

1 OGUNNIYI LAUDIA TITIOLA¹, Olapade-ogunwole² and Olapade-ogunwole³

2 ¹ LADOKE AKINTOLA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

3 *Received: 8 June 2011 Accepted: 7 July 2011 Published: 20 July 2011*

4

5 **Abstract**

6 The study focus on the living conditions of respondents in the study area, determine their
7 poverty level and examine the existence of income inequality among farmers in the study area.
8 A multistage random sampling was used to select the 150 respondents from the two Local
9 Governments Areas; a well structured questionnaire was used to collect primary data from the
10 farmers. Data collected was analysed using descriptive statistics, Gini coefficient and FGT
11 poverty ratio. Majority of the farmers are male and the mean age for food crop, livestock and
12 mixed farmers are 51years, 50years and 49 years respectively. Household size of 5 members or
13 less is generally above average in the study area. Livestock farmers accounted for the highest
14 value respondents without formal education i.e. 32.5 percent; most of the farmers are
15 educated. While personal savings and cooperative sociteis are the major source of fund for
16 agricultural production in the study area, commercial banks are least patronized for funding
17 in the 3 categories of farm practices. Result of the living condition of the respondents reveals
18 that 58.3 percent of the mixed farmers lived in family house, while 20 percent of livestock
19 farmers lived in their personal apartment. While 62 percent of crop farmers uses pit latrine for
20 faecal disposal, 13.3 percent of mixed farmers used water closet. Majority of the respondents
21 sourced their water from dug well, only 1.7 percent of those engaged in mixed farming sourced
22 water from government provision of pipe borne water. The result showed that the moderate
23 poverty line are 1,222.86, 1566.45 and 1381.26 for food crop farmers, livestock farmers and
24 farmers that engage in mixed farming respectively while the core poor are 611.43, 783.22 and
25 690.63 for the three group of farmers.

26

27 **Index terms**— Comparative, Poverty, Metropolis
28 Comparative Analysis of Poverty and Income Inequality Among Food Crop and Livestock Farmers in Ilesa
29 Metropolis, Osun State

30 **1 Abstract**

31 The study focus on the living conditions of respondents in the study area, determine their poverty level and
32 examine the existence of income inequality among farmers in the study area. A multistage random sampling
33 was used to select the 150 respondents from the two Local Governments Areas; a well structured questionnaire
34 was used to collect primary data from the farmers. Data collected was analysed using descriptive statistics, Gini
35 coefficient and FGT poverty ratio. Majority of the farmers are male and the mean age for food crop, livestock
36 and mixed farmers are 51years, 50years and 49 years respectively. Household size of 5 members or less is generally
37 above average in the study area. Livestock farmers accounted for the highest value respondents without formal
38 education i.e. 32.5 percent; most of the farmers are educated. While personal savings and cooperative sociteis
39 are the major source of fund for agricultural production in the study area, commercial banks are least patronized
40 for funding in the 3 categories of farm practices. Result of the living condition of the respondents reveals that 58
41.3 percent of the mixed farmers lived in family house, while 20 percent of livestock farmers lived in their personal
42 apartment. While 62 percent of crop farmers uses pit latrine for faecal disposal, 13.3 percent of mixed farmers
43 used water closet. Majority of the respondents sourced their water from dug well, only 1.7 percent of those
44 engaged in mixed farming sourced water from government provision of pipe borne water. The result showed that

45 the moderate poverty line are 1,222.86, 1566.45 and 1381.26 for food crop farmers, livestock farmers and farmers
46 that engage in mixed farming respectively while the core poor are 611.43, 783.22 and 690.63 for the three group
47 of farmers. Poverty is most pervasive among mixed farmers with a value of 21.7 compared to other categories.
48 Farmers growing food crops recorded the least poverty incidence, depth and severity. Income is most unequally
49 distributed among livestock farmers as represented by a value of 0.04 and also they have the highest social welfare
50 (7145.24) because of the higher mean income of N17, 863.10. Integrated community development is recommended
51 because rural community problems are multifaceted and need several approaches of various institutions to meet
52 these problems to improve levels of living.

