Determinants of Poverty Profiles in Ogun State

Kareem, R.O (Ph.D.)
Department of Economics and Actuarial Sciences, College of Social and Management Sciences, Crescent University, Abeokuta, Nigeria

*Corresponding Author
Kareem R.O (Ph.D.)
Email: rskventures@yahoo.com

Abstract: This research focuses on the Analysis of Determinants of Poverty Profiles in Ogun State using a case study of Abeokuta North Local Government. The broad objective of the study is to examine the determinants of poverty in Ogun State the case of Abeokuta North Local Government area of Ogun State. The specific objectives are to: describe the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents; determine the factors influencing poverty profile in the study area and proffer recommendations based on research findings on how to improve the welfare of the people and Ogun state in general. The study adopted descriptive statistics and Regression Analysis to achieve the stated objectives. The study revealed that majority of the respondents are males, still in their active and single. Majority of the respondents are within the age range 21-30 years with the maximum household size of 3-4, majority of the respondents stay in bedroom that are owned by them, majority are fairly educated and spend ≤₦5,000 on feeding, cloth, water bill, transportation, Nepa bill and school fees per term. The result also shows that majority opined that poverty in Ogun State will be decreasing in the next 10 years and the government is rated averagely when it comes to the amelioration of poverty. Also, the analysis shows that educational level and household size have positive relationship with the household expenditure model and both are significant at (5%) while age and marital status of the respondents have no significant difference in profile model. (proxied by household expenditure). This research therefore concluded that educational level and household size of the respondents have significant roles to play in the poverty profile in the study area. This research recommends that the government should: Create more job opportunities for people that are willing and able to work, improve the standard of educational with the introduction of vocational skills and also create an enabling environment (social amenities, infrastructure, etc.) that will enhance more investment to the state.

Keywords: Socio-economic characteristics, Poverty profile, Regression analysis, Descriptive statistics, Household expenditure.

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Poverty is a global phenomenon but the level of the problem in developing countries has reached alarming proportions. Globally, about 1.2 billion people are living in extreme poverty with less than one dollar per day. Due to the high prevalence of poverty, reducing it has been of grave concern to many countries in the past few decades. Though, there have been a lot of improvements in the developed world, such cannot be said of developing ones especially in the Sub-Sahara Africa where poverty is prevalent due to many factors namely: poor governance and political instability, poor economic management, mismanagement of resources, poor programme implementation, corruption and lack of purposive leadership [1].

The Nigerian situation has been described as a paradox. This is because the poverty level contradicts the country's immense wealth. The increasing level of poverty has been pervasive in the rural areas and has also been a concern to policy makers for a long time [2-3] reported that by 2009 about 69percent of Nigerians were poor. In fact, it is a general belief that poverty is more widespread and prevalent in rural than urban areas [4] and that inequality is higher in rural than urban Nigeria [5]. The worsening standard of living of people in the country can be traced to a number of factors ranging from lack of access to education, health care facilities, good food, potable water, proper sanitation system, poor infrastructural development, and inadequate access to land and capital or credit. Poverty is undesirable, it is an economic and social malaise, a ravaging phenomenon that must be tackled [6].

Problem Statement

High level of income inequality exists in many nations of sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). This can be buttressed by widening dimension of poverty and general economic problems in many of these nation. [7] stated that low income countries contain approximately 62percent of the world's population. This shows great

disparity between total incomes and per capita income of the developed and developing countries.

The differential between rural and urban incomes, most times, inhabitants of the rural areas migrate to urban areas in search of proverbial pot of gold or greener pastures because they feel urban areas hold more opportunities for them than the rural areas. This influx of rural dwellers into the urban areas results in over population and over taxing of the amenities available in the urban areas which eventually lead to high level of poverty among the populace. Thus, the question is what are the determinants of poverty profile in the study area? Therefore, the broad objective of this study is to examine the determinants of poverty profile; In the case of Abeokuta North area, Local Government area of Ogun State. The specific objectives are to: describe the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, determine the factors influencing poverty profiles in the study area, and proffer recommendation based on research findings on how to improve the welfare of the people in the study area and Ogun state in general.

Research Hypothesis

The understated null hypothesis was tested for this study:

H_O: There is no significant difference between socio-economic characteristics and poverty profile (proxied by household expenditure) in the study area.

