

Agriculture and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria; A Review

Jamal, Abdul-Majid Abubakar¹, Sani, Saddiq Abubakar¹, Muhammad Sanusi Ibrahim¹, Abdulwahab Kolo²

¹School of General Studies, Abubakar Tatari Ali Polytechnic, Bauchi.

²Department of Agricultural Economics, Faculty of Agriculture, ATBU, Bauchi

ABSTRACT: A strong agricultural sector provides food for the country's increasing population, employment opportunities; generate foreign exchange and raw material to industries. This paper reviewed the role of agriculture towards poverty reduction in Nigeria. The aim of this paper is to assess the importance of agriculture to alleviation in Nigeria. The Nigerian agricultural sector has been an important sector in the economy both in the past and present because it provides employment opportunities, eradicates poverty and contribute to the growth of the economy. It was revealed from the review that more than 70% of Nigerians were poor in the year 2001 and more than 60% in 2010. The review showed that more than 60% of Nigerians were employed in agricultural sector. Improving agriculture will help to create jobs which will lead to poverty reduction. A unit change in agricultural output will cause 34.4% change in GDP. The Nigerian capital expenditure on agriculture has been declining which reduces the effectiveness of increase in agricultural output to the reduction of poverty. It was revealed that the incidence of poverty increased from 54% in 2009 to 69% in 2012. The review concluded that, agriculture is very significant in poverty reduction via income generation and job creation. It was recommended by the paper that Government should improve agricultural productivity, increase agricultural capital expenditure and improve marketing activities for agricultural output.

Keywords: Agriculture, Employment, Poverty, Poverty alleviation

Date of Submission: 23-01-2018

Date of acceptance: 15-02-2018

I. INTRODUCTION

Poverty can be regarded as a "Virus" spreading wider among the populace in sub-Saharan Africa. Any nation or region that want growth and development must limit the effect or eliminate the poverty 'virus' completely. This can be deduced from the words of Adam Smith 1776, as found in Adofu and Ocheja (2013) , **"no society can be flourishing and happy, of which by far the greater part of the members are poor, unemployed and miserable"**. In line with the above, poverty is one of the major problems challenging the world, especially developing and underdeveloped countries. As such, the UN made it the first objective of its Millennium Development Goal (MDG) eradication of extreme poverty and hunger by 2015. The agricultural sector has been an important sector in the Nigerian economy both in the past and present despite the oil discovery. This is basically because, it provides employment opportunities for the teeming population, eradicating poverty and contributes to the growth of the economy. Ogen (2009) as reported by Olajide, *et al.* (2013) opined that a strong agricultural sector will provide food for the country's increasing population, provide employment, generate foreign exchange and provide raw material for industries. The sector is believed to have multi-functional effect on nation's socio-economic and industrial sector.

The concept of poverty is perceived differently by the poor themselves, politicians, planners, and academics. It is this perception on poverty identification, and its causes that solutions are proposed. Chinake (1997) explains that defining and fighting against poverty is more of a political and technical problem than a rational activity. Therefore, politicians are in a better position to explain the causes of poverty because they run the country and are responsible for the problems within it. Poverty is a multi-dimension, socio-economic and cultural situation which transcends economic description and analysis (Okuneye, 2001). To all agencies now, poverty is not seen as simply lack of income or consumption but it includes deprivation in health, education, nutrition, security, power and others. Adeleke (2012) defined poverty as a condition characterized by severe deprivation of basic human needs including food, sanitation facilities, education, information, lack of income and productive resources.

From the foregoing, definition and measurement of poverty depends on community's understanding of the concept. According to Kale (2010), poverty is measured using four approaches in the country by the

Harmonized Living Standard Survey. These four approaches give rise to relative poverty, absolute poverty, Dollar per day poverty and subjective poverty.