53 2 I. NTRODUCTION

54 poverty is the inability to adequately meet the basic human necessities, such as food, shelter, clothing and medicare.
55 It is also a state of deprivation of human needs to which a person, household, community or nation can be
56 subjected. It is a broadly multidimensional, partly subjective phenomenon, often viewed as both the cause and
57 symptoms of Author : Department of Agric. Economics, Ladoke Akintola University of Tech, Ogbomoso. E-mail
58 : titiogunniyi@yahoo.com underdevelopment. It is manifested in many ways including the lack of capability by
59 individual or group to function and feed well in the society ??Sen,1996). The incidence of poverty among farmers
60 and farm labourers is related to the broader society in which they live. Poverty is a result of low level of assets,
61 coupled with low returns. The poor have very few assets beyond their own labour, which is inevitably spent in
62 tedious, backbreaking, low paid work. Poverty breeds poverty. A poor individual or family has a high probability
63 of staying poor. Low incomes carry with them high risks of illnesses, limitations on mobility, limited access to
64 education deprivation but also in terms of an individual's inability to access basic social amenities (CBN/World
65 Bank, 1999). It can also be said that poverty as a way of live is characterized by low calorie intake, inaccessibility
66 to adequate health facilities low quality education system, low income, unemployment, and under employment
67 and inaccessibility to various housing and societal facilities (Onibokun and Kumuyi, 1996).

68 In Nigeria, studies reveal that income inequality is increasing in rural and urban areas and this can be linked to
69 the growing dimension of poverty. Aigbokhan ??2000), argued that inequality adversely affects growth through
70 a number of channels. Firstly inequality may generate social conflict over dimensional issues that diminish the
71 security of property rights thereby lowering investment and economic growth, Secondly, he said that the need
72 to reduce poverty through lowering inequality in the face of social conflict might encourage higher taxes. These
73 higher taxes lower the rate of return to private access and thereby affect accumulations; such imperfections would
74 mean that people cannot really borrow to finance education from their own resources and this affect the rate of
75 growth as it affect the rate of growth of labour force. And thirdly, inequality through its effects on investment in
76 human capital may increase fertility. Meludu and Adekoya (2005) reported that poverty is also strongly influenced
77 by education and location, in Nigeria poverty is seen as a rural problem where majority of the inhabitants engage
78 in agricultural productions as a means of livelihood. The agricultural sector employed about 65 percent of the
79 population for

80 3 August

81 -Poverty manifests itself not economic in only the production of food and livestock for consumption, raw materials
82 for agro allied industries as well as pharmaceutical industries etc. the low performance of the agricultural sector
83 can be attributed to subsistence level of production which consequently result in reduced income thereby causing
84 disparity in income compared to their counterparts. To make up for this low income, farmers engage in other
85 income earning activities which further widens the gap created by income inequality (Ipinnaiye, 2001) .

86 According to Caninada and Goudsward (2001), agricultural activities are common in rural areas while non-
87 farming activities dominate the urban area. Intrasectorally, income inequality is lower within the agricultural
88 sector than the non-agricultural sector. ??uznet (1963) observed that average income from nonagricultural
89 sector were higher than those from agricultural activities and were associated with differences in organization,
90 technology and productivity. He also deduced that, income inequality in agricultural sector was still higher than
91 income inequality in nonagricultural sector for the undeveloped than the developed countries. ??acobs (2000) in
92 his study stated that total income inequality accounted for, by differences between age groups is very low (less
93 or equal to 5 percent) , therefore age does not explain much of the observed income inequality. Inequality was
94 observed to be more prevalent between individual for the same groups.

95 4 Bovillon et al., (2001) identify the contribution of micro

96 economics factors to increasing income inequality. They reported that changes in returns to household
97 characteristics in particular, changes to education are responsible for about 50 percent change in income inequality,
98 this was also supported by Alayande (2003). Omonona (2001) also reported the varying levels of inequalities in
99 the sources of per capita income of the households, according to the study, the higher the years of education of
100 the household head the higher the incentive to get income from non farm wage employment.

101 It is also worthy to note that reduction in rural infrastructure on the part of the government can also contribute
102 to poverty hence, income inequality. A good road network especially in rural areas, efficient and cost effective
103 irrigation system, rural electrification and improvement in per capita energy consumption apart from upgrading

104 of marketing infrastructure the need to improve health delivery system, improve quality of education and provide
105 access to safe drinking water and sanitation to all can reduce income disparity and alleviate poverty. In view of
106 this, the study examines the socio economic characteristics of the respondents, the level of income as well as the
107 living conditions that determine poverty levels of households in the study of area.

