

SOCIAL INNOVATION AND POVERTY REDUCTION IN SELECTED STATES IN NIGERIA

OLOTA, Oluwayomi Omotayo

Department of Business Administration, University of Ilorin, Nigeria

GUNU, Umar

Department of Business Administration, University of Ilorin, Nigeria

OMOLEKAN, Olushola Joshua

Department of Business Administration, University of Ilorin, Nigeria

Abstract

The fact that poverty is multifaceted and multidimensional necessitates serious attention on a local and global level. Poverty is not just a problem in underdeveloped nations; it is a significant issue in industrialised countries as well. As a result, this study aims to investigate how social innovation contributes to poverty reduction in a chosen Nigerian state. Its particular goals were to determine how much new farming methods increase household income generation and how much new farming methods improve household consumption. In order to gather pertinent data directly from respondents, the study used a cross-sectional survey design. According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), a sample of 374 farmers or respondents was chosen for the study out of the 14700 farmers in the chosen states. The respondent was given a questionnaire to collect the required data, and the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was utilised to test the hypotheses using multiple regression. The findings indicate that the creation of household income is positively impacted by modern farming practices. Additionally, home consumption is significantly impacted by changing farming practices. According to the study's findings, social innovation significantly and favourably reduces poverty. In order to raise farmers' incomes and lower their poverty levels, the study advises governmental and non-governmental organisations that engage in social entrepreneurship to support social innovation among farmers, particularly in the areas of new farming practices like harvest automation, sowing planters, silo storage, and mixed farming.

Keywords: Social Innovation, Poverty Reduction and Farming

INTRODUCTION

The fact that poverty reduction is the first goal in both the Sustainable Development Goals and the Millennium Development Goals shows how important it has become on a global scale in recent years. Poverty requires a great deal of national and international attention because of its complex character. Poverty, according to Omobowale (2014), is a condition in which people lack access to the positive aspects of life as well as the means to attain the level of wellbeing and standard of living that society deems acceptable. By 2018, there were 600 million people living in poverty, down from 766 million in 2016, according to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (Kharas, Haml & Hofer, 2018). The filthy, dehumanising conditions that billions of people around the world live in are made worse by disease, famine, and degradation. In 2013, 766 million people Over the previous 25 years, 385 million people—including children—lived on less than \$1.90 per day, despite efforts by

numerous organisations, governments, and non-governmental organisations around the world to eradicate suffering (World Bank, 2017; World Food Programme, 2016).

Poverty is a severe issue in both industrialised and developing countries; in 2012, more than 300 million people were estimated to fall below the poverty line (ILO, 2012; UNDP, 2016). However, the poverty rate in emerging countries is higher than in prosperous countries. Nigeria is one of the developing countries that is suffering from extreme poverty, despite its natural abundance in terms of its population, agriculture, gas, oil, and other minerals and natural resources. Nigeria is rich in resources, such as vast amounts of arable land, river water, building land, human capital, and other endowments. With a projected population of more than 200 million in 2020, Nigeria is the most populated nation in Africa and the seventh most populous country in the world (Population Reference Bureau [PRB], 2017; Worldometer, 2020). It is the world's largest

supplier of crude oil, among many other resources. Despite its wealth, 39.1% of Nigerians live below the poverty line of US\$1.90 per day, placing it well below other sub-Saharan African nations like Rwanda (60%), Zambia (64.4%), and Mozambique (68.7%) in terms of poverty. Nigeria now has a dismal ranking of 158th out of 189 countries in the Human Development Directory (UNDP, 2018; UNDP, 2016). 86.9 million Nigerians, according to the June 2018 World Poverty Clock research, make at least \$1.90 USD each day. Over 91 million Nigerians are living in extreme poverty as of February 2019, with over 3 million more having slipped into poverty. Nigeria has the highest number of people (86.9) living in extreme poverty when compared to a number of other African countries; comparable numbers include 19.9 million, 14.7 million, 13.8 million, and 9.5 million in Tanzania, Kenya, South Africa, and Zambia, respectively (Worldwide Poverty Clock, 2018).

According to Phillips et al. (2015), social innovation is defined as a novel strategy that addresses a social problem more effectively, sustainably, and fairly than existing solutions, ultimately serving the interests of the larger community rather than simply those of the individual. Social innovation focusses on addressing societal issues, whereas corporate innovation prioritises meeting market and customer needs (Lettice & Parekh, 2010). Phillips et al. (2015) claim that social entrepreneurship and social innovation are similar because they both concentrate on identifying chances to address social needs or mitigate societal problems. Accordingly, social business has three primary characteristics: it primarily makes money through economic activities, concentrates on social (environmental or cultural) goals, and seeks to benefit something other than the creation of private wealth (Burkett, 2010).

