DETERMINANTS OF POVERTY STATUS AMONG FARMING HOUSEHOLDS IN ODOGBOLU LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, OGUN STATE

Oyekale, Tolulope Olayemi*
Institute of Food Security, Environmental Resources and Agricultural Research.Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria.PMB 2240 Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria. Email: oyekaleto@fumaab.edu.ng; 07036368094

Bayedo Olasehinde, Pius
Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management, Federal University of Agriculture, PMB 2240 Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria. Email: olasehindebayedo@gmail.com; 08038458962

and

Olugbire Oluseyi Olutoyin
Forest Economics and Extension Services Department, Forestry Research Institute of Nigeria, P.M.B. 5054, Jericho, Ibadan, Nigeria, Email: olugbireolutoyin@gmail.com 08056148523

ABSTRACT
This study examines the poverty status of farming households in Odogbolu Local Government area of Ogun State. Data were collected from 120 farming households. Multistage sampling procedure was adopted in this study. Descriptive statistics, Foster Greer and Thorbeck (FGT) and Tobit regression model were used for the data analysis. The result shows that 26.7% of the household were poor. The female headed household were poorer (42%) that the male headed household (21%). Poverty was pronounced among the married. The tobit regression result shows that age, household size significantly increase poverty status at ($p<0.10$) and ($p<0.01$) respectively, while land size cultivated by farmers significantly reduce it at ($p<0.05$). To alleviate poverty, the study concluded that large family size should be discouraged through intense orientation campaign for birth control or family planning and its benefit, so as to minimize dependency ratio. Also measure should be taken towards encouraging farmers to cultivate large farm size by providing land, implements such as tractors, spraying machine etc. that could aid their farming activities, enhances their productivity thereby increase their income and this will be in collaboration sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)- Goal 1: "To end poverty in all its forms everywhere"

Keywords: Poverty, Households,Foster Greer and Thorbeck (FGT) and Tobit regression

JEL Codes: I32; I31; D60

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of poverty has been a very serious and long standing issue in Nigeria, especially looking at the vast wealth the country controls, which the situation has been described as suffering in the midst of plenty. Nigeria's huge Agricultural resources base provides great potential for the growth not only for rural sector but the entire economy. However, in spite of these enormous natural resources in the Country, increasing poverty remains a great challenge, low social status and poor living conditions are indications of the inhabitants. Based on the most recent official survey from the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), approximately 53.5 percent of the population is living in extreme poverty (NBS, 2010), with almost 70 percent being rural farmers. Future projections did not show much improvement as the national extreme poverty rate in 2019 was projected to be 50.1 percent (World Bank, 2020). Over the years, the problem has been made worse by the development pattern which has favoured the urban sectors to the rural sectors detriment (World Bank, 2018). World Bank (1999) and Narayan (2000), defined poverty as hunger, lack of shelter, being sick, not being able to go to school, not being able to communicate or speak properly, not knowing how to read, no job, fear for the future, child illness brought about by unclean water, lack of representation, freedom and powerlessness.

Poverty has also been referred to as the lack of certain capabilities, such as: inability to participate with dignity in society. Hence, it is a state of denial in terms of food, self-esteem, social status, and self-actualization (Adegbite and Ayinde, 1999; Aromolaran et al., 2002).

Poverty is mainly influenced by location and education, but in Nigeria, it is seen as the problem of rural dwellers where majority of them engage in agricultural production as a means of livelihood (Olorunsanya, 2009; Olorunsanya and Omotoso, 2012). Rural Poverty has been widely regarded as the main element of poverty (Patel, 2004; Olorunsanya and Omotoso, 20012). Although, the absolute importance of rural poverty varies largely from Country to country. In developing Countries, over 70% of total poverty is found in the rural areas. (FAO 2001; Olorunsanya, 2009)

Poverty in Nigeria has been the most significant challenge facing the government, studies across the Country has indicated in International Bank of Reconstruction and development (IBR & D) (1996) shows that poverty in Nigeria is a rural problem (Onu and Abayomi 2009, Ojide *et. al* 2006).

Nigeria is ranked the eighth largest oil producing country in the world, yet it harbors the largest population of people that are poor in sub-Saharan Africa, also ranked 158th on the human development index. There is also pervasive high income inequality which has brought about the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few people (Action Aid Nigeria, 2009). As at 2003 Nigeria's income per capital of $290 when compared to the world's per capital income of $7,140, further shows the state of poverty among households (Garba, 2006). Incidence of poverty in Nigeria has been increasing as furthered pointed out by Oladunni (1999).