108 The study was carried out in Ilesa metropolis, Osun state. Ancient Ilesa city used to be a single Local
109 Government Area, until November 1988, when it was divided into two LGAs i.e. Ilesa West and Ilesa East local
110 Government Areas accordingly which makes up the metropolis. Ilesa East local Government is about 113km²
111 in land area and size and it is located on 17° 30' 1 North of the equator and West local Government is about
112 114km² in land area and size and it is located on 19° 30' 1 South of the equator and 5° -75 1 A multistage random
113 sampling technique was used to select the respondents. The first stage involves the random selection of two wards
114 each from the 2

115 LGAs. Two villages each was also selected at random from each of the ward to make a total of eight villages,
116 this forms the second stage. The last stage involves random selection of 20 farmers from each village to give a
117 sample population of 160 respondents. However, data from 150 respondents was finally used for the analysis.
118 The remaining 10 questionnaire were discarded due to incomplete information.

119 **5 a) Method of Data Analysis**

120 Descriptive statistics, poverty indices and Gini coefficient was used to analyse data collected. The estimation
121 of Gini coefficient involves ranking the units of observation on the basis of some quality of interest and then
122 estimating cumulative proportions. It shows the distribution of expenditure above the poverty line. The closer
123 the distribution, the better the people while the more dispersed the distribution, the more pronounced poverty
124 is in the area of study. Gini coefficient is estimated according to Sen (1996).

125 **6 b) Gini Coefficient**

126 The -coefficient involves ranking the units of observation on the basis of some quality of interest and then
127 estimating cumulative proportions. It shows the distribution of expenditure above the poverty line. The closer
128 the distribution, the better the people while the more dispersed the distribution, the more pronounced poverty
129 is in the area of study.

130 **7 August estimation of the Gini**

131 Gini coefficient is estimated as: $GC = \frac{1}{X} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (Y_i - Y_{i+1}) (X_i - X_{i+1})$ Where X =
132 Percentage of household Y = Cumulative percentage of expenditure-distribution c) FGT Poverty Measures

133 The Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (FGT) poverty measures are additive. This means that the poverty measures
134 of the population as well as a whole is equal to the weighted sum of the poverty measures for the population
135 subgroups, with the weights defined by the population shares of the subgroups. It is written as: This is the
136 proportion of people below the poverty line. Mean per capita income is calculated and the poverty line is drawn
137 to separate the poor from the non poor. Head count ratio is used to calculate the number of households whose
138 members have per capital income below the poverty line. When there is no aversion to poverty, it is expressed
139 as: $H = \frac{\text{Number of poor households}}{\text{Total number of households}}$

140 Where H = Headcount ratio. This index measures the incidence of poverty.

141 **8 e) Poverty Gap Ratio**

142 Poverty gap is the aggregate short fall of income of all the poor from the specified poverty line. It measures the
143 difference between actual income and minimum non-poverty income. It is denoted as G and is expressed as: $G = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - Y_{\text{poverty line}})}{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i}$ f) Severity Indices

144 The severity of poverty indices, denoted by P , is the sum of the square of poverty depth divided by the
145 number of poor households. It allows for concern about the poorest of the poor by attaching greater weight to
146 the poorest of the poor than of those just below the poverty line. The distribution of respondents according to their socio-
147 economic characteristics is presented in table 1. The result reveals that 86 percent food crops farmers are male,
148 66.7 percent of farmers engaging in mixed farming are also male, while only 14 percent of the food crops farmers
149 are female. This is an indication that most of the food crops and livestock farmers, as well as respondents engaged
150 in mixed farming are male. The reason for this is not far fetched as agricultural production is tedious in nature
151 especially growing food crops relative others. About 50 percent of the respondents are between the age range
152 of 40 -59 with an exception of live stock farmers. The mean age is 51.34 years, 50.30 years and 49.37 years
153 respectively for food crops, livestock and farmers engaged in mixed farming respectively. This implies that most
154 of these farmers are in their productive age and therefore they can participate actively in various agricultural
155 productions. Majority of the respondents (88% of food crops, 77.5% of livestock and 81.7 of mixed farming) are
156 married while others are single, divorced or widowed. This indicates that married people were more involved
157 in agricultural production in the study area. The higher percentage of married respondents agrees with Jibowo
158 (1992) who reported that the higher percentage of farming populace is made up of married people.

