KIU Journal of Humanities Copyright©2017
Kampala International University ISSN: *2415-0843*; 2(1): 177–186

Employment Creation and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria: A Case of Farmers' Cooperative Societies in Kano State, Nigeria.

Murtala Mohammed, Eric B. Mugerwa
Nkumba University, Uganda.

Abstract. This study examines the role of employment creation on poverty reduction among members of farmers' cooperative societies in Kano State Nigeria. A cross-sectional survey research design was adopted. Primary data collection method was used in which self-administered questionnaire were distributed to a total sample of 217 respondents selected from the target population of 498 members of farmers' multi-purpose cooperative societies. Pearson correlation and binary logistic regression model were used to determine the influence of employment creation on poverty reduction among the respondents. The mean per capita expenditure was used as a dependent variable, while employment creation as the independent variable.

The findings indicated that female were more affected by poverty than their male counterparts. Gender was not a significant factor that determined poverty level in this research. Young and middle age were the majority of the respondents and these age groups were more affected by poverty. Age was found as a significant factor that determined poverty level in this research. Majority of the respondents had household size of 7 to above 12, and the respondents with large family size were more affected by poverty than those with small ones. The household size was found as a significant factor that determined poverty level in this research. Majority of the respondents had low educational qualifications, and the respondents with low educational qualifications were more affected by poverty than those with higher educational qualifications. The educational qualification was found as a significant factor that determined poverty level in this research.

The results further showed that employment was found as statistically significant factors that contributed towards poverty reduction among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this study, and the study recommended that age, family size, educational qualifications, and given adequate soft loans should be considered when designing employment creation programmes for poverty reduction.

Key Words: Employment Creation, poverty, Farmers' cooperative societies.

1. Introduction

This study examines the role of employment creation on poverty reduction among members of farmers' cooperative societies in Kano State Nigeria. The employment creation is one the objectives of Farmers Empowerment Programme (FEP) which was designed and implemented under National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in 2007 with the sole purpose and mandate of fighting or alleviating poverty levels among members of farmers' cooperative societies in Kano State, Nigeria.

In spite of the above mandate, there are several concerns (complaints) about the persistent increase of poverty level among farmers in Kano State in particular and Nigeria in general (Garba, 2006; National Bureau of Statistics, NBS, 2010; Okpe and Abu, 2009; World Bank, 2015).

In 2004, the national statistics showed that 68.9 million (54.89%) people were affected by poverty in Nigeria, but this problem has continued to get degenerated as the number of people living in poverty increased from 112.47 million (69%) in 2010 to 119 million (70%) in 2015 (National Bureau

of Statistics, NBS, 2004; 2010; World Bank, 2015). While, in the geo-political zones/regions National Bureau of Statistics (NBS, 2012), reported that the poverty level in Nigeria was lowest in the South-West geo-political zone (59.1%) and that the North-West geo-political zone had recorded the highest poverty rates in the country with 77.7% and 62% of the farmers are poor. Hence, Kano State was chosen for this research because it is the most populated state in the North-Western Nigeria and the poverty rate in the state is 72.3% which is greater than the national level of 70%.

Therefore in the in the light of the above situation, it was necessary to carry out this study in order to examine the role of employment creation on poverty reduction among members of farmers' cooperative societies in Kano State Nigeria.

2. Literature Review

Poverty is defined as lack of income or consumption level beyond which a person is classified as poor or non-poor. This is narrow definition of poverty but the broader definition goes beyond the level of income or consumption to include lack of capability such as employment, education, shelter etc. to live a decent live. For poverty reduction or alleviation three dimensions of have been explained which include (a) poverty alleviation which means alleviating the symptoms of poverty and/or reducing the severity of poverty without transforming the poor people into non-poor people; (b) lifting people out of poverty which means poverty reduction in the true sense which has to do with reducing the number of poor people and/or transforming the poor people into non-poor people; (c) poverty prevention which means enabling the people to avoid falling into poverty by reducing their vulnerability. Therefore, there are numerous empirical studies which decompose the key determinants of poverty reduction in which employment creation is consistently identified as one of the major factors (Leibbrandt and woolard, 2001).

