The Economic Journal, 110, 158-175.

Ray R, 2003. The Determinants of child labour and child schooling in Ghana. Journal of African Economies, 11, 561-590.

Reardon SF, 2011. The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. Stanford University "Whither Opportunity? Rising Inequality, Schools, and Children's Life Chances" (Russell Sage Foundation, 2011).

Summers L, 1992. Investing in all the people. Policy Research Working Paper 905: The World Bank.

UNDP, 2009. Human development report. New York, Oxford University Press.

UNESCO, 2000. Global monitoring report on education for all. UNESCO, Paris, France.

UNESCO, 2003. Gender and education for all: The leap to equality. EFA Global Monitoring Report 2003/4. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris, France.

UNESCO, 2007. Education for all by 2015: Will we make it? UNESCO, Paris, France.

UNESCO, 2008. Education for all. Global Monitoring Report. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris, France.

United Nations Children's Fund, 2013. Syria conflict depriving hundreds of thousands of children of their education. UNICEF, Amman/Damascus, 5 March 2013.

United States Agency for International Development (USAID), 2005. Education strategy: Improving lives through learning. Washington, DC, USAID.

Van de Berg S, 2008. Poverty and education. Education Policy Series, International Institute for Educational Planning; UNESCO.

Walters PB and Briggs CM, 1993. Family economy, child labour, and schooling: Evidence from early twentieth-century south. American Sociological Review, 58,163-181.

World Bank, 2004. School education in Nigeria: Preparing for universal basic education. Africa Region Human Development Series, No 53, The World Bank, Washington DC, USA.

World Bank, 2012. Gender and development. World Bank, Washington DC, USA.