159 The table further reveals that 46 percent of food crop farmers have about 5 household members while other
160 categories have above average i.e. 70 and 68 percent for livestock and mixed farming respectively. this implies

162 that majority of the farming households in the study area do not have large household size, hence income earned
163 from farming activities will be expended on these members which will consequently improve their welfare. Most
164 of the farmers in the three categories of farmers have one form of formal education or the other ranging from
165 primary education to tertiary education, about 22 percent accounted for respondents who grow food poverty
166 line. It is expressed as: August ?? percent represent respondents that engage in livestock and mixed farming
167 that have no formal education respectively. Literacy level among the respondents is high which may affect their
168 productivity in various enterprises.

169 Furthermore, the distribution of respondents based on sources of funding for their agricultural activities shows
170 that personal saving (76.0%, 55.0%, and 73.3%) and cooperative (46.0%, 32.5%, and 41.7%) are the predominant
171 sources of funding for food crop and livestock farmers and those who are involved in mixed farming respectively.
172 Source of funding percentage i.e. 6.0, 5.0 and 3.3 percents for the three (3) categories of farmers. The result
173 reveals that commercial banks are less patronized for financial support for farming in the study area. This may
174 be due to avoidance high interest rate on collected loan.

175 While 90.0 and 98.0 percent of food crop farmers cultivate cassava and maize respectively, about 70.0, 76.0, and
176 31.0 percent of respondents that engage in mixed farming produce cassava maize and yam along with livestock
177 production respectively. Also, the distribution of respondents according to types of livestock raised shows that
178 52.5 and 32.5 percent engage in goat and poultry production, 63.3% and 33.3% are mixed farmers raising goat
179 and poultry along side with food crop farming. Few of the farmers rear pig (12.5%) or rear it along side crop
180 farming (6.7%). This therefore implies that mixed farming of goat, poultry and crops are predominant. Majority
181 of the respondents in the study area earn less than N40,000 from their farming in the study area. Only 6.0, 7.5
182 and 15.0 percent earn as much as N80,000 in food crop and livestock production and mixed farming respectively.
183 This is an indication that earning from farming activities is generally low in the area.

184 **9 Global Journal of Human Social Science**

185 Volume XI Issue V Version I 2 discusses the distribution of the respondents according to the standard of living
186 in the study area. Majority of the farmers are indigene in all the categories of farming under consideration.
187 While 76.0 percent of food crop farmers and 55.0 percent of livestock farmers are indigenes about 56.7 percent
188 of *Multiple choices respondents that engage in mixed farming are indigenes but there is a wider variation in
189 those that are indigenes under the mixed farming category, which is 43.3 percent of those in this category are
190 non indigenes against the 24.0 and 15.0 percent in others that are also non indigenes. The distribution of August
191 respondents according to ownership of house of residence shows that about 58.3% and 52.5% of farmers that
192 engage in mixed farming and livestock farmers respectively live in family houses while 40.0% of food crop farmers
193 reside in rented apartment. However, 42.0, 20 and 23percent of food crop farmers, livestock producers and those
194 who engage in mixed farming live in their personal place of abode. It therefore implies that the farmers live in
195 varying categories of houses with family house and rented house having a larger proportion.

196 Based on type of apartment that the farmers reside, majority of the food crop farmers (66.0%), livestock
197 farmers (57.5%) and mixed farming respondents (46.7%) dwell in face to face houses. While, 35.0% of farmers
198 that engage in mixed farming live in flat, only about 20.0 percent of food crop and livestock farmers live in flats.
199 This implies that majority of the respondents dwell in face to face apartment. Sixty-two, 57.5 and 46.7 percent
200 of food crop farmers, livestock farmers and mixed farming respondents live in apartments that uses pit latrine to
201 dispose faecal waste. Apartments that uses water closet in the study area accounted for only 20.0, 22.5 and 13.3
202 percent of food crop and livestock farmers and mixed farmers respectively. it is observed that use of conventional
203 toilet is predominant in the study area.