The important of employment creation is informed by a prevalent assumption that employment has a positive impact on poverty reduction. It is assumed that employment creation reduces poverty directly by increasing households' incomes, and indirectly by stimulating the economy through the creation of demand thereby promoting increased economic activities and further employment growth (ILO, 2009; World Bank, 2011).

Scholars such as Gutierrez, Orecchia, Paci, and Serneels, (2007); Cristescu, Stanila, and Ecaterina, (2013); Bereck, Costello, Fortmann, and Hoffman, (2000); Dalis (2014); UK National Statistics (2015) were interested in relationship between employment creation and poverty reduction. Gutierrez et al (2007) studied how employment/productivity profile of growth and its sectoral pattern were correlated with poverty reduction. Their analysis covered the period between 1980 and 2004, and used a sample of 39 developing countries in which regression model was adopted. They established that in the short run, the aggregate employment-rate intensity of growth did not significantly impact on poverty reduction but what is importance was the sectoral pattern of employment growth. Employment-intensive growth in the secondary sector was associated with decreases in poverty, while employment-intensive growth in agriculture was correlated with poverty increases. Their study also revealed that some conditions of labour market and economic environment were associated with employment-intensive growth or specific sectoral growth, for example, the labour market is divided into two segments, a bad jobs sector and a good jobs sector. In the good jobs sector productivity is higher and so wages are higher and poverty level is low, while in the bad jobs sector productivity is low and income from self- employment/wages is low thereby poverty level is high.

However, a similar finding was obtained by Cristescu et al (2013), as they examined the relationship between the employment rate, social benefits, real GDP and poverty rate in 27 European Countries, using panel data. In their study, they adopted regression model, where they established that increase in employment generation had negatively and statistically insignificant impact on poverty reduction. Their study also revealed that the lower impact of employment on reducing poverty level was due the fact that many European Countries economic growth was not distributed across all social categories and there were many people with low incomes even though they had a job.

UK National Statistics (2015) studied the impact of employment on poverty reduction in UK where it established that employment had a significant impact on poverty level, for example, majority of people (70%) who got jobs exit poverty and only few (30%) who still remained in poverty after getting jobs. The study also found that there were a number of employment-related factors which had affected how likely it was people would move out of poverty after getting a job. This included the level of pay, as well as whether the job was full-time or part-time. Other factors such as the composition of the household people lived in might also have an impact. The

majority of the employed as full-time worker got a chance of pulling out of poverty while majority of the people who got employment as part-time workers remained as working poor.

Bereck et al (2000) studied the long run impact of change in timber-related employment and poverty level in rural California. Using Vector Autoregressive (VAR) Model, they found mixed evidence that changes in timber employment had a long run significant impact on poverty reduction while employment in non-timber sectors had a weak impact on poverty reduction. Hence, the reason behind this mixed evidence is that in rural California counties timber is the major exporting goods which employed large number of people and at least offers adequate income for people employed in the sector to escape poverty.

Dalis (2014) studied the links between employment and poverty in Cambodia. Using probit model, they established that employment creation in services was found to help the poor to have a better chance of overcoming poverty, but this was not the case in agriculture and industry. The empirical results showed that households employed in agriculture had a higher chance of being poor than those employed in industry. The important factors determining the household escaping poverty were land and education.

3. Research Methodology

This study adopted a cross-sectional research design because necessary information about the role of employment creation on poverty reduction among different members of farmers' multi-purpose cooperative societies was gathered through the use of self-administered questionnaire and interview at a go. This choice of the research design is supported by the statement of Sekaran (2003) that when a researcher is faced with a situation where he/she will gather data just once from a cross-section of different respondents for the purpose of answering research questions the appropriate research design for him/her is cross-sectional research design. On the other hand, Amin (2005) contended that a cross-sectional survey is the most commonly used research method in social science research. The cross-sectional research design required one to use a number of data collection methods and collect information from a cross-section of respondents (Sekaran, 2003). This study also employed a mixed methodology approach which involves using quantitative and qualitative approach.