Significance of The Study

The 1990s witnessed resurgence in theoretical and empirical attention by development economists to the distribution of income and wealth. This is because high level of income inequality produces unfavourable environment for economic growth and development [8]. The present study differs from previous studies that used (FGT) Foster-Greer-Thorbecke in terms of the methodology. In this study, a survey was conducted in a rural area in Ogun State using descriptive statistics and regression analysis to describe socio economic characteristic as well as determining factors influencing poverty profile in Abeokuta North and Ogun State in general.

This study will further assist and suggest alternative measures that could be used to improve the socio-economic status of Nigerians in the rural areas. In other words, the knowledge will help the policy makers in formulating policies that will ameliorate the incidence of poverty in the State and Nigeria in general.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Estimation of Poverty Line

Expenditure of the households on food and non-food were used as proxy for income to determine poverty lines of the households. Firstly, monthly household expenditure was expressed in per capita terms, that is, Monthly Per Capita Household Expenditure (MPCHHE) to adjust for household size, by dividing each household's monthly expenditure by the household size. Then, the mean monthly per capita household expenditure (MMPCHHE) was arrived at, by the summation of all MPCHHE and dividing it by total number of households. MMPCHHE allows us to have two poverty lines. The upper poverty line is equivalent to two-third of the MMPCHHE and the lower is equivalent to one third of the MMPCHHE [9]. The core poor households are those with MPCHHE less than one-third MMPCHHE, moderately poor have MPCHHE less than two thirds MMPCHHE, and the non-poor have MPCHHE greater than two-thirds MMPCHHE.

Analysis of Poverty In Nigeria

National Bureau of Statistics adopts the relative poverty measurement for monitoring poverty trends in the country. It remains a paradox however, that despite the fact that the Nigerian economy is growing, the proportion of Nigerians living in poverty is increasing every year, although it declined between 1985 and 1992, and between 1996 and 2004. However, (Table 1) shows the distribution of the proportion of the extremely poor increased from 6.2 percent in 1980 to 29.3 percent in 1996and then came down to 22.0 percent in 2004 before reaching 38.7% in 2010. For the moderately poor, the picture was quite different as the proportion rose between 1980 and1985 from 21.0 percent to 34.2 percent. It went down between 1996 and 2004, from 36.3percent to 32.4 percent, and even further in 2010 to 30.3 percent. On the other hand, the proportion of non-poor was much higher in the country in 1980 (72.8 percent) compared to1992 (57.3 percent). It dropped significantly in 1996 to 34.4 percent, falling further in 2010 to31 percent.

Table 1: Relative poverty headcount from 1980-2010

Year	Poverty Incidence (₦)	Estimated Population (Million)	Population in Poverty (Million)

1980	27.2	65	17.1
1985	46.3	75	34.7
1992	42.7	91.5	39.2
1996	65.6	102.3	67.1
2004	54.4	126.3	68.7
2010	69.0	163	112.47

Source: National Bureau of Statistics (2010).

Empirical Review

The impact of income risk on the level of well-being of rural households in Ogun state, Nigeria was analyzed [10]. Income risk was defined as the risks associated with variability in income well-being. It was found that household heads' age, years of formal education, household size of land cultivated and total expenditure (on food and non-food items) are major determinants of income risks among rural households, while income risk impact negatively on the well-being of the households.

Moreso, [11] analyzed the idiosyncratic and covariate factors that explain expected poverty in rural Nigeria using 1996 national data. Results show that the over-all expected poverty for the country at 0.535 is 1.02 times the observed poverty in 1996. Higher expected poverty is synonymous with north east, no formal education, farming, older head of household, large household size and male headed household.

Poverty was referred to by [12] as a lack of command over basic consumption needs, that is, a situation of inadequate level of consumption; giving rise to insufficient food, clothing and shelter. Similarly, [13] defined poverty as lack of certain capabilities, such as being able to participate with dignity in societal endeavour. Poverty has also been defined as the inability to attain a minimum standard of living [14]. The report constructed two indices based on a minimum level of consumption in order to show the practical aspect of the concept. While the first index was a country specific poverty line, the second was global, allowing cross-country comparisons [15].

However, [16] submitted that it is conceived as the prospect that a person has now of becoming poor in the future if currently not poor, or the prospect of continuing to be poor if currently poor. [17] equally found that the highest incidence of poverty was among farming households in 1985, 1992 and 1996 with the highest incidence (70 percent) occurring in 1996. Similarly, lack of adequate security was identified as another dimension of poverty in urban areas [18-19].