204 The major source of water in the study area is dug well, 64.0%, 60.0%, and 48.3% of food crop farmers,
205 livestock farmers and those who engage in both get their water from the well, while 43.3% of both food crop and
206 livestock farmers get their water from stream, 26.0% of food crop farmers source from pipe borne water provided
207 by government. About 50.0%, 47.5% and 31.7% of food crop farmers, livestock farmers and both livestock and
208 food crop farmers respectively affirmed the presence of tarred but damaged road in their locality, while, 35.0%,
209 30.0% and 26.7% of livestock, food crop and mixed farming farmers claimed that the roads in their communities
210 are not tarred but they are motorable. Only about 5 percent livestock and food crop farmers have roads that are
211 not motorable.

212 This can consequently affect easy transportation of their produce from their farm gate. On the means of
213 transportation in the study area 52.0 and 20.0 percent of food crop farmers travel by public transportation
214 respectively while 35.0 percent of the livestock farmers uses motorbike as a means of transportation, while 48.3%
215 of those farmers who cultivate both food crop and rear livestock trek to their farmland. This implies that the
216 farmers employ various means of transportation. The farmers that cultivate crops and rear animals have highest
217 level of poverty incidence, poverty gap and poverty severity of 21.7%, 18.0% and 14.9% respectively. This implies
218 that farmers who engage in mixed farming are the poorest compared with their counterpart. However, it is
219 worthy to note that the category that has the lowest incidence of poverty (Po) was for food crop farmers (14.0%),
220 with poverty gap (8.6%) and poverty severity (5.3%). The result shows that poverty is more pervasive among
221 farmers that engage in mixed farming compared with food crop farmers and livestock farmers. The values of
222 14.0%, 17.5% and 21.7% poverty head count are lower when compared with 38%, 35% and 37% reported for
223 urban areas in Nigeria in 1985, 1992 and 1996 (Aigbokan, 2000 ?? FOS, 1997. The low values of poverty severity

224 index that is, 5.3%, 12.0% and 14.0% for food crop farmers, livestock farmers and both food crop and livestock
225 farmers respectively, indicate that poverty is not too severe in all the cases. For instance, the poverty severity
226 index of food crop farmers of 5.3% reveals that approximately three (3) farmers out of fifty (50) sampled food crop
227 farmers are extremely poor, the poverty severity index of livestock farmers of 12.0% means that approximately
228 five (5) farmers out of forty (40) sampled livestock farmers are extremely poor. Lastly, the poverty severity index
229 of mixed farming is 15%, indicating that approximately nine (9) farmers out of sixty (60) sampled food crop and
230 livestock farmers are extremely poor.

231 The Gini coefficient of income distribution among food crop farmers as shown in Table 3 is 0.33 for food crop
232 farmers, livestock farmers is 0.40 while that of crop and livestock farmers is 0.39. The Gini coefficient of income
233 distribution of livestock farmers is the highest. This mean that income is most unequally distributed among live-
234 stock farmers while it is more unequally distributed among respondents that engage in mixed farming and least
235 among food crop farmers. The higher the value of August's social welfare, the higher the general welfare of the fa-
236 rmers group. Social welfare value is derived from the mean income and the Gini coefficient of a particular group
237 of people. The higher the mean income and the lower the Gini coefficient, the higher is the social welfare of the
238 group (Salimonu et al., 2006). Livestock farmers have the highest social welfare (7145.24) because of higher
239 mean income (17863.10) and highest Gini coefficient (0.40) while the social welfare of crop and livestock farmers
240 is higher (6351.64), due to higher Gini coefficient (0.39) and high mean income (16286.25). This study had found
241 out that poverty and income inequality exist among farmers in the study area especially among the farmers
242 practicing mixed farming. Poverty alleviation strategy can be effective only if measures are simultaneously taken
243 on several fronts with a view to increase the income of the poor families. In view of this, it is recommended that,
244 integrated community development should be adopted in providing rural infrastructures to improve the living
245 standard of the rural community. Also, government will also need to step up investment in rural infrastructure.
246 Private sector / Voluntary sector can play a very effective role in dissemination of knowledge and providing
247 backward and forward linkages necessary for making any economic activity of the poor viable.