- (a) **Relative poverty:** This is measured in terms of the living standard of the majority in a given society. Those living below the majority's living standard are said to be poor. It is computed by considering household with expenditure greater than two thirds of the total household per capital expenditure are **Non-Poor**, whereas those with below are **Poor**. Accordingly, the relative poverty measurement gives room for subdividing poverty into-extreme poor (i.e. household with less than one third of total household per-capital expenditure and sometimes referred to as core-poor). Moderate poor(i.e.households with greater than one third of total household per capital expenditure but less than two third of total per capital expenditure).
- (b) **Absolute poverty:** This is defined in accordance to basic need requirement. It includes households who cannot afford the minimal requirements necessary of food, clothing, health care and shelter. The absolute poverty measurement is sometimes known as Food-Energy In take measurement of poverty. It was the per capital expenditure approach to compute the food expenditure that can give 3000 calorie per day based on the national food basket for the poorest 40 per cent.
- (c) **Dollar Poverty:** This measure poverty in terms of World Bank's purchasing power parity (PPP) index. Simply known as dollar per day measurement. This approach defines poverty as living on less than One US dollar per day which is referred to as poverty line.
- (d) **Subjective poverty:**This refers to poverty defined based on individual opinion. This approach considers the respondents' opinion on whether they consider themselves to be poor or not.

From all the above, one can simply define poverty as a socio-economic situation in which individual (i.e. the poor) cannot afford the minimum requirement of food, shelter, education, health care and other necessities of life at minimal level. Therefore, the objective of this paper is to assess the importance of agriculture to poverty reduction in Nigeria.

II. POVERTY IN NIGERIA

It was reported by Bello, *et al.* (2009) that poverty was minimal in Nigeria between 1960s and early 1970s. This was due to the steady growth in per capita income as the agricultural, industrial and the public sectors absorbed most of the labour force. The beginning of real poverty in Nigeria was in the late 1970s to early 1980s, when oil prices began to fall in 1982 and per capita income and private consumption dropped. For instance, the poverty level stood at 43% between 1985 and 1986 but rose to 54% , 61% and 66% in 1996, 1997 and 1999 respectively (World Bank, 1995; CBN 2003 in Bello *et al.*,2009). National Bureau of statistics reported a decline in poverty incidence to 54.4% but later grew to 69% in 2010 (A. S. Oyekale and T. O. Oyekale, 2013). According to Nnadi *et al.* (2013) the incidence of poverty has been high and increasing since 1980 in Nigeria. Empirical studies have shown that Nigeria, a Sub-Saharan African country has at least half of its population living in abject poverty.

Table of Relative Poverty in Nigeria 1980 – 2010

Year	Non-Poor	Moderate poor	Extremely poor
1980	72.8	21.0	6.2
1985	53.7	34.2	12.1
1992	57.3	28.9	13.9
1996	34.4	36.3	29.3
2004	43.3	32.4	22.0
2010	31.0	30.3	38.7

Source: IgbaGjobi, et al., 2013

From Table 1, majority (72.8%) of the population were not poor in 1980 while 27.2% were poor divided in to 21.0% as moderate poor and 6.2% extremely poor. Indicating that majority of the poor was not extremely poor i.e. can afford some of the basic needs. They were only poor in relation to prevailing living condition of the majority in the country. This was when agriculture was considered, by both the government and private individuals, as important occupation. The number of poor became higher than non – poor by 1996, where the non-poor were 34.4% while poor was 65.6%. But even then, only in 2010 that the extremely poor were greater than moderate poor i.e. 38.7% and 30.3% respectively.

Table of Poverty Incidence in Nigeria (2000-2013)

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Population	115.2	118.8	122.4	126.2	129.9	135.5	140.0	140.0	154.3	159.3	167.9	168.3	173.2
Poverty Incidence (%)	70.10	NA	NA	NA	54.4	54.4	54.0	54.0	54.0	69.0	71.5	72.0	NA

Source: Oriola (2009); CBN (2013)

NA = Not available.

Table 2 presented an estimated population of the country and poverty incidence. Estimated population was 115.2 million people in 2000 to which 70.10% were poor and in 2012, population was estimated at 168.3 and poverty incidence stood at 72.0% as given in the table.

The simple justification for low poverty level to the tune of 27.2% in the early 1980s was the provision of employment by the agricultural sector and the few employed in the public sector. It was the period when both government and the public accepted agriculture as important source of income and livelihood to individuals and the economy as a whole.