3.1 Study Population

The target population of this study consists of 498 members of 18 different farmers' multi-purpose cooperative societies. Sampling strategies used in this study was random sampling technique and specifically stratified random sampling technique was chosen because the cooperative societies were heterogeneous in their activities (Amin, 2005; Bogere and Gesa, 2015; Kothari and Garg, 2014; and Odiya, 2009).

Sample Size Determination

217 sample size was selected from the target population of 498 using Krecie and Morgan (1967)'s formula as can be seen below;

$$s = \frac{x^2\, Np\,(1-p)}{d^2\,(N-1) + x^2\, p(1-p)}$$

$$= \frac{3.841 \times 498 \times 0.50(1-0.50)}{(0.05)^2(498-1) + 3.841 \times 0.50(1-0.50)}$$

= 217

3.2 Sample Size Distribution

For proper distribution of these 217 sample size the proportional stratified random sampling technique was used under which the sizes of the samples from the different strata were kept proportional to the sizes of the strata (Kothari and Garg, 2014). This can be shown in table 1 below:

Table 1 Allocation of 217 Sample Size to Three Different Strata

S/N	Stratified Cooperative Societies	Population	Sample Size
1	Crop Production Cooperative Societies	106	46
2	Agro-processing Cooperative Societies	173	75
3	Livestock Production Cooperative Societies	219	96
TOTAL		**498**	**217**

Source: Researcher's calculation from NAPEP, 2007

Table 1 shows how 217 sample sizes were distributed using proportional stratified random sampling formula to three different strata of farmers' multi-purpose cooperative societies.

3.3 Data Collection Method

This study used primary data collection method which involved survey/questionnaire and personal interview. The data collection instruments used in this study were questionnaire and interview guide.

3.4 Validity of the Research Instruments:

It is observed that validity of the research instrument is concerned with the idea that research design fully addressed the research objectives. The validity of a research instrument is the degree to which the instrument actually measures or collects data on what it is really intended to measure (Kakinda-Mbaga, 1990). In this current study, the validity of the research instrument was established through a validity test using face validity, content validity and construct validity.

Face Validity

This is where the supervisors were provided with the draft of the research instrument (questionnaire) to check for its validity. Face validity is important because it provides an Idea about the validity of the instruments used (questionnaire). Therefore, the supervisors were provided with the draft of the questionnaire for their inputs. Hence their inputs were used to improve the instrument.

Content Validity

To ascertain the content validity, content validity index (CVI) was computed from the responses of 10 specialists or experts in the field of study in which they assessed the questionnaire items' suitability and relevance vis-à-vis to the objectives of the study. Therefore, these assessors or experts were asked to rate the validity of all the items on the questionnaire using the scale of: not relevant (NR) = 1; somewhat relevant (SR) = 2; quite relevant (QR) = 3; relevant (R) = 4; and very relevant (VR) = 5. The relevant and very relevant were summed up and divided by the sum of all items as can be seen using content validity index formula and the result was shown below:

$$\text{CVI} = \frac{Number\ of\ questions\ ticked\ relevant\ (R\ \&\ VR)}{Total\ number\ of\ questions}$$

$$= 0.9222$$

Therefore, comparing this result with the conventional research wisdom which requires that a credible research instrument should have validity score from 0.7 and above shows that the questionnaire items and the whole questionnaire is credible and valid for use in this research (Amin, 2005; Sekaran, 2003; Sullivan, 2001).

3.5 Construct Validity

The questionnaire was subjected to the factor analysis (Exploratory Factor Analysis, EFA) to determine its validity using construct validity (convergent) test. The convergent validity test was shown in table 2

Table 2: Convergent Validity Results of the Employment Creation

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.733
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	192.062
	Df	6
	Sig.	.000

Source: primary data (2016)

The table 2 shows Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) results of the study variable (employment creation). The KMO value (0.733) shows that the variable was acceptable as it had a value greater than 0.5, the Bartlett's test of sphericity Sig. value was 0.000. The rule of thumb states that KMO should be greater or equal to 0.5 to show sample adequacy, while Bartlett's test of sphericity Sig. value should be less than 0.05 (Field, 2009). Based on this assumption it implies that the study sample was adequate enough to continue with factor analysis.