In the same vein, [20] used data from eight countries containing approximately two-thirds of the developing world's people suggest that the locus of poverty is shifting from rural areas to urban areas. Furthermore, poverty gap in Nigeria is widening and a greater proportion of the nation's wealth is being concentrated in the hands of the few individuals [21].

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
Study Area

The study was carried out in Abeokuta the capital city of Ogun State, South-west Nigeria. The state was carved out the old Western region in 1976 by the then Federal military Government. It is located within latitudes 3°30'N-4°30'N and longitudes 6°30'E-7°30'E. The state has a total of 20 Local Government Areas. Abeokuta (the study area) has the highest population and it is the most urbanized city in the state. It is mostly populated by civil servants, artisans, traders, transport workers, student's etc. Substantial part of the population migrated from nearby villages and small towns to this capital city. The state is bounded in the West by the Republic of Benin, in the south by Lagos State and the Atlantic Ocean, in the east by Ondo state and in the North by Oyo State. The state covers a land area of 16,762 km^2 with a population of 3,728,098 according to the 2006 population census.

Abeokuta North is a Local Government area in Ogun State, Nigeria. Its Headquarters are in town of Akomoje, near Abeokuta .It has an area of 808 km^2 and a population of 201,329 as at the 2006 census.

Sampling Techniques

Simple random sample was used to select 50 households across different locations in the study area. The respondents were randomly chosen with a view to eliminating bias in the selection.

Method of Data Collection and Data Sources

Primary data were used in this study. These were collected by personal interview with the aid of structured questionnaires. Data were collected on socio-economic characteristics of households (such as household head's age, income, education etc.), types of houses, ownership, types of schools attended by the children, types of toilets in the house, types of occupation, health services patronized, food and non-food expenditure among several other variables in order to capture the research topic' determinant of poverty profile in the study area.

Method Of Data Analysis
Descriptive statistics: Frequency tables and percentages were used to describe the socio-economic characteristics of respondents, (e.g. Education, Age, Marital Status, Household Size etc.)

Multiple Regression Analysis: The Ordinary Least Square (OLS) multiple regression analysis was used to determine factors influencing poverty profiles proxied by their per capita expenditure. The model is given as:
$Y = F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, U)$ = Implicit Function

Where;
Y= Household Expenditure of Respondents (₦)
λ_1= Education of Respondents (Yrs)
λ_2=Age of the Respondents (Yrs)
λ_3= Marital Status of Respondents (Dummy)(0,1)
λ_4= Household Size of Respondents (No)
U=random error
$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1\lambda_1 + \beta_2\lambda_2 + \beta_3\lambda_3 + \beta_4\lambda_4 + U$ = Explicit Function

The *apriori* expectations are: β_0 and $\beta_1 > 0$; $\beta_4 < 0$; $+ \beta_2$ and $\beta_3 <$ or> 0
$\beta_1 > 0$ implies that the higher the level of the education of the respondents the higher the expected household expenditure of the respondents.
$\beta_4 < 0$ implies that the higher household size of the respondents the higher the expected household expenditure of the respondents.
β_2 and $\beta_3 <$ or> 0 implies that age and marital status of the respondents either brings high level of expected household expenditure or low level of expected household expenditure.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents
The results of the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents is as shown in table 2. It shows that the majority (64%) of the respondents are males while females constitute (22%). The implication of this result is that the majority of the people in the study area males. It revealed that the age of the high proportion (38%) of respondents range from 21-30 years, followed by age range 20 and below (34%) and the least age range was 41-50 (6%). The result implies that most respondents were still in their active age. Similarly, table 2 shows that majority (56%) of the respondent are single, 38% of the respondents are single, (4%) are divorced and (2%) are widows. This might be a reason to determine poverty profile in the way the marital status is being set up. Moreso, results revealed that majority (34%) have number of households ranging from 3-4 with the least being (4%) which is 7-8 number of households. Similarly, results indicate that high proportion of the respondents (46%) are WASCE/SSCE holders, followed by HND/B.Sc holders which are (30%) and the least being MSc

holders which is (4%). This implication is that majority of the respondents are fairly educated. The high proportion (42%) of the respondents are living in flat, followed by (34%) stay in self-contain and (24%) reside in old structure type (face me and face you). This shows that majority of the respondents stay in bedroom flat apartment which might be an indication of being fairly educated.