Poverty is multidimensional, poverty encompasses diverse dimensions of deprivation that relate to human capabilities, as well as consumption and food security, education, security, health, rights, dignity, and decent work.

Poverty has many causes, which all reinforce one another. The sources include lack of basic services, such as education, clear water and health care, lack of assets, such as land, tools, credit and supportive networks of friends and family, and lack of employment income, as a direct factor causing poverty. (Chukwuemeka, 2008).

Since the causes or sources of poverty are diverse, it should be seen as a multidimensional problem which calls for a solution with a multi-pronged approach, especially as it affects households who face multiple disadvantage.

Identifying the determinants of poverty among households is very crucial not only by understanding the causes of Poverty, but as well as formulating policies directed at its reduction. Since, Poverty is a major constraining issue among household. Therefore, the study seeks to answer the following questions: what is the poverty status of the farming households in the study area? what is the distribution of the poverty status across some socioeconomic group and what are the determinants of poverty among the farming households in Nigeria?

2. METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Odogbolu Local Government area of Ogun State, Nigeria. It's headquarter is Odogbolu at 6^0 50^0N $3^0$$46^0$E / 6,$833^0$N 3.767^0E in the North-west of the area. Odogbolu local government area is located on a large expense land of about 640km^2 and shares boundaries with Ijebu North Local Government in the North, on the Eastern with Ikene, while on the South with Epe Local Government area of Lagos State. Odogbolu Local Government has a population of about 127,123 (2006 census).

A Multistage sampling technique was used in this study. First stage was Random selection of Ijebu Zone from the four Agricultural Zone in Ogun State. The Second stage was random selection of a block (Ala block) out of the 6 blocks in Ijebu zone which are Isoyin, Ala, Ijebu-Igbo, Ago-Iwoye, Ijebu-ife and Ibiade. The third stage was purposive selection of Odogbolu from the 5 cells in Ala block. They are, Ala, Ibefun, Imosan, Ogbo and Odogbolu. The fourth stage was random selection of six villages from the cell. The fifth stage was random selection of 20 farmers from each village. A total of 120 farmers were interviewed.

A structured questionnaire was used to collect information from the farmers on their socio economic characteristic and household expenditure. The analytical tools used were descriptive statistics, Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (FGT) index (Foster *et al*, 1984) and Tobit regression models.

The FGT index was used to determine the poverty incidence, depth and severity among the farming household in the study area. The FGT index was computed with the mathematical formula stated below:

$$P_{\propto} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{H}(Z - Y_t)^{\propto}$$

where:

Z = poverty line

N = total Sample
H = the number of poor (below poverty line).
Y = average household monthly *per capita* expenditure
α = poverty index which takes value of 0, 1 and 2

1. When $\alpha = 0$, the poverty index (PID) becomes Head Count Ratio or Poverty Incidence Index (HCR or PII) i.e. the proportion of people below the poverty line. It is used to determine the number of households having *per capita* income below the poverty line. It is stated as: Po = H/n. where H is the head count.
The PII (P0) gives the prevalence of poverty at a point in time.

2. When $\alpha = 1$, PID becomes the Poverty Gap Index (PGI) i.e. the aggregate short fall in income of the household from the poverty line. It measures the difference between actual income and minimum non-poverty income. The poverty line proportion (value) that the average poor require to meet the poverty line; the lower the value, the lower the poverty gap. At a point in time The PGI (P1) gives the depth of poverty.

3. When $\alpha = 2$, PID becomes poverty severity index (PSI) i.e. PSI gives more weight to the poverty gap of the poorest. The closer the value is to 1 (100%), the harder the household poverty condition. The PSI gives the severity of poverty at a point.

Construction of the Poverty Line
Poverty line has been defined as the minimum or the cut-off standard of expenditure on food or per capita income below which an individual or household is described as poor (Anyanwu 1997) and Canagarajah and Thomas, (2002), reported that there is no official poverty line in Nigeria and as such many earlier studies have used poverty lines which are proportions of the average per capita expenditure. However, in this study per capita expenditure, which is considered more appropriate in past studies because it is consistent and does not change over a period of time when compared to income was adopted.
Oyakale *et al*. (2012) used 2/3 of the mean per capital expenditure in their study of the determinants of poverty among Riverine rural households in Ogun State, Nigeria and the results shows that 28.8 percent of the households were poor.
Sanusi *et al*. (2013).Adopted 2/3 of the mean per capital monthly expenditure in their study of the determinants of poverty among farm households in Ikorodu Local Government Area of Lagos State, Nigeria. The result shows that 67.5 percent of the households were below the poverty line. Therefore, the poverty line was defined as the two-thirds (2/3) of the mean value of per capita consumption expenditure in the study area. The farm households were categorized into poor and non-poor group using the two-third mean per capita expenditure (Durojaiye, 1995; World Bank, 1996) as the bench mark. Households whose mean consumption expenditure falls below the poverty line are regarded as being poor while those with their expenditure above the benchmark are non-poor.
PCE = TCE/HHS ----------(2)