Many authors have expressed the Nigerian poverty situation as paradoxical in nature. Almost all literatures opined to the fact that Nigeria is rich in natural resources but majority of its people poor (Nnadi *et al.*, 2013; Ogunleye, 2010; Agbaeze and Onwuka, 2014; A. S. Oyekale and T. O. Oyekale, 2013; Adeleke, 2012). According to Okpe and Abu (2009) in Nnadi, *et al.* (2013) the poverty level in Nigeria stood at 74.2% in the year 2000. The Federal Bureau of Statistics reported that in 1960 only 15% of Nigerian population was poor. The level increased to 28% in 1965 and by 1985 it was 46%. In 1996 the poverty incidence was 66% which moved up to 70% by 2006 consequently Nigerian been placed 25th among the world poorest nation (Adeleke, 2012).

Table of Trend of Poverty level in Nigeria (%)

Year	Rural Poverty (%)	Urban Poverty (%)	Estimated Population (Millions)	Proportion of population in Nig.
1980	28.1	17.2	65	27.2
1985	46.3	37.8	75	46.3
1992	42.7	37.5	91.5	42.8
1996	65.6	58.2	120	62.2
2000	65.65	58.6	120	62.2

Source: Okuneye, *et al.*, 2004

Table 3 shows the trend of poverty level in Nigeria which divide the population into rural and urban poor. Poverty was higher in the rural areas than the urban centers. For instance, rural poverty was 28.1% in 1980 while urban poverty was 17.2% and 27.2% of the total population in Nigeria was poor in 1980. Both the rural and urban poverty increased to 65.65% and 58.6% respectively in the year 2000.

If we recall the expression of poverty as not only lack of income but to include deprivation in health, education, nutrition, security, power e.t.c. Issues like educational level, health care provision, food, shelter are very important in determining the true poverty level in a given country.

Table of Some Economic Indicators of Nigeria and some Developed Countries 2009

Countries	Per capital GNP	Adult literacy	Commercial Energy Consumption	Physician /population
Nigeria	280	49	165	9,591
U. S. A.	29,080	99.5	7,905	420
France	36,300	96.4	4,150	350
Germany	28,280	98	4,156	380
U. K.	20,870	97	3,057	450
Switzerland	43,060	97.2	3,057	630
Japan	40,940	92.2	4,964	610

Source: World Bank (2009) reported by Adeleke, (2012)

Table 4 revealed that there is low economic development in Nigeria and by extension shows the existence of poverty. Compared with the selected Developed countries, Nigeria GNP per capital was 280 U.S. dollar whereas all other countries in the table have their GNP per capital above 20,000 U.S. dollar. On adult literacy, none of the selected developed nations have less than 90% adult literacy but in Nigeria only 49% of the adult were literate. Observing the table all the indicators are not favorable to the Nigerian Economy.

III. SUMMARY OF POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMMES IN NIGERIA

According to Adofu and Ocheja (2013), Poverty Alleviation refers to sustained improvements in the living condition of a particular group of people. This implies that poverty alleviation is closely related to economic growth and development. Since both the poverty alleviation and economic growth and development processes are characterized by increased productivity, equalization of income distribution and other social amenities. Therefore, quality of life is the objective of both poverty alleviation and development processes. The poverty alleviation programmes can be divided into sectorial and multi-sectorial approaches. The sectorial include those programmes designed for a specific sector e.g. Agriculture, Health and others; multi-sectorial approach include Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI), National Directorate for Employment (NDE), Better life etc.

Early poverty alleviation programmes were basically rural development strategies in which Agricultural Development Projects were established. The agricultural sector's programmes to alleviate poverty in Nigeria include; the Operation Feed the National and Green Revolution of 1970s, Rivers Development Project of 1980s, National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA) 1991. The financial sector of the economy also introduced programmes like the Agricultural Credit Scheme - 1970s, Peoples Bank of Nigeria - 1989 and community Bank 1990. In the health sector, primary health care was introduced in 1988 to provide health care at the grass root. Later the Expanded Programme on Immunization was established in 1992. In the education sector universal primary Education (UPE) was established in 1980s and Federal Mortgage Bank of 1991 to provide house for all.