248 IV.

249 10 Policy Recommendation and Conclusion



Figure 1:

Figure 2:

250 1 2

¹© 2011 Global Journals Inc. (US)

²Comparative Analysis of Poverty and Income Inequality Among Food Crop and Livestock Farmers in Ilesa Metropolis, Osun State © 2011 Global Journals Inc. (US)

from commercial banks accounted for lowest

2011

August

Variables

		Foodcrops farmers	Freq	Percentage	Livestock farmers	Freq	Percent
Sex :	Male	43	86.0		26	65.0	
	Female	7	14.0		14	35.0	
Age (Y) :	< 40	8	16.0		10	25.0	
	40-49	16	33.0		16	40.0	
	50-59	14	28.0		3	7.5	
	60 and above	12	24.0		11	27.5	
	Mean	51.34			50.30		
Marital status :	Single	6	12.0		9	22.5	
	Married	44	88.0		31	77.5	
Household size :	<= 5	23	46.0		28	70.0	
	6 -10	19	38.0		8	20.0	
	Above 10	8	16.0		4	10.0	
Educational level :	No formal education	11	22.0		13	32.5	
	Primary Education	15	30.0		10	25.0	
	Secondary Education	16	32.0		6	15.0	
	Tertiary Education	8	16.0		11	27.5	
* Sources of funding :	Commercial Bank	3	6.0		2	5.0	
	Cooperative Society	23	46.0		13	32.5	
	Personal savings	38	76.0		22	55.0	
	Gift	9	18.0		13	32.5	
	Friends and relatives	13	26.0		9	22.5	
*Food crops grown :	Yam	20	40.0				
	Cassava	45	90.0				
	Maize	49	98.0				
	Cocoyam	3	6.0				
Livestock Raised :	Goat				21	52.5	
	Poultry				13	32.5	
	Sheep				7	17.5	
	Pig				5	12.5	
	Cow				27	67.5	
Incomefrom farming :	< 20,000	23	46.0		13	32.5	
	20,000 -40,000	11	22.0		10	25.0	
	40,000 -60,000	8	16.0		9	22.5	
	60,000 -80,000	5	10.0		5	12.5	
	above 80,000	3	6.0		3	7.5	
	Total	50	100.0		40	100.0	

[Note: © 2011 Global Journals Inc. (US)]

Figure 3: 4

1

-economic characteristics

Figure 4: Table 1 :

Figure 5: Table

2

Variables	Food crops farmers		Livestock farmers		Mixed farming		
	Freq	Percentage	Freq	Percentage	Freq	Percentage	
Indigene	38	76.0	34	85.0	34	56.7	
Non indene	12	24.0	6	15.0	26	43.3	
Ownership of House : Rented apartment	20	40.0	11	27.5	11	18.3	
Family house	9	18.0	21	52.5	35	58.3	
Personal	21	42.0	8	20.0	14	23.3	
Type of apart- ment :	Flat	10	20.0	8	20.0	21	35.0
	Face to face	33	66.0	23	57.5	28	46.7
	Bungalow	2	4.0	2	5.0	2	3.3
	Boys quarters	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.0
	Room and parlor	5	10.0	7	17.5	6	10.0
Toilet type :	Pit latrine	31	62.0		57.5	28	46.7
	Bush	8	16.0	8	20.5	9	15.0
	Bucket latrine	1	2.0	0	0.0	15	25.0
	Water closet	10	20.0	9	22.5	8	13.3
Source of drinking Water :	Stream	5	10.0	8	20.0	26	43.3
	Borehole	0	00.0	6	15.0	4	6.7
	Well	32	64.0	24	60.0	29	48.3
	Pipe borne water	13	26.0	2	5.0	1	1.7
Accessibility of roads :	Tarred and motorable	8	16.0	5	12.5	11	18.3
	Tarred but damaged	25	50.0	19	47.5	19	31.7
	Not tarred but mo- torable	15	30.0	14	35.0	16	26.7
	Not motorable	2	4.0	2	5.0	14	23.3
Means of Transportation :	Trekking	2	4.0	4	13.0	29	48.3
	Bicycle	4	8.0	0	0.0	6	10.0
	Private Motorbike	10	20.0	14	35.0	9	15.0
	Public transport	26	52.0	8	20.0	10	16.7
	Private vehicle	8	16.0	5	12.5	6	10.0
Total		50	100.0	40	100.0	60	100.0

Figure 6: Table 2 :