Despite the fact that the majority of them are not called social innovation, social innovation has been applied in numerous programs aimed at reducing poverty across the globe (Millard et al., 2016). Karnani (2017) argues that the development of numerous vocations suitable for the poor must be the focus of efforts to alleviate poverty. Through agricultural systems, the poor can become producers as opposed to only potential consumers, boosting their income through purchases (Karnani, 2017). Therefore, in order to reduce poverty by increasing the incomes

of the poor and creating more jobs, social innovation that fosters social transformation through social entrepreneurship is required. Most importantly, encouraging social entrepreneurs to use social innovation may also improve societal and economic outcomes, potentially leading to an increase in wealth.

With an emphasis on a small number of Nigerian non-governmental organisations (NGOs) that work with farmers on social innovation, the study will look at the connection between social innovation and poverty reduction in a few states. Three Nigerian states were chosen for this study: Oyo State in the southwest, Kano State in the northwest, and Adamawa State in the northeast. These states were chosen due to the existence and operations of the non-governmental organisation that aims to reduce poverty among farmers in those states. Because of their large populations and physical location, these states have significant rates of agricultural activity. Nigeria topped even India as one of the world's poorest nations, according to the 2018 Brookings Institution annual study. Before achieving independence in 1960, Nigeria had relatively low levels of poverty. Nigeria went from a state of economic hardship to one of the nations with the greatest incidence of restricted resources in the world today, despite this, 60 years after winning independence. Despite efforts by succeeding administrations to end poverty since 1980, Nigeria was unable to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) poverty targets by 2015. Poverty has persisted despite the greatest efforts of both military and democratic administrations. Thus, poverty has continued to be a significant barrier to Nigeria's socioeconomic growth in spite of a number of measures (Danaan, 2018).

Despite multiple attempts of meddling since the 1970s, the Nigerian government has failed to maintain its success in several important areas, such as housing, infrastructure, education, health, and agriculture, among many others (Amaechi, 2018; Benyin & Ugochukwu, 2015).

Consequently, how is it possible for a prosperous nation to have a sizable section of its populace living in abject poverty? Is there a connection between development, poverty, and resource availability? Nigeria's incapacity to offer its citizens a standard of living on par with modern civilisations is among the most important problems it is now dealing with. The Sustainable Development Goals were developed after a

summit after the Millennium Development Goals failed to reduce poverty by half by 2015, and their primary goal is to eradicate poverty since it is a fundamental cause of non-sustainable development (Amoo, 2018; Amoo et al., 2019). The aforementioned situation highlights how critical it is to pay attention to Nigeria's poverty situation and gain a greater understanding of poverty and how it affects the country's growth. Furthermore, examining each of the conflicting elements would improve informed policy proposals aimed at reducing poverty.

This research will examine how social innovation may be used as a key driver to reduce poverty in society and how to create well-informed interventions to reduce poverty that penetrates the nation's developmental agenda in order to close the gap and meet the SDGs on poverty.

The following research questions are proposed for the study as it emanated from the issues identified above which are: to what extent does new farming practices increase household income generation? And to what extent does a new farming process enhance household consumption?

The main objective of this study was to examine the impact of social innovation on poverty reduction in selected state in Nigeria. The specific objectives were to: examine the extent to which new farming practices increase household income generation; and determine the extent to which new farming processes enhance household consumption.

In line with the objectives set above, the following null hypotheses were formulated for the study

H₀₁: New farming practice has no significance influence on household income generation.

H₀₂: New farming process has no significance influence on household consumption.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept of Social Innovation

Social Innovation

The idea of social innovation is expanding quickly. Numerous businesses are attempting to ascertain how social innovation could support their business plan (Davies, 2014). Many instances of businesses creating effective social innovation and/or social enterprises may also be found in the Stanford Social Innovation Review (<https://ssir.org/>, 2014). Nonetheless, the

idea of social innovation is ambiguous and subject to numerous interpretations. According to Van der Have and Rubalcaba (2016), this circumstance hinders the creation of generalisable facts as well as rational ideas and hypotheses about the causes and effects of social innovation as well as the circumstances in which it emerges, takes shape, and evolves.