MPCHE = THHE/TNR ----------(3)
PL = 2/3 * MPCHE ----------(4)
where:
PCE = Per Capita Expenditure (Naira)
TCE = Total Consumption Expenditure (Naira)
HHS = Household Size
MPCHE = Mean Per Capita Households Expenditure
TNR = Total Number of Respondent
THHE = Total Households Expenditure
PL = Poverty Line
In order to identify determinants of poverty status of farm households sampled for this study, a tobit regression was carried out. These analytical functions was used to determine the household's poverty depth.

Tobit Regression Model
Tobit Regression model was used to identify the determinants of poverty depth in the study area. This model originates from the work of Tobin (1958) and has been used by economists to determine the effect of changes in the explanatory variables (xi) on the prospect of being poor and the depth or intensity of poverty (McDonald and Moffit, 1980). The model not only determines the probability that a farmer is poor but also the depth of poverty (Tobin, 1958). The model is expressed based on Tobin (1958):

$q_i = P_i = X_i\beta + e_i$ if $P_i > P_i^*$

$0 = X_i\beta + e_i$ if $P_i \geq P_i^*$

i = 1, 2 …… n

Where, qi is the dependent variable. It is discrete, when the households are not poor and continuous, when they are poor. Pi is the poverty depth/intensity defined as (Z-Yi)/Z and Pi* is the poverty depth, when poverty line (Z) equals the expenditure per adult equivalent. Xi is a vector of explanatory variable, β is a vector of un-known co-efficient and $\mathbf{e_i}$ is an independently distributed error term. The explanatory variables specified as determinants of poverty are:
X1= Age of the household head (years)
X2 = Sex of the household head (1 = male, 0 = otherwise)
X3= Marital status of the household head (1 = married, 0 = otherwise);
X4 = Size of household
X5 = Years of schooling (years)
X6 = Farm size (hectares)
X7 = Farm Income (₦)
X8 = Farming experience (years)

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This section shows the result from the study. The section describe the socio economic characteristic of the respondents and shows the factors that determines the poverty status of the farming household in Odogbolu local government has been captured

Socio Economic Characteristics of Farmers in the Study Area

Table 1 revealed that majority (74.20%) of the respondents are male. This implies that most of the farming households are headed by male. This is in accordance with the findings of Obayelu *et.al* (2014) that farming in Odogbolu is dominated by male fox. It implies that male are considered to be the bread winner of the family and once the male is affected by poverty, it affect the female.

TABLE 1: Socio-economic characteristics of farmers

Sex	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Male	89	74.20
Female	31	25.80
Age (in years)		
21-40	41	34.17
41-60	60	50.0
>60	19	15.83
Marital Status		
Single	3	2.50
Married	101	84.17
Separated	6	5.0
Widowed	10	8.33
Education		
No formal Education	1	0.83
Primary Education	31	25.83
Secondary Education	70	58.33
Tertiary Education	18	15.0
Farm Experience		
1-10	71	59.17
11-20	31	25.18
21-30	11	9.17
30 and above	7	5.83
Secondary Occupation		
No	73	60.83
Yes	47	39.17
Land Size (in Hectares)		
0-1.9	89	74.17
> 2.0	31	25.83
Farm Income		
22500-200000	17	14.17

210000-400000	58	48.33
410000-600000	33	27.50
610000-800000	10	8.33
8100000-1000000	1	0.83
1100000-1250000	1	0.83

Source: Field survey data 2016

It further shows that the mean age of the farmers was 47 years, it also reflected that majority (84.17%) them are in their active period to produce economically. Most of the farmers were married literate and well experienced in farming (12 years) with average household size, monthly income and farm size of 5 person, ₦377437 and 1.19 hectare respectively. Obayelu *et.al* (2014) also found that most of the farmers in the study area were married. . Being married means that there is room for reproduction and large household size. This has two implications: A large household size implies that farmers will have access to the use of cheap family labour. Also, a large house household will increase dependency ratio most especially where majority of the children are still very young and unproductive, this may increase poverty status, such that; expenses on food, cloth, school fees health etc increases as household size increases. The monthly income of the farmers was relatively small. It implies that they would not be able to meet up with their basic necessity of life.