The Poverty Alleviation Programmes in the country to be regarded as multi-sectorial include; Directorate of Food, Road and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI)- 1986; National Directorate of Employment (NDE) -1986; Better Life Programme (BLP) 1987; Family Support Programme (FSP)-1994; Family Economic Advancement Programme (FEAP) -1997; Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP) - 2000; National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP)- 2001. Other programmes include Mass Mobilization for Social Justice and Economic Reconstruction (MAMSER) - 1986; Community Action Programme for Poverty Alleviation (CAPP) - 1997; National Economic and Empowerment Development Strategy (NEEDS) -2004; Small and Medium Enterprises Development Agency of Nigeria (SMEDAN)

IV. AGRICULTURE AND POVERTY REDUCTION

In his acceptance speech for the 1997 Nobel prize in Economics, Theodore Schultz Observed that *“Most of the people in the World are poor so if we knew the economics of being poor we would know much of the economics that really matters. Most of the world's poor people earn their living from agriculture, so if we knew the economics of agriculture we would know much of the economics of being poor”* (Schultz, 1997 in Cervantes-Godoy and Dewbre, 2010). Omorogiuwa, *et al.* (2014) examine the effect of other channels of growth on decrease in poverty and the overall growth rate in six low income countries of Africa. Their findings revealed that industrial growth is less effective in reducing poverty compared to agricultural growth because a major percentage of the population (about 70%) live in rural areas. Not that alone, the agricultural sector is providing employment opportunities to many of the poor. The industrial sectors, according to the findings, fail to provide employment opportunities for the greater portion of the unskilled workers.

The above statement is still convincing and relevant to most developing and sub-Saharan African countries as majority of their people still depends on agriculture for their livelihood and they are poorer compared to those working in the manufacturing or public sector. Therefore, reducing poverty means improving the source of income and other amenities needed by the majority of the poor. Olajide *et al.* (2012) in their study concluded that agriculture contribute significantly to the growth of GDP. From their findings a unit change in agricultural output will cause 34.4 percent change in GDP. Similar to Olajide *et al.*; Ogbalubi and Wokocho (2013) also reported that, the importance of agriculture in any nation cannot be over emphasized. To stress their point, they provided examples of agricultural contribution to GDP in some countries like United State 1.1% , China 13% South Africa 9%, Israel 2.5%, Argentina 1.1%, Egypt 13.5% and Nigeria 26.8%, also agriculture provide job for 25% of the work force in Brazil, 32% in Egypt, 3.7% in Israel and 70% in Nigeria. The above indicates that as country become richer the contribution of agriculture to GDP becomes lesser

Yekini, *et al.* (2012) identified three concepts that determine level of poverty in any society. Therefore, to eradicate poverty in any society these three concepts must be handled with seriousness. These include:

(a) Empowerment

- (b) Opportunity
- (c) Enhanced Security

ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT

The World Book Dictionary explains empowerment as the act of empowering. Economic empowerment means to enable individual have the capability of taking care of his basic and social needs. These include the ability to feed oneself, his family, provide shelter and make other economic and social decisions. Agriculture provides employment to large proportion of the population in Nigeria thereby serving as a source of food income. According to Ofem and Ajayi (2008) it is general unemployment that throws the youth into joblessness, agent of social vices and general idleness. This implies that empowering the youth is simply by provision of employment. Thus, agriculture is still the major source of employment to many in Nigeria especially the rural Nigerians. It provides employment and income to about 71.65% of the population. This can be seen in table below.

Table of Share of the Working Population by Sector of Primary Occupation 2004

Occupation	Male %	Female %	Total %
Agriculture	47.25	24.39	71.65
Manufacturing	1.03	1.03	2.07
Sales	2.07	5.02	7.09
Services	6.53	12.62	19.15
Mining/Extraction	0.04	0.0	0.04

Source: Timothy (2011)

The table shows that 71.65% of the total population was engaged in agriculture, 2.07% employed in the manufacturing sector, and 7.09% in sales activities. While 19.15% employed in the service sector and only 0.04% employed in the mining/extraction activities. From this table, the major employer of labour is agriculture followed by the service sector. This is a clear indication that improving the income of farmers, poverty will be reduced to large extent. Therefore, agriculture is very important to poverty reduction and reducing income inequality in Nigeria. Agbajeet *al.* (2013) also revealed similar percentage engaged in agriculture. Their study revealed that 76.70% were engaged in agriculture out of the total population of study. Agriculture is an important tool of empowering people to achieve economic growth as opined by Soludo (2005) that economic growth cannot be achieved with poverty in existence. Therefore, a programme must be designed to reduce poverty through empowering the people by increasing their access to factors of production.