Reliability of the research instruments

The importance of research reliability calls for concern to ensure that the data collection instrument should be able to yield the same results when repeated tests are conducted on the same respondents under the same conditions (Koul, 2004). Therefore, the data obtained from the pilot study were subjected to reliability test through the use of the Cronbach's (1964) alpha ($\propto$) test so as to ascertain the internal consistency of the study variables or questionnaire items. Therefore, reliability tests using Cronbach alpha are shown on the table 3:

Table 3: Reliability Tests Results

Cronbach Alpha	Number of items
0.794	9

Sources: Field Research, 2016

The reliability test of the questionnaire items from the table 3 using Cronbach alpha test shows that employment creation scored 0.794; Classification on quality of Cronbach's Alpha value by George and Mallery (2003), state that value of 0.9 to 1 is excellent, between 0.8 and 0.899 is good, 0.7 to 0.799 is acceptable, 0.6 to 0.699 is questionable and 0.5 to 0.599 is poor, and below 0.5 as unacceptable. The result obtained from this analysis as depicted from 3 shows that Cronbach's Alpha value was high, indicating a high reliability of the research instrument. Therefore, this implies that the questionnaire items and the whole questionnaire are reliable, credible and consistent for use in this research (Amin, 2005; Sekaran, 2003; Sullivan, 2001).

4. Findings Presentation, Interpretation and Discussion

In this section of the paper, findings, interpretation and discussion are all handled at the same time. First the cross-tabulation of demographic characteristics of the respondents and poverty were presented and thereafter the correlation and regression of the study objective was presented.

4.1 Cross Tabulation of Demographic characteristics of the respondents and Poverty

The demographic characteristics of the respondents were cross-tabulated with poverty in order to examine their association with the poverty level among members of farmers' cooperative societies, and the results were as follows:

Table 4: Cross-tabulation of Gender and Poverty

Gender	**Count**	**Poverty Level**		**Total**
		Non-poor	**Poor**	
Male	Count	60	118	178
	% within Gender	33.7%	66.3%	100%
Female	Count	9	26	35
	% within Gender	25.7%	74.3%	100%
Total	**Count**	**69**	**144**	**213**
	% within Gender	**32.4%**	**67.6%**	**100%**
x^2 = 0.853, df = 1, Sig = 0.356				

Sources: *Primary field data (2016)*

Table 4 shows that majority of the female (74.3%) were affected by poverty compared to their male counterparts (66.3%). This study confirmed the feminization of poverty among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this research. This finding is in agreement with authours like Dreze and Sen 1995; Buvinic and Gupta, 1997; Dunlop and Velkoff 1999; Senada and Sergio (2007); and Oyekale, Adepoju and Balogun (2012).

In many developing countries social and cultural motives restrict women's access to work and education, and hence women do not participate in labour market as freely as men do (Dreze and Sen 1995, Dunlop and Velkoff 1999) and thus, the female headed households regarded to be poor compared with male headed household. Several reasons are attributed to cause this situation. First, female headed households in general have more dependents and thus have higher non-workers to workers ratio compared to other households. Second, female heads typically work for lower wages and have less access to assets and productive resources compared to men owing to gender bias against women. Third, women typically bear the burden of household chores that result in time and mobility constraints compared to male-heads (Buvinic and Gupta, 1997).

However, the chi-square test showed that there was no significant relationship between gender and poverty (x^2 = 0.853, df = 1, Sig = 0.356). The implication is that gender is not a significant factor that contributed to the poverty level among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this research. This finding is in agreement with authours like Senada and Sergio (2007); Oyekale, Adepoju and Balogun (2012); and Makame and Mzee (2014) where they all found that gender was not a statistically significant factor in determining poverty level in their study areas.