Distribution of Poverty Status of the Farming Households
This section presents poverty situation in Odogbolu, using the FGT measures.

Distribution of the Poverty Status Based on Sex
Table 2 revealed that 42.0% of the female headed household are poor while 21% of the male headed household are poor. It appears from the findings that poverty rate is higher among female headed household as opposed to male headed households. Chant (2001) supported this finding, she is of the view that female headed households are those fueling the cycle of poverty. They earn low income and the burden of child care, health care among others often made them more vulnerable to poverty.
Also, the poverty depth/gap for male and female headed household were 0.043 and 0.056 respectively, which suggest that the intensity of poverty is more felt on female headed household compare to male headed household. This implies that male headed household require about 4.3% of the poverty line to escape poverty whereas the female headed household requires 5.6% to escape poverty.
Furthermore, the result revealed severity of poverty at 0.013 and 0.009 for male and female headed household respectively. This means that 1.3% inequality exist among the male headed house hold while 0.9% for female headed household. This might be a manifestation of unequal access to productive resources, such as land, agricultural credit facilities and other resources required for production. Onagun et.al (2014) shares the view that poverty is feminine in Nigeria. They further opined that female headed households were deprived in several ways.

Distribution of the Poverty Status Based on Marital Status

It is observed that 26.7% of the married household fall below the poverty line while otherwise (Single, Separated & Divorced) 26.3% fall below the poverty line. This indicate that married household head are poorer than otherwise. The result also shows that the poverty depth for married household and otherwise are 0.050 and 0.028 respectively which suggest that the intensity of poverty is more felt on married household heads compare to otherwise household heads. It implies that Married household head require 5.0% of the poverty line to escape poverty whereas otherwise household head require 2.8% to escape poverty. It implies that being married there is room for reproduction which will increase the household consumption and per capital expenditure. Furthermore, the result shows that severity is at 0.014 and 0.005 respectively.

TABLE 2: Poverty distribution of the household head

Sex	**Incidence**	**Depth**	**Severity**
Male	0.213	0.043	0.013
Female	0.420	0.056	0.009
Marital Status	**Incidence**	**Depth**	**Severity**
Married	0.267	0.050	0.014
Otherwise	0.263	0.028	0.005
Education			
Non formal Education	0	0	0
Primary Education	0.419	0.078	0.022
Secondary Education	0.186	0.035	0.009
Tertiary Education	0.333	0.042	0.010
Secondary Occupation			
No	0.164	0.027	0.008
Yes	0.426	0.077	0.019

Source: Field survey data 2016

Distribution of the Poverty Status Based on Educational Qualification

Table 2 revealed that the incidence, depth and severity of poverty is highest in the household by primary school certificate holders with incidence 0.419, depth 0.078 and severity 0.022 followed by those with tertiary education having incidence of 0.333, depth 0.042 and severity 0.010, secondary education have incidence of 0.419, depth 0.078 and severity 0.022 and lastly those with no formal education having no sign of being affected with poverty. The report of Grovetti (2020) contradict this finding. Those without education were not poor. His report opined that education is among the many causes of poverty. It was further pointed out that most of those living in extreme poverty *do* lack a basic education. The poor household head are most likely to keep their children out of school, implying that their children will vulnerable to poverty.

Distribution of the Poverty Status Based on Secondary Occupation

The household heads without secondary occupation has lower incidence, depth and severity with 0.164, 0.027 and 0.08 respectively, while households with secondary occupation has higher incidence, depth and severity of 0.426, 0.077 and 0.019 respectively. This could be as a result of the household having more focus on farming as their only source of livelihood and thereby diverting all their resources, time and effort on the farm and cultivating more hectares of land. This is contrary to the finding of Ibitoye and Odiba (2015). They are of the view that secondary occupation would serve as source of extra income and would serve as buffer during the off farming season.

Determinants of Poverty among Farming Households

Table 3 shows the result of the determinants of poverty among farming households in the study area.

The result reveals that age of the household heads was significant at 10% and have positive relationship with the poverty status i.e. the probability of the household becoming poor increases. This is in line with the findings of Omonona (2010) that the age of household heads has influence on the welfare of the household, relatively old farmers is likely to be poor. Omotayo and Oyekale (2013) also discovered that as farmer grows older they tend to become poorer.