Table 2: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	32	64.0
Female	18	36.0
Age		
Below 20yrs	17	34.0
21-30yrs	19	38.0
31-40yrs	7	14.0
41-50yrs	1	6.0
51yrs and above	4	8.0
Marital status		
Married	19	38.0
Single	28	56.0
Divorce	2	4.0
Widow	1	2.0
Household size		
1-2	9	18.0
3-4	17	34.0
5-6	17	34.0
7-8	2	4.0
9 and above	5	10.0
Educational qualification		
WASCE/SSCE	23	46.0
OND	10	20.0
HND/BSc	15	30.0
MSc	2	4.0
Type of accommodation		
Self contained	17	34.0
Flat	21	42.0
Face me and I face you	12	24.0

Source: Computed from field survey

Distribution of the respondents based on household expenditure
Table 3 shows the distribution of respondents based on households expenditure. It shows that majority of the respondents (74%) spend ≤ ₦5,000 on feeding, while majority of the respondents (88%) also spend ≤ ₦5,000 on clothing. Majority (84%) spend ≤ ₦5000 on

house rent monthly, followed by (8%) of people who spend between ₦5,001- ₦10,000 and the least with (2%) from ₦ 10,001- ₦15,000 and ₦ 15,001- ₦ 20,000 respectively. Majority (94%) spend ≤ ₦5,000 on Nepa bill and others with (2%) spend ₦5,001- ₦ 10,000, ₦ 15,001-₦20,000 and ₦20,001 and above respectively on Nepa bill. It also shows that majority (94%) spend ≤ ₦ 5,000 on transportation while only (6%) of respondents spend between ₦ 5,001- ₦ 10,000 on transportation. Results also revealed that majority (58%) spend ≤₦5,000 on school fees per term, (32%) spend ₦ 20,001 and above and (10%) spend between ₦5, 001-₦10,000 on school fees per term. Similarly, majority (98%) spend ≤₦5,000 on water bill and (2%) spend between ₦ 5,001-₦ 10,000 on water bill. It also indicates that majority (70%) spend ≤₦5,000 for household upkeep, 12 percent spend ₦ 20,001 and above, 10 percent spends between ₦50,001-₦10,000, others with (4%) spend between ₦10,001- ₦15,000 and ₦15,001- ₦ 20,000 respectively for the upkeep of the household.

Distribution of respondents on households income/month

Table 4 shows that majority (36%) of households income fall between ₦10,001-₦15,000, 32 percent fall between ₦5,001-₦10,000 with the least 2 percent being ₦20,001 and above. It also shows that (28%) of respondents' spouse were getting ≤₦10,000 as take home pay, followed by 24 percent of the respondents taking between ₦20,001-₦30,000 while the least 8 percent of the respondents' spouse getting between ₦10,001-₦20,000 and (2%) of the respondents did not respond.

Distribution of respondents by Access to facilities

Table 5 shows that majority (84%) of the respondents have access to electricity and (16%) of the respondents do not have access to electricity. It also revealed that majority (84%) of respondents owned television/radio and (16%) of the respondents do not own television/radio. Moreso, majority (78%) of respondents owned handsets and (22%) of the respondents do not own handsets. Majority (70%) of respondents owned fans and (30%) of respondents do not own fans. Majority (52%) of respondents do not own upholstery chairs, (48%) of respondents owned upholstery chairs. Majority (54%) of respondents do not own a dining table, (46%) of respondents owned a dining table.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents by Households' expenditure

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Expenditure on feeding		

<₦5000	37	74.0
<₦5001-₦10,000	8	16.0
<₦10,001-₦10000	1	2.0
<₦15,000-₦20,000	2	4.0
<₦20,001- and above	2	4.0
Expenditure on clothing		
<₦5000	44	88.0
<₦5001-₦10,000	5	10.0
<₦20,000 and above	2	2.0
Expenditure on house rent		
<₦5000	42	84.0
<₦5001-₦10,000	16	8.0
<₦10,001-₦10,000	1	2.0
<₦15,000-₦20,000	1	2.0
<₦20,001 and above	2	4.0
Expenditure on Nepa Bill		
<₦5000-₦10,000	47	94.0
<₦10,001-₦10,000	1	2.0
<₦15,001-₦20,000	1	2.0
<₦20,000 and above	1	2.0
Expenditure on transportation		
<₦5000-₦10,000	47	94.0
<₦10,001-₦10,000	3	6.0
Expenditure on school fees		
<₦5000	29	58.0
<₦5001-₦10,000	5	10.0
<₦20,000 and above	16	32.0
Expenditure on water bill		
<₦5000	49	98.0
<₦5001-₦10,000	1	2.0
Expenditure on household keeping		
<₦5000	35	70.0
<₦5001-₦10,000	5	10.0
<₦10,001-₦15,000	2	4.0
<₦15,001-₦20,000	2	4.0
<₦20,001-and above	6	12.0