Table 5: Cross-tabulation of Age Group and poverty

Age Group	Count	Poverty Level		Total
		Non-poor	Poor	
Young (20-39 Years)	Count	10	41	51
	% within Age Group	19.6%	80.4%	100%
Middle age (40-49 Years)	Count	38	79	117
	% within Age Group	32.5%	67.5%	100%
Old age (50 Years and above)	Count	21	24	45
	% within Age Group	46.7%	53.3%	100%
Total	**Count**	**69**	**144**	**213**
	% within Age Group	**32.4%**	**67.6%**	**100%**
x^2 = 7.993, df = 2, Sig = 0.018				

Sources: *Primary field data (2016)*

Table 5 reveals that young (80.4%) and middle age (67.5%) respondents were more affected by poverty than the old (53.3%) respondents. However, the chi-square test showed that there was a significant relationship between age and poverty level (x^2 = 7.993, df = 2, Sig = 0.018) among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this study. This implies that the more members of farmers' cooperative societies increase age the less he/she is affected by poverty. This finding is also in relation to the findings of Achia, Wangombe, and Khadioli (2010).

Table 6: Cross-tabulation of Household Size and poverty

Household Size	Count	Poverty Level		Total
		Non-poor	Poor	
1-3	Count	11	14	25
	% within Household Size	44%	56%	100%
4-6	Count	14	21	35
	% within Household Size	40%	60%	100%
7-9	Count	16	31	47
	% within Household Size	34%	66%	100%
10-12	Count	14	36	50
	% within Household Size	28%	72%	100%
Above 12	Count	14	42	56
	% within Household Size	25%	75%	100%
Total	**Count**	**69**	**144**	**213**
	% within Household Size	**32.4%**	**67.6%**	**100%**
x^2 = 7.328, df = 4, Sig = 0.036				

Sources: *Primary field data (2016)*

Table 6 shows that households with more members 7 to above 12 were more affected by poverty than the households with small members 1 -3. This finding implies that the households with small members are less affected by poverty whereas the households with large members are more affected by poverty. This finding is in agreement with the findings of Achia, Wangombe, and Khadioli (2010); Abdul-Hakim, Ismail, and Abdul-Razak, (2010); and Makame and Mzee (2014).

The large family size which characterized with larger number of dependents against few bread earners, and also the increase of family size which is not in line with the increase of income that resulting in increasing the chance of the family entering into poverty status (Abdul-Hakim, et.al. 2010; and Makame and Mzee,2014).

However, the chi-square test showed that there was a significant relationship between household size and poverty level (x^2 = 7.328, df = 4, Sig = 0.036) among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this study. The implication of this is that the larger the number of the household size of members of farmers' cooperative societies the more likely they will be affected by poverty and vice versa. This finding is also in relation to the findings of Abdul-Hakim, et.al. 2010; and Makame and Mzee, 2014, where they found that household size had a positive effect on household being poor. For every one member increase in the household the probability of household being poor will increase.

Table 7: Cross-tabulation of Educational Qualification and poverty

Highest Educational Qualification	Count	Poverty Level		Total
		Non-poor	Poor	
Informal Education	Count	11	42	53
	% within Highest Educational Qualification	20.8%	79.2%	100%
Primary Education	Count	7	20	27
	% within Highest Educational Qualification	25.9%	74.1%	100%
Secondary Education	Count	13	30	43
	% within Highest Educational Qualification	30.2%	69.8%	100%
OND/NCE	Count	20	38	58
	% within Highest Educational Qualification	34.5%	65.5%	100%
Degree/HND	Count	10	10	20
	% within Highest Educational Qualification	50%	50%	100%
Postgraduate	Count	8	4	12
	% within Highest Educational Qualification	66.7%	33.3%	100%
Total	**Count**	**69**	**144**	**213**
	% within Highest Educational Qualification	**32.4%**	**67.6%**	**100%**
x^2 **= 13.268, df = 5, Sig = 0.021**				

Sources: *Primary field data (2016)*

Table 7 reveals that majority of the respondents with lower educational qualifications (informal 79.2%, primary 74.1%, etc) were more affected by poverty than those with higher educational qualifications (Degree 50%, Postgraduate 33.3%). This finding implies that the higher the educational qualification of the members of farmers' cooperative societies the less their chances of being affected by poverty. This finding concurs with Achia, Wangombe, and Khadioli, 2010; Geda et al., 2005; Maitra, 2002; Makame and Mzee 2014 where they all found that the likelihood of being poor is decreased when house head attained higher education. This implies that, education is the important factors in reducing the impact of poverty among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this study.