TABLE 3: Result of the Tobit Regression model

Variables	**Coefficient**	t **value**
Age (in years)	0.0048804*	1.77
Sex	-0.1119192	-1.66
Marital Status	0.0360346	0.42
Household Size	0.0922921***	6.16
Year of Schooling (in years)	0.0002579	0.04
Land Size (in Hectares)	-0.0957206**	-2.04
Income (in Niara)	-1.28e-07	-0.57
Farm Experience (in years)	-0.0021622	-0.59
Constant	-0.6478126	-3.70

Source: Computed from field survey data 2016

*****t value significant at 1% level, **t value significant at 5% level, *t value significant at 10% level**

Household size in the study area was significant at 1% level as it was positive, it indicated that the larger the household size, the higher the probability of being poor, the older a farmer become, the more his poverty level increases. This is in contrast with the findings of Omonona et al (2006) which stated that household size was not a significant factor in the adoption analysis, the result agrees with the findings that the larger the family, the poorer the family (Omonoma 2010).

The result also reveals that the land size was also significant and negative at 5%, this implies that as farm size increases, it will lead to poverty reduction. Household with larger farm size have tendency of not being poor, this because households with larger farm size were expected to generate more income, which would enhance their consumption and subsequently improve the poverty status of the household. This is in line with the findings of Omonona (2001) and FOS (1999).

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this research work, it shows that majority of the respondents in the study area were male and married. The study indicates that the cankerworm of poverty is prevalent among female headed households that the male headed households in Nigeria. From the gender point of view, poverty is feminine. Also, that factors such as age, Household size and land size significantly affect poverty situation in Nigeria. The study also reveals that the incidence of poverty is (0.267), poverty depth is (0.0467) and poverty severity is (0.0124).

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are suggested in order to reduce or eradicate poverty in the study area. During the course of the study it was discovered that poverty was feminine in the study area. Therefore, poverty interventions should be targeted at the female headed households. The study also reveals that household size has inverse relationship with the poverty status in the area, therefore, large family size should be discouraged through intense orientation campaign for birth control or family planning and its benefit and encourage child spacing. The study also reveals that increase in the size of farmland cultivated reduces the probability of being poor of the households, as the farm size increase the poverty status reduces. Therefore, measure should be taken towards encouraging farmers to cultivate more farm size by providing Land, implements such as tractors, spraying machine etc. that could aid their farming activities and enhances their productivity thereby increase their income and this will be in collaboration sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)- Goal 1: to end poverty in all its forms everywhere.

REFERENCES

Action Aid Nigeria, (2009). *Fighting poverty in the midst of plenty II*. Country strategy paper 2009-2013, Action Aid Nigeria.

Adegbite, D.A., & Ayinde, I.A. (1999). *Family economic advancement programmes*: A strategy towards rural poverty alleviation and sustainable food security in Nigeria. Proceedings of the Nigerian Association of Agricultural Economist (NAAE). 298-308.

Anyanwu, J.D., (1997). Poverty in Nigeria: Concepts, measurements and determinants. Proceedings of the Nigerian Economic Society (NES). 93-120.

Aromolaran, A.B., Afolami, C.A., Vaughan, I.O., Fanimo, A.O. & Ayinde, I.A. (2002) *Intra-zonal poverty situation among farmers in Ogun State, Nigeria*. Moor Journal of Agricultural Research, 3. (2), 306-312.

Canagarajah, S., & Thomas, S. (2002). Poverty in a wealthy economy, the case of Nigeria. International Monetary Fund Working Paper, WP/02/114: 10-25.

Chant, S. (2001) Lone Mothers in Nations of the South. International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Science.

Chukwuemeka E. E. O. (2009) Poverty and the millennium development goals in Nigeria: The nexus Educational Research and Review 4. (9), 405-410

Durojaiye, A.D., (1995). Dimension of urban poverty: A case study of Agbowo area in Ibadan Metropolis, Oyo State, Nigeria. An unpublished M.Sc Dissertation of the Department of Agricultural Economics. Nigeria: University of Ibadan.

Food and Agricultural Organization of United Nations. *Farming System and Poverty: Improving Farmers Livelihood in a Changing World*. FAO, Rome, Italy, 2001.www.fao.org/farmingsystem.

Federal Office of Statistics (FOS), (1999). Poverty and agricultural sector in Nigeria. Abuja, Nigeria: Federal Office of Statistics.