Opportunity

Increase in agricultural productivity creates opportunity in other sectors of the economy. It provides raw material to some industries and create employment opportunity in other sectors of the economy through its multiplier effect. Apart from direct provision of employment by the agricultural sector, it encourages production in other sectors especially the agricultural processing industries thereby creating more opportunities for employment and income to large proportion of the population.

Enhanced Security

Lack of support and basic amenities in rural areas causes rural-urban migration. Most of the people that move from rural areas to urban centers have no specific work. Therefore, become available to all sort of criminal activities.

Effectiveness of Agriculture to Poverty Reduction

Agriculture is reported to be more effective in poverty reduction, especially among the poorest of the poor (i.e. one dollar/day). The influence of agriculture to growth and poverty reduction could be in the form of direct effect, indirect effect and participation effect. The direct effect of agriculture on growth and poverty reduction is about the total factor productivity (TFP) which exceeded the TFP in almost all other sector (Jorgenson *etal.*, 1987; Lewis *etal.*, 1988; Bernard and Jones, 1996 in Christiansen, *et al.* 2010).

Indirectly, agriculture could contribute to growth in other sectors. There are three ways by which agricultural growth influences growth in other sector: production Linkages (backward to supply sector and forward to agro-process), consumption linkages due to increased demand and wage good effect (i.e. decrease in prices of food will lower the real product wages and therefore increase investment and profitability in other

sectors). In a related study Haggledetal. (2007) in Christiansen, *et al.* (2010) found that the multiplier effect of agricultural spending ranges from 1.3 to 1.5 in Africa and 1.6 to 1.8 in Asia.

The participation effect has to do with the number of people engage in agriculture. Mbam and Nwibo (2013) observed that active participation in agriculture will adequately reduce poverty in their study areas. Agricultural growth benefit poor people in the rural areas especially when the growth is labour intensive and land distributed more equally. Christiansen *et al.* (2010) reported that Chinese land distribution is relatively equal and made Chinese agricultural growth to reduce poverty four times as much as growth in industry and servicing. But distribution is much more unequal in India and Pakistan which made agricultural growth to have less impact on poverty in those countries. The expected, effect of agricultural output growth on poverty are summarized and presented in a tabular form by Irz *et al.* with 12 possible effect and condition required for or against achieving positive effect.

Table showing the Ways by which Agricultural growth can affect Poverty

SNO	Effect of agricultural growth	Conditions necessary
1.	Higher income for farmers	- Access to farm land - Sustained output price - Ability to adopt improved technology
2.	Employment opportunity	- Extent to which rural poor depend on farm laboring for their incomes - That machinery are not use in place of labour to increase output
3.	More jobs in agriculture and food chain upstream and downstream of farm	- Depends on strength of linkages - Location of linked activities
4.	More jobs or higher incomes in non-farm economy	- Depends on the kinds of goods and services demanded by farms
5.	Better nutrition, health, education etc as income increased	- Depends on distribution of income and the marginal propensity to spend on food, health care & schooling
6.	More revenue to local authorities due to tax and improved infrastructures	- Depends on local tax regime and quality of government
7.	Linkages in production chain	- Depend on the nature of linkages & social characteristics of actors
8.	Reduced prices of food in rural area.	- Depends on the distance of the rural area from national market.
9.	Increase in real wage as food is cheaper	- Depends on the easiness of export. If increase output is exported, prices will not fall.
10.	Generation of savings from farming allows investment in non-farm sector creating jobs and income in the sectors	- Depends on institutions that mediates, How savings are channeled to productive investment
11.	Foreign exchange earnings which allows import of capital goods	- Depends on the extent at which the farm produce are tradable either export crop or import-substitution.
12.	Release of farm labour allows production in other sector	- Depends on the willingness of laborers to migrate and their skills and capitalities for employment in other sectors. -