However, the chi-square test showed that there was a significant relationship between educational qualification and poverty level (x^2 = 13.268, df = 5, Sig = 0.021) among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this study. The implication of this is that higher the educational qualification significantly reduces poverty level among the members of farmers' cooperative societies in this research and vice versa. This finding is also in relation to the findings of Achia, Wangombe, and Khadioli, 2010; Geda et al., 2005; Maitra, 2002; Makame and Mzee 2014 where they all established that education was statistically related to the poverty reduction. For example, Geda et al., (2005) established that poverty was strongly associated with the level of education; Maitra (2002) also found that that the education attainment of the household head had a significant impact in poverty status and standard of living of the household; and Achia, Wangombe, and Khadioli, 2010 further showed that increases in educational attainment had an important impact on reducing the probability that a household would be poor.

Relationship between Employment Creation and Poverty Reduction

In this section, analysis of relationships between employment creation and poverty reduction was under taken in order to establish their relationship. Pearson correlation was first executed to determine their relationship and thereafter the binary logistic regression was also performed to find out by how much percentage the employment creation contributed to the alleviation of poverty level among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this research. This was intended to provide support or otherwise of the null hypothesis which states that "employment creation does not significantly reduce poverty level among members of farmers' multi-purpose cooperative societies in Kano State, Nigeria".

As indicated, the hypothesis was first tested using bivariate correlation which yielded the results that proved the existence of moderate negative significant relationship between employment creation and poverty reduction among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this study [r (213) = -0.505, $p<0.01$] it is easy to understand that employment creation is a significant factor that influences poverty reduction among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this study. The relationship being negative implies that the more employment is created, the less members of farmers'

cooperative societies being affected by poverty or the more poverty is likely to be reduced or alleviated among members of farmers' cooperative societies in Kano State, Nigeria.

Furthermore, to get the more details or general picture on the overall influence of employment creation on poverty reduction among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this research the binary logistic regression was performed.

Table 8: Logistic Regression Results for Employment Creation and Poverty

		B	S.E.	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	**Employment Creation**	-2.161	.340	40.472	1	.000	.115	.059	.224
	Constant	8.097	1.204	45.228	1	.000	3.283E3		
a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Employment Creation.									

Source: *Primary Data (2016)*

The results of logistic regression on table 8 further reveals that employment creation was negatively statistically significant (beta = -2.161, $p < 0.01$) in reducing poverty level among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this research. The results also showed that increasing employment creation by 1 unit, the probability or likelihood of members of farmers' cooperative societies falling into poverty or being affected by poverty decreased by 2.161. The results further shows that increasing employment creation by 1 unit the odd ratio or probability of the poverty levels among members of farmers' cooperative societies will reduce by 0.115 time.

It is therefore, clearly shown that based on the findings the null hypothesis (H^1_O) which states that; "employment creation does not significantly reduce poverty level among members of farmers' multi-purpose cooperative societies in Kano State, Nigeria" was rejected and the alternate hypothesis (H^2_O) which states that; "employment creation does significantly reduce poverty level among members of farmers' multi-purpose cooperative societies in Kano State, Nigeria" was accepted.

This finding is in agreement with the scholars such as Bereck, Costello, Fortmann, and Hoffman, 2000; De Vries and Specker 2009; Ellis, Harvey, Lemma, and Higgins, 2010; and Islam, 2004. Bereck et al (2000) evidenced that changes in timber employment had a long run significant impact on poverty reduction. They also established that rural California counties timber was the major exporting goods which employed large number of people and at least offered adequate income for people employed in the sector to escape poverty.