Source: Computed from field survey, 2014
Exchange rate at the time of survey- One USD = ₦167.00

Table 4: Distribution of respondents on households income per month

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<₦5000	10	20.0
<₦5001-₦10,000	16	32.0
<₦10,001-₦15,000	18	26.0
<₦15,001-₦20,000	5	10.0
<₦2001 and above	1	2.0

Spouse income		
No response	2	4.0
<₦5000	14	28.0
<₦5001-₦10,000	4	8.0
<₦10,001-₦15,000	12	24.0
<₦15,001-₦20,000	6	12.0
<₦20,001 and above	12	24.0

Source: Computed from field survey

Exchange rate at the time of survey: ₦167 = One USD

Table 5: Distribution of respondents by Access to facilities

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Access to electricity		
Yes	42	84.0
No	8	16.0
Access to television/radio		
Yes	42	84.0
No	8	16.0
Access to hand sets		
Yes	39	78.0
No	11	22.0
Access to ceiling /standing fans		
Yes	35	70.0
No	15	30.0
Access to upholstery chairs		
Yes	24	48.0
No	26	52.0
Access to Dinning table		
Yes	23	46.0
No	27	54.0

Source : Computed from field survey, 2014

REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Table 6 shows that the R-Square is 0.291. This implies that about 29.1% of the total variation in household expenditure (proxy for income) is being explained by explanatory variables (educational level, age, marital status and household size of the respondents).

Table 6 shows the coefficient of the parameters. The parameter with positive value shows that a unit increase in the variable will lead to corresponding unit increase in dependent variable. Meanwhile the results of educational level, marital and household size of the respondents are positively related to poverty profile or household expenditure. This result implies that all these variables (Educational level, Age, Marital status, Household size) will lead to a unit increase in dependent variable (household expenditure).

However the result of age of the respondent is negatively related to poverty profile. This result implies that a unit increase in age of respondents decreases the household expenditure, In other words, as older, one becomes, (Aged) the less one consumes, which means that younger ones consume more at their early stage of life than the aged ones. The result of the T- Statistics shows that Educational level and Household size were significant at (5%) probability level. This result indicates that the educational level and household size are the determinant of poverty profile in the study area. In other words, educational level and household size are the factors influencing poverty profiles in the study area. Table 6 also shows that the F-statistics is also significant at 1% probability level (0.03) is of goodness of fit, Moreso, F-statistics is a measure of the significant of the explanatory variables.

Table 6: Regression analysis

Y	Bo	β1	β2	β3	β4	F-value	R^2	Adjusted R^2
	-26574.2	3645.8	-619.8	11467.7	4904.4	0.003	0.291	0.228
t-value	(-1.15)	(2.16)	(-1.45)	(1.41)	(2.44)			
Sig.value	0.260	04.15	165	019				

Source: Computed from field survey, 2014

The t- Test of Household Expenditure And Educational Level of Respondents

Table 7 shows the T- test of household expenditure and Educational level of respondents.. The results revealed that there is significant difference between the poverty profile and Educational level of the respondents. This implies that there is high level of differential among the respondents based on the household expenditure. Thus, the higher the level of education the lower the expected level of poverty.

Table 7: T-test of households' expenditure and Educational level of respondents

Mean	Standard	Standard Error	T	Df	Sig

	Deviation	Mean			
2.7123E4	32682.70039	4621.89039	5.868	49	.000

t- Test of Household Expenditure and Household Size of Respondents

Table 8 shows the T- test of household expenditure and household size of respondents. The results indicate that there is significant difference between the poverty profile and household size of the respondents. This implies that there is high level of differential among the respondents based on the household expenditure. Thus, the higher the level of education, the lower the expected level of poverty.