Source: Irz *et al.*2001

V. CONCLUSION

This paper reviewed the importance of agriculture to poverty reduction in Nigeria. It appears that majority of Nigerians, about 90 percent of its poor, are engaged in agriculture (Mbam and Nwibo, 2013). Based on the review, therefore, the paper concludes that agricultural growth will be very effective in poverty reduction, especially the poorest of the poor surviving on less than a dollar per day. Majority of those in this segment of the population live in the rural areas of the country who are mostly engaged in agriculture. But for the relative poor non-agricultural growth is more effective. Agriculture will not be effective to poverty reduction as country becomes richer and richer. To achieve significant contribution of agricultural growth to poverty reduction,

poverty reduction programme should be guided by the need of the poor as evident by Ravallion and Datt (1996); report by Okunyeet *al.* (2004) that household survey in India revealed that urban growth reduced urban poverty with little effect on national poverty. Thorbecks and Jung (1996) found that the agricultural sector contribute the most to overall poverty reduction then followed by the services and informal sector in Indonesia. In China, using data for 1985 to 1996, higher growth in agriculture reduces both rural and urban poverty, though the pro-poor effect is largest for rural areas. Based on data from broad sample developing countries (1970s – 1980s) Bourguignon and Morrison (1998) in Okunyeet *al.* (2004) found that variables which measured agricultural growth/productivity are important in explaining income in equality. Therefore, agricultural growth is more effective to reducing poverty and in equality. Finally, as observed by Ogbalubi and Wokocho (2013), agriculture has practically worked in countries like Mexico, India and China. Also a significant increase in GNP per capita was attained in Taiwan. It is only agriculture which provides employment to both skilled and unskilled work force of the teeming population. The importance of agriculture to economic development and poverty reduction can be seen clearly when we consider china with a population of over, 1.3 billion people but able to produce enough food for the population and still become a major exporter of agricultural product to the world. The conclusion of Irzet *al.* revealed a strong poverty alleviating effects of agricultural growth. That increasing agricultural output by one third might reduce poverty by a quarter or more.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings in this review, the paper recommends that

1. Government should improve agriculture from the grass root by providing the needed condition for the poor farmers to improve their productivity.
2. Increase in output should be more of labour intensive so as the multiplier effect of such increase to widely felt.
3. Capital expenditure on agriculture should be improving so that farmers can have access to farm implements.
4. Government should help farmers to sell their product at reasonable price

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adeleke, A. (2012), Improving poverty Alleviation Programme in Nigeria through Smalland Medium Scale Agricultural Development Projects.
- [2]. European Journal of Business and Management. **4**(11): 109 – 119.
- [3]. Adofu, I. & Akoji, O. (2013). Alleviating Poverty through the use of Entrepreneurship skill Acquisition in Kogi State, Nigeria. *International Open Journal of Economics*. **1**(2): 14-23.
- [4]. Agbaeze, E. K. & Onwuka, I.O. (2014). Impact of Micro-Credit on poverty Alleviation in Nigeria – the case of Enugu east Local Council.
- [6]. *International Journal of Business and Management Review*. **2** (1): 27–51.
- [7]. Agbaje, M.A., Okunmadewa, F.Y., Omomona, B. T., & Oni, O.A. (2013). An Assessment of Vulnerability to Poverty in Rural Nigeria. *ARPN Journal of Agricultural and Biological Sciences*. **8**(1): 60 – 75.
- [8]. Babatunde, R.O. (2008), Income Inequality in Rural Nigeria: Evidence from Farming Households survey Data. *Applied Sciences*. **2**, 134 – 140.
- [9]. Bello, R. A., Toyebe, G.O. A., Balogun, I.O., & Akanbi, S.B. (2009). Poverty Alleviation Programmes and Economic Development in Nigeria: A Comparative Assessment of Aba and Ilorin West Local Government Area of Kwara State, Nigeria. *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia*. **3**, 283 – 297.
- [10]. Cervantes – Godoy, D. & Dewbre, J. (2010). Economic Importance of Agriculture for poverty Reduction. *OECD food, Agriculture and Fisheries Working paper*. No. 23, OCED Publishing.
- [11]. Christiansen, L., Demery, L. & Kuhl, J. (2010). The role of agriculture in poverty reduction an empirical perspective. *Journal of Development Economics*. **3** - 7
- [12]. Chinake, H. (1997), Strategies for poverty Alleviation in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Social Development in Africa* **12**(1): 39 – 51.
Gafar, T. I., Munkaila, A. I., Raji, A. B. & Michael A. A. (2011) Economic growth and poverty reduction in Nigeria. *International Journal of business and social science* **2**(15) 147- 154
- [13]. Igbalajobi, O., Fatuase, A.I., & Ajibafun, I. (2013). Determinant of poverty Incidence among Rural Farmers in Ondo State, Nigeria. *American Journal of Rural Development*. **1**(5): 131 – 137.
- [14]. Irz, Lin, L., Thirtle, C., & Wiggis S. (2001) Agricultural productivity Growth and Poverty Alleviation. *Development policy Review*. **19**, 449 – 466.