Islam (2004) established that access to resources and markets, and the distribution of assets were critical determinants of the extent to which employment were contributing to poverty reduction. This study also provides support to the findings of Bereck, Costello, Fortmann, and Hoffman, 2000; Dalis 2014; De Vries and Specker 2009 who established the importance of the accessibility of jobs by the poor, and the sectors (which employ large number of poor people) in which employment is created for poverty reduction among poor farmers.

However, this study is found to be in disagreement with Gutierrez, Orecchia, Paci, and Serneels, (2007) who established that employment creation in agriculture was correlated with poverty increases. The findings of this research also negated the finding of Cristescu et al (2013) who established in their research that increasing employment creation had negatively and statistically insignificant impact on poverty reduction. This study is also in disagreement with the finding of Dalis (2014) who established that employment creation in agriculture was not significant in reducing poverty level in Cambodia.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

This study examined the role of employment creation on poverty reduction among members of farmers' cooperative societies in Kano State, Nigeria. The study found that female members of farmers' cooperative societies were more affected by poverty than their male counterparts. Gender was not a significant factor that determined poverty level among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this research. Young and middle age respondents were more affected by poverty and age was found as a significant factor that determined poverty level among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this research.

Majority of the members of farmers' cooperative societies with large family size were more affected by poverty than those with small ones. The household size was found as a significant factor that determined poverty level among the respondents. The members of farmers' cooperative societies with low educational qualifications were more affected by poverty than those with higher educational qualifications. The educational qualification was

found as a significant factor that determined poverty level among the respondents.
Employment creation through given soft loans to the poor farmers; assisting poor farmers to satisfy their basic needs; creating an enabling environment where poor people get employment; and assisting poor farmers to start their own business was found as statistically significant factor that contributed towards poverty reduction among members of farmers' cooperative societies in this study.

Based on the findings in this study the followings were recommended:

- Government and other stakeholders should consider age, family size, and educational qualification of the respondents when designing employment creation programmes that aims to reduce or alleviate poverty among members of farmers' cooperative societies.
- Government and other stakeholders should give adequate soft loans to the poor farmers, assist poor farmers to satisfy their basic needs, create an enabling environment where poor people get employment, and assist poor farmers to start their own business as these factors were found statistically significant towards alleviating poverty among members of farmers' cooperative societies.

References

Abdul-Hakim, R., Ismail, R., and Abdul-Razak, N. (2010), Does Social Capital Reduce Poverty? A Case Study of Rural Households in Terengganu, Malaysia, *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 14 (4) 556-566

Achia, T., Wangombe, A., and Khadioli N. (2010). A Logistic Regression Model to Identify Key Determinants of Poverty Using Demographic and Health Survey Data, *European Journal of Social Sciences*,13 (1) 38-45

Amin, M. E. (2005). *Social Science Research, Conception, Methodology and Analysis* Kampala: Makerere University Printery.

Bereck, P., Costello, C., Fortmann, L., and Hoffman, S. (2000) Poverty and employment in timber-dependent counties, *Resources for the Future, Discussion Paper,* No. 52, 1-31

Bogere, M. and Gesa, A. (2015) *Understanding Research and Statistical Methods: A Guide for East African Students and Researchers,* Uganda, Smart Stationers LTD

Buvinic, M., and Gupta, G.R. (1997): Female-Headed Households and Female-Maintained Families: Are They Worth Targeting to Reduce Poverty in Developing Countries?, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 45 (2), 259-80

Cristescu, A., Stanila, L., and Ecaterina, M. A. (2013). Causal disparities of poverty and unemployment in the EU: *Journal of Eastern Europe Research in Business and Economics,* 1, 1-12.

Dalis, P. (2014) Links between Employment and Poverty in Cambodia, *Cambodia Leading Independent Development Policy Research Institute, Working Paper Series*, No. 90, 1-36.

De Vries, H., and Specker, L. (2009) *Early Economic Recovery in Fragile States: Priority Areas and Operational Challenges.* The Hague: Clingendael Institute.