Table 8: T- test of household expenditure and household size of respondents

Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	T	Df	Sig
2.7123E4	32681.54278	4621.54278	5.869	49	.000

SUMMARY CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of research findings

This study focuses on the Analysis of Determinants of Poverty Profiles in Ogun State using a case study of Abeokuta North Local Government. The study revealed that

- Majority of the respondents are males, still in their active and single. Majority of the respondents are within the age range 21-30 years with the maximum household size of 3-4, majority of the respondents stay in bedroom that are owned by them, majority are fairly educated and spend ≤₦5,000 on feeding, cloth, water bill, transportation, Nepa bill and school fees per term.
- The result also shows that majority opined that poverty in Ogun State will be decreasing in the next 10 years and the government is rated averagely when it comes to the amelioration of poverty.
- The analysis shows that educational level and household size have positive relationship with the household expenditure model and both are significant at (5%) while age and marital status of the respondents have no significant difference in profile model. (proxied by household expenditure).
- Educational level and Household size of the respondents have significant roles to play in the poverty profile in Abeokuta North Local Government Area in Ogun State.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on research findings, the study concluded that educational level and household size of the respondents have significant roles to play in the poverty profile in Abeokuta North Local Government Area in Ogun State. In order to reduce high rate of poverty in the study area and Ogun State in general. The following are therefore recommended.

- Giving out soft loans or credit facilities for people to invest on profitable ventures.

- The standard of education should be improved with introduction of vocational skills.
- Creation of enabling environment (social amenities infrastructures like good roads, hospitals etc.) that will enhance more investment in the state as well as the creation of job opportunities for the people.
- Creation of more poverty alleviation programs with a view to ameliorating poverty profile of the citizenry.
- Create entrepreneurial training centres for low income dwellers on what they can do to help improve their income.

REFERENCES

1. Babatunde RA, Olorunsanya EO, Adejola; Assessment of Rural Household poverty Evidence from South Western Nigeria, Eurasian, S. Agric and Environ. Sci, 2008; 3(6):900-905..
2. Federal Office of Statistics (FOS); Poverty and Welfare in Nigeria, (Nigeria: FOS, 1999).
3. National Bureau of Statistics. Poverty Profile of year, 2010; 1-19
4. International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFA): Rural and Urban Inequality in Nigeria. 2007.
5. Oyekale TO, Okunmadewa FY, Omonona BT, Oni OA; Fuzzy Set Approach the Multidimensional Poverty Decomposition in Rural Nigeria. The ictfai Journal of Agricultural Economics, 2009; 6(3&4):7-44 .
6. Obaseki PJ, Onwioduokit EA; Indicators of Poverty: Cross Country Analysis. Selected Papers for the 1997Annual Conference of the Nigerian Economic Society, 1997; 301-326.
7. Thirlwall A P; Growth and Development with special by Developing Economics, Macmillan Publisher. 1994; 15-19
8. Birdsall N; Rising Inequality in the New Global Economy. World Institute for Development Economic Research (WIDER) 2005; 2(1).

9. Foster J, Greer J, Thorbecke E; A class of decomposable poverty measures. Econometrica, 1984; 52 (3):761–6.
10. Oluwatayo IB; Income Risk and Welfare Status of Rural Households in Nigeria. Ekiti State as a Test Case Research. Paper No.2004/61. World Institute for Development Economic Research (WIDER). 2004.
11. Oni OA, Yusuf SA; The Determinants of Poverty Among Rural Households. Department of Agriculture, University of Ibadan. 2007; 1-44
12. Ravallion M, Bidani B; How Robust is a Poverty Profile? The World Bank Economic Review, 1994;8(1):75- 102.
13. Aluko S; Poverty: Its Remedies. In Poverty in Nigeria, the Nigerian Economic Society, Ibadan. 1975; 122.
14. World Development Report; The Real Poverty, 1990.
15. Walton M; Combating Poverty, Experience and Prospect. Finance and Development. 1990; 27(3):5-15
16. Christiaensen L, Subbarao K; Towards and Understanding of Vulnerability in Rural Kenya. Mimeo. 2004; 1-7.
17. Okumadewa F; Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria: The International Dimension. Selected Papers for the Nigerian Economic Society's 1997 Annual Conference of the Nigerian Economic Society. 1997; 287-300.
18. World Bank; Ecuador Poverty Report. World Bank Country Study, The World Bank, Washington, DC, 1996; 43-45.
19. World Bank. Inequality Measurement and Decomposition, World Bank Poverty. 1999.
20. Ruel MT, Garratt JL, Morris SS, Maxwell D, Oshaug A, Engle P, Menon P, Slack A, Haddad L; Urban Challenges to Foods and Nutrition Security: A Review of Food Security Health and care giving in Cities. FCND Discussion paper no.51.IFPRI. 1998.
21. Ali-Akpajiak SCA, Pyke T; Measuring Poverty in Nigeria. Oxfam Working Paper, Oxfam GB, 274, Oxford. 2003.