- [15]. Kale, Y. (2010), Nigerian Poverty Profile Report 2010 – NBS Press briefing by the Statistician – General of the Federation/Chief Executive Officer, National Bureau of Statistics, at the conference room 5th floor, NBS Headquarters Abuja,
- [16]. Mbam, B.N., & Nwibo S.U. (2013). Entrepreneurship Development as a Strategy for Poverty Alleviation among farming Households in Igbo-Eze North Local Government Area of Enugu State, Nigeria. *Green Journal of Agricultural Science*. **3**(10): 736 – 742.
- [17]. Nandi, F.N., Chikaire, J., Echetama, J. A., Ihenacho R. R. & Utazi, C.O. (2013). Assessment of agricultural extension strategies for poverty alleviation in Imo State, Nigeria. *Net Journal of Agricultural Science*. **1**(2): 17 – 23.
- [18]. Ofem, N.I. & Ajayi, A.R. (2008). Effects of youth Empowerment Strategies on Conflict Resolution in the Niger Delta of Nigeria: Evidence from Cross River State. *Journal of Agriculture & Rural Development*. **6**(1 &2): 139 – 146.
- [19]. Ogbalubi, L.N. & Wokocha, C.C. (2013). Agricultural Development and Employment Generation: The Nigerian Experience. *IOSR Journal of Agriculture and veterinary science*. **2**(2): 60 – 69
- [20]. Ogunleye, O.S. (2010), Towards Sustainable Poverty in Nigeria. *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia*. **4**(2): 294 – 302.
- [21]. Okuneye, P.A., Fabusoro, E., Adebayo, K. & Ayinde, I.A. (2004). The Nigerian Agriculture and Poverty incidence: The need for private sector empowerment. A paper prepared for presentation at the Farm Management association of Nigeria Conference, Abuja Nigeria (October, 19-21, 2004).
- [22]. Olajide, O.T.; Akinlabi, B.H. & Tijani, A.A. (2012). Agriculture Resource and Economic Growth in Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal* **8**(22): 103 – 115
- [23]. Olawuyi, S.O. & Adetunji, M.O. (2013). Assessment of rural household poverty In Nigeria: Evidence from Ogbomoso Agricultural Zone of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports* **2**(1): 35 – 45
- [24]. Omorogiuwa, O., Zivkovic, J. & Ademoh, F. (2014) the Role of Agriculture in the Economic Development of Nigeria, *European Scientific Journal* **10**(4): 133 - 147
- [25]. Oyekale, A.S. & Oyekale, T.O. (n.d) An Assessment of income shocks and Expected Poverty dynamics in rural Nigeria.
- [26]. Oyekale, T.O. & Oyekale, A.S. (2013). Assessment of Multi-dimensional poverty in Rural and Urban Nigeria: Evidence from Demographic and Health Survey (DHS). *Kamla-Raj Hum Ecol*. **42** (2): 141 – 154.
- [27]. Timothy, A.T. (2011), Rural Non-farm incomes and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), Nairobi.
- [28]. Umaru, A. & Zubairu A. A. (2012) An empirical analysis of the contribution of Agriculture and Petroleum sector to the growth and development of the Nigerian economy from 1960 – 2010. *International Journal of social science and education* **2**(4) 758- 769.
- [29]. Yekini, N.A., Rufai, M.M., Adetoba, B.T., Akinwole A.K., T Ojo, O. (2012). Ict tools for Poverty Eradication and Economic Growth in Nigeria. *Greener Journal of Educational Research*. **2**(1): 013 – 019.

Jamal, Abdul-Majid Abubakar I. “Agriculture And Poverty Reduction In Nigeria; A Review.” *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* , vol. 23, no. 2, 2018, pp. 61-68.