3

Variables	Food crops farmers	Livestock farmers	Mixed farming
Poverty indices			
Relative poverty	1222.86	1566.46	1381.26
Core poor	611.43	783.22	690.63
Poverty profile			
P 0 (poverty incidence	14.0	17.5	21.7
P 1 (poverty depth/gap)	8.6	14.5	18.0
P 2 (poverty severity)	5.3	12.0	14.9
Income inequality			
Gini coefficient	0.33	0.40	0.39
Mean income	18865.67	17863.10	16286.25
Social Welfare	6225.67	7145.24	6351.64

Figure 7: Table 3 :

251 .1 This page is intentionally left blank

252 [Ipinnaiye ()] *A Decomposition Analysis of the Souce of Inequality in Ibadan Metropolis* Unpublished B. Sc, A O
253 Ipinnaiye . 2001. Project Dept. of Agric. Economics, U.I

254 [Alayande (2003)] *Decomposition of Inequality Reconsidered: Some Evidence From Nigeria. Paper submitted to*
255 *the UNU-WIDER for the conference on Inequality, Poverty and Human Well Being in Helsinki*, B Alayande
256 . 2003. May 2003.

257 [Meludu and Adekoya ()] *Determinants of Forces Behind Poverty and Coping Strategies in Selected Areas*
258 *of Nigeria. A Project Funded by Idachaba Foundation for Grant*, N T Meludu , A E Adekoya . 2005.
259 20051FRGA04. 1 p. 23.

260 [Salimonu et al. ()] 'Income Inequality, Poverty and Social Welfare Among Government and Private Employees
261 in Lagos and Osun States of Nigeria'. K K Salimonu , J O Atoyebi , W A Sanusi . *Agricultural Journal* 2006.
262 1 (40) p. .

263 [Jibowo ()] A A Jibowo . *Essentials of Rural Sociology*, (Abeokuta Nigeria) 1992. Gbemi Sodipo Press Limited.

264 [Jacobs ()] *Low inequality with low redistribution? An analysis of income distribution in Japan, South Korea*
265 *and Taiwan compared to Britain CASE paper 33 Center for Analysis of Social Exclusion*, D Jacobs . 2001.
266 London School of Economics Houghton Street London

267 [Nigeria's Development Prospects: Poverty Assessment and Alleviation Study (1999)] *Nigeria's Development*
268 *Prospects: Poverty Assessment and Alleviation Study*, 1999. 8 March 1999. Central Bank of Nigeria/ World
269 Bank

270 [Sen ()] *Poverty and Famine: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*, A K Sen . 1996. Oxford: Clarendon
271 Press.

272 [Omonona ()] *Poverty and its Correlates Among Rural Farming Households in Kogi State, Nigeria. An*
273 *Unpublished PhD Thesis*, B T Omonona . 2001. Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Ibadan

274 [Poverty and the Agricultural Sector. A Publication of the Federal Office of Statisticits ()] *Poverty and the Agri-*
275 *cultural Sector. A Publication of the Federal Office of Statisticits*, (Lagos) 1999.

276 [Poverty profile for Nigeria ()] *Poverty profile for Nigeria*, 1997. 1980 1996.

277 [Aigbokan ()] 'Poverty, Growth and Inequality in Nigeria: A Case Study'. B E Aigbokan . *Sponsored AERC*
278 *Study RP* 2000. 102.

279 [Sen ()] 'Poverty: an ordinal Approach to Measurement'. A K Sen . *Econometrica*. Pp 1981. p. 44.

280 [Kuznets (1963)] 'Quantitative aspect of the economic growth of nations: Distribution of Income by Size'. S
281 Kuznets . *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 1963. October. 11 p. .

282 [Bovillon et al. ()] 'Rising Inequality in Mexico: Household Characteristic and Regional Effects. Part of
283 References References Referencias Caninada'. C P Bovillon , A Legovini , N ; Lustig , K Goudsward , K
284 . *International Trends in Income Inequality in Ibadan Metropolis. Unpublished B. Sc project*, 2001. 2001. Dept
285 of Agricultural Economics, University of Ibadan

286 [Onibokun and Kumuyi ()] *Urban Poverty in Nigeria: Towards Sustainable Strategies for its alleviation. Centre*
287 *for African Settlement Studies and Development (CASSAD) Ibadan*, A Onibokun , Kumuyi . 1996. Nigeria.