Foster, J.E., Greer J., & Thorbeck, E. (1984). *A class of decomposable poverty measures*. Econometrica, 52. (1), 761-766.

Garba, A., (2006). *Alleviating poverty in Northern Nigeria*. A paper presented at the annual convention of zumunta association, Minneapolis, MN, USA.

Grovetti, O. (2020) How Does Education Affect Poverty? It can help End it. Concern Worldwide US

Ibitoye, S. J., & Odiba J. (2015) Analysis of impact of Community Based Poverty reduction Projecton Farming Communities in Kogi State, Nigeria. Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development 6. (4), 18-24

Mc Donald J.D., & Moffit R.A. (1980). The Uses of Tobit Analysis. Rev. Econ. Stat., 62. 318–21

Narayan D. (2000) Poverty is Powerlessness and Voicelessness. Finance and Development. 37. (4)

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2010). National Poverty Rates for Nigeria, 2003-2004 and 2009-2010. NBS, Abuja, Nigeria.

Obayelu E. A., Olarenwaju T. O., & Oyelami N. L. (2014) Effect of Rural Infrastructure on Profitability and Productivity af Cassava-Based Farms in Odogbolu Local

Government Area, Ogun State, Nigeria Journal of Agricultural Sciences 59. (2), 187-200

Ojide, M. G., Oyedele, O. A., Ukwueze, E. R., & Ikpeze, N. I. (2006) Evaluating the Effect of Road Infrastructure on Household Income in Ogoni Community, River State, Nigeria. Journal of Economics and Allied Research 1. (1), 93-105

Oladunni, E.B.I., (1999). *The dimension of poverty in Nigeria: Spatial, sectoral and gender*. Central Bank of Nigeria Bullion, 23. (4), 17-30.

Olorunsanya, E. O., & Omotesho O. A. (2012). *A Gender Analysis of Poverty Among Rural Farm Households in North Central, Nigeria*. *Journal of Social Science*.28. (3), 366 – 376.

Olorunsanya, E. O. (2009). *Gender of Household Heads and Relative Poverty among Rural Farming Households in Kwara State, Nigeria*. An Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Omonona, B. T. (2010) Quantitative Analysis of Rural Poverty in Nigeria, International Food Policy Research Institute *(IFPRI)*, IFPRI-Abuja, www.ifpri.org

Omonona, B. T; Udoh, E.J., & Egunjobi, G. J. (2006) Urban people's perception and causes of

Omonona, B.T., (2001). Poverty and its correlates among rural farming households in Kogi State,

Omotayo A. O., & Oyekale A. S. (2013) Effect of Malaria on Farming Households' Welfare in Ido Local Government Nigeria Area of Oyo State, Journal of Human Ecology, 44. (2), 189-194

Onagun I. A., Fuadah J., & Mohammed H. A. (2014) Managing Immediate Action for Women and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria: An Explanation from the Generic Theory. Asian Journal of Management Science and Education. 3. (1), 178-188

Onu, J. L., & Abayomi.Z. (2009) *An Analysis of Poverty among Households in Yola Metropolis Adamawa State, Nigeria*. *Journal of Social Science*. 20. (1), 43 – 48. ISSN: 1549-3652. PID: 100-287-325

Oyekale A. S., Adepoju A. O., & Balogun A. M. (2012). Determinants of poverty among Riverine households in Ogun State, Nigeria.*Stud Tribes Tribals.* 10. (2), 99-105

Patel, K. (2004). *Rural Poverty and Nutrition in South Africa*. Occasional Paper for International Association of Agriculture Economists (IAAE), 41 Aldershot, U.K. Gower. 79 – 82.

Sanusi R. A., Owagbemi, T. S. & Suleman M. (2013).Determinants of poverty among farm households in Ikorodu Local government area of Lagos State. IJAFS 4. (1&2), 538-552

Tobin, J. (1958). Estimation of Relationships for limited dependent variable. *Econometrica*, 26. (1), 24–36.

United Nations (UN) (1995) The Report of the World Summit for Social Development. The Copenhagen Dewclaration and Programme of African.6-12 March.

United Nations (UN) (2001) Substantive Issues arising in the Complementation of the International Covenant of Economic Social and Cultural Rights. New York: UN.

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

World Bank (2018). *Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2018: Piecing Together the Poverty Puzzle*. World Bank, Washington, D.C.

World Bank, (1999).*Understanding and responding to poverty*. Retrieved February, 2011. Available from: http://www.WorldBank.org/Poverty/Mission.