Dreze, J., and Sen, A. (1995). India *Economic Development and Social Opportunity*, Oxford University Press

Dunlop, J.E., and Velkoff, V.A. (1999). Women and the Economy in India, U.S. Census Bureau, Official Statistics December 3.

Ellis, K., Harvey, P., Lemma, A., and Higgins, K. (2010) *Job Creation in Fragile States*, London: Overseas Development Institute.

Field, A. (2009). Discovering statistics using SPSS; Sage Publications, Los Angeles, U. S. A

Garba, A. (2006). *Alleviating Poverty in Northern Nigeria,* A paper presented at the Annual Convention of Zumunta Association, USA Minneapolis, MN.

Geda, A., Jong, N. D., Kimenyi, M. S., and Mwabu, G. (2005). Determinants of poverty in Kenya: A household level analysis. Working Paper, No.44, Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut.

George, D. and Mallery, P. (2003). SPSS for Windows step by step. A sample Guide and reference. Alyn and Bacon. Boston, U. S. A.

Gutierrez, C., Orecchia, C., Paci, P., and Serneels, P. (2007). Does employment generation really matter for poverty reduction? *Policy Research Working Paper*, No, 4432, World Bank

ILO (2009) *Policy for post-conflict employment creation and income generation, and*

reintegration, Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Islam, R. (2004). The Nexus of Economic Growth, Employment and Poverty Reduction: An Empirical Analysis. *Issues in Employment and Poverty Discussion Paper*, No. 14, Geneva: International Labour Organization, Recovery and Reconstruction Department.

Kakinda-Mbaga, F. M. (1990) I*ntroduction to Social Research*, Unpublished Manuscript

Kothari, C. R. and Garg, G. (2014) *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, New Delhi: India, New Age International (P) Limited

Koul, L. (2004) *Methodology of Educational Research*, 3rd revised edition, New Delhil, Vikas Publishing House PVT Ltd.

Krejcie,R. V. and Morgan, D. V. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research activities, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 608

Leibbrandt, M., and Woolard, I. (2001). *Household incomes, poverty and inequality in a multivariate framework:* In Bhorat H, Leibbrandt M, Maziya M, van der Berg S, Woolard I (eds), Fighting poverty: labour markets and inequality in South Africa. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Maitra P. (2002). The Effect of Household Characteristics on Poverty and Living Standards in South Africa, *Journal of Economic Development*, 27 (1)

Makame, I. H., and Mzee, S. S. (2014). Determinants of Poverty on Household Characteristics in Zanzibar: A logistic Regression Model, *Developing Country Studies*, 4(20), 188- 195.

National Bureau of Statistics, NBS (2012). Nigeria poverty profile 2010. http://www.google.com.

National Bureau of Statistics, NBS. (2010). Nigeria poverty Profile: The Harmonised Nigeria Living Standard Survey. Abuja: National Bureau of Statistics.

Odiya, J. N. (2009). *Scholarly Writing: Research Proposals and Reports in APA or MLA publication styles*. Kampala, Uganda: Makerere University Printery.

Okpe, I. J., & Abu, G. A. (2009). Foreign Private Investment and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria, *Journal of Social Sciences, 19(3), 205-211*.

Oyekale, A.S., Adepoju A.O., and Balogun, A.M. (2012) Determinants of Poverty among Riverine Rural Households in Ogun State, Nigeria, *Study Tribes Tribals*, 10(2): 99- 105

Sekaran, U. (2003) *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach.* 4th Edition New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Senada, S., and Sergio, E. (2007). Poverty amongst Female-headed Households in Bosnia and Herzegovina: An empirical analysis, *South East European Journal of Economics and Business*, 2(1), 69-88

Sullivan, G. M. (2011). A Primer on the Validity of assessment instrument, *Journal of Graduate Medical Research*, 3(2)

UK National Statistics (2015). Poverty and employment transitions in the UK, *Office of National Statistics UK*, 1-16

World Bank (2011) *Conflict, security, and development:* World development report 2011, Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank (2015) *Annual Report*, Washington DC