For a definition to be useful for business studies, it must have three elements: it must be about developing solutions that are valuable to society; it must be viewed as a process; and it must be clear that most implementations fail.

Social innovation is meant to "empower people, and drive change" in the sense that it leads to societal transformation that produces enduring social inclusion, claim Fougère, Segercrantz, and Seeck (2017). The EU and European Commission define social innovation in this way. A more popular definition of social innovation than private individuals is "Social innovation is an original solution to a societal issue that is more successful, productive, sustainable, or simply better than current remedies and for which whatever value is generated accumulates mainly to society as a whole rather than just." Deiglmeier, Miller, and Phillips (2008). This useful idea highlights how important it is to introduce ideas to assist socially marginalised populations participate.

Oeij, Torre, Vaas, and Dhondt (2019) define social innovation as the development, improvement, and use of new ideas to solve societal problems that impact people one-on-one, in groups, or in communities. This perspective holds that the "implementation" of innovation signifies the successful resolution of societal problems. Social difficulties, as characterised by the ideas of "inclusiveness" and "participation," are any situation that keeps individuals, societies, or organisations from being accepted into society; on the other hand, they could be any circumstance that keeps people, communities, or groups from experiencing social welfare and wellness. Societies fight social exclusion and poverty through social inclusion (Atkinson & Marlier, 2010).

Pol and Ville (2009) defined social innovation as any new idea that has the potential to improve either the macro-quality of life or the quantity of life. The improvement of the macro-quality of life is considered to be the formation of valuable decisions that relate to the welfare of the

group, but not necessarily of each individual (Pol & Ville 2009). Social innovation, according to Caulier-Grice et al. (2012), is by definition trans-disciplinary and can take place across domains (private, public, non-profit, informal sector, e.g., social movement) as well as on an individual or group level. Innovation research in sociology frequently focusses on the relationship between social and technological innovations and social transformation (Kesselring & Leitner 2008, Howaldt and Schwarz 2010). In economics, social innovation research often focusses on the welfare of a beneficiary (Dawson & Daniel 2010, Pol & Ville 2009). In the fields of management and organisation, social innovations—like new patterns of interaction and communication for effective organisational transformation—are commonly seen as changes in social capital (Loogma et al. 2013).

Social change, social entrepreneurship, business strategy for successful growth, innovative implementation for societal needs, administration, being empowered, and capacity building models are the five areas into which Caulier-Grice et al. (2012) split social innovation. Bassi (2011) divides the most widely used definitions into three categories: systematic, pragmatic, and managerial. The first category refers to broader sociological definitions of collaborative aspects of the innovation process and social system development. The next group examines social innovation from an economic standpoint, using the example of a company that focusses on social concerns and develops creative solutions to solve them. The last category is a combination of the first two, focussing on societal changes overall and highlighting the effectiveness and efficiency of inventions. The European Commission lists three approaches to social innovations: the perspective of systemic change through organisational development; the societal challenge perspective, which includes innovations in the social, economic, and environmental domains; and social demand innovations, which address the needs of marginalised social groups that the market does not cover (European Commission 2013). The conceptual perspective, which emphasises social frameworks, social context, and their impact on the process of social innovation, and the individualistic perspective, which emphasises the significance of an individual "heroic" agent, are the two dominant perspectives that Cajaiba-Santa (2014) identifies

as dividing the current corpus of research on the topic.

Variables of Social Innovation

a. New Services/Products

New service/product development is the process of developing new products, services, or models to better meet the needs of society and promote the social advancement of the most marginalised groups. Building on Adam Smith's insight that services expire at the precise moment of production, economic research in this field has sought to determine the intrinsic characteristics of these activities. Services are therefore considered immaterial or intangible and interactive (co-produced) (Howells, 2007).

Innovation evaluations of the output's fuzziness, immateriality, and intangibility have a number of ramifications. It has the potential to distract from consideration of the service's most obvious features, particularly its procedures (whether or not they are new). It makes it difficult to distinguish between process and product innovation, to measure the level of novelty, to enumerate the innovations, and to assess their economic impact (e.g., in terms of sales or employment). Efforts to protect the invention are undermined by the "product's" vague and unpredictable nature, which also facilitates copying. Nonetheless, intangibility makes it possible for both intangible innovations to be made in products and processes and for innovation to be formalised in order to reduce the ambiguity of the service (Gallouj & Djellal, 2010).

Both functional and social innovation can be viewed from two perspectives: sectorally (social innovation as service development and social innovation as service innovation are instances of both).

Every socioeconomic sector and industry, including enterprises, the public, semi-public, and private sectors, services, the industrial and agricultural sectors, civil society, etc., has the rare capacity to produce social innovation. It is often a service innovation, even if it did not start in the services sector. In fact, regardless of the industrial or agricultural sector in question, social innovation often involves offering "services" to address socio-economic challenges.

However, the tertiary and service sectors are particularly supportive of social innovation, despite the fact that it affects all economic sectors. All services are impacted, but the public sector,

personal services, and most notably the "third sector," or social and solidarity economy, have experienced extremely quick growth. This significant relationship between social innovation and the service sectors can be explained in a number of ways. The primary reason for this is the distinctive features of service activities, which are based on intimate social relationships between users, suppliers, and consumers. The character of the values that are common in the public and private sectors, such justice and solidarity, may also help to explain it (European Commission, 2011).

b. New Practices

New social practices designed to improve the lives of the poorest and most disadvantaged people. It entails deliberately changing ingrained social norms. It encompasses new behavioural strategies used in a specific social context. Social innovations include strategy, intent, and expected impact on the intended social context. "An endeavour to establish new social relations, new social structures, and new decision-making processes" (Cloutier, (2003)). implementing cutting-edge social ideas to produce positive societal effects.

c. New Processes

Conventional innovation is not the same as social innovation. not only in terms of its "nature," but also in terms of its production methods and stakeholders. Another characteristic of social innovation is its local or grassroots nature, as well as the pivotal role that users play in its development and implementation. User engagement includes the idea of coproduction, which is fundamental to service economics and management. However, it may also relate to the user's capacity to recover or reclaim control over their life, environment, and future, making its scope much vaster. Some authors even go so far as to use this aspect of active engagement as the primary or even exclusive means of describing social innovation (Lallemand, 2001). Informality and a diverse variety of participants are common in these local or grassroots manufacturing processes. It is easy to understand that a technologically based social innovation might be developed in a lab environment without user participation. The "local" and "informal" (or "grass-root") facets of social innovation also have exceptions. For example, from a historical

perspective, the major changes in the country's political system and social economy could be listed using a formalised "top-down" perspective.

Concept of Poverty

In all of its manifestations, poverty continues to pose a menace and a challenge to humanity. It is intricate, multifaceted, and manifests itself in the political, social, economic, and environmental spheres, among other areas of human existence. As a result of new viewpoints in various circumstances, the concept of poverty has evolved over time. According to Bhalla and Lapeyre (2016), social isolation is becoming a bigger issue in both developed and developing nations. In their examination of poverty among children, Bradshaw and Main (2016) examine the impact of poverty indicators on the wellbeing of children. Even in the most developed nations, poverty persists, according to Room's (2016) analysis of the new poverty in European society. According to Beegle, Christiaensen, Dabalen, and Gaddis (2016) and Grootaert (1995), Africans still frequently discuss poverty.

Poverty has been associated with climate vulnerability (Thornton et al., 2006), gender issues (Shah, 2016), and social protection (Barrientos & Hulme, 2016). From an emphasis on income indicators in the 1960s to the inclusion of non-monetary variables in the 1990s and beyond, Ajakaiye and Adeyeye (2001) provide a historical backdrop of these shifting viewpoints. One risk factor for coping with health issues is poverty (Pearson, 2015). Because poverty has numerous connections and effects, a lack of resources can have an impact on relationships, education, security, life expectancy, and health. In order to combat poverty and enhance living conditions, international efforts are being stepped up through interventions, reforms, and sustainable development goals. Indicators that directly affect poverty are used to classify nations on the development scale.

The monetary method defines poverty as the amount that a person's pay cheque (or spending) falls below a particular minimal level of resources (Laderchi et al., 2003). Methodologies that prioritise monetary data and an unbiased determination of the poverty line are part of the monetary approach to assessing poverty. The monetary technique is predicated on the idea that each person's unique circumstances and heterogeneity may be taken into account by using

a consistent monetary meter. emphasised that to determine poverty, Selecting an indicator, a unit of analysis, and a poverty line are crucial when utilising a monetary measure. According to Laderchi et al. (2003), a monetary indicator offers a common denominator of measurement for comparison.

Income Generation

The poverty threshold is determined by giving the bare minimum of food needed for survival a monetary value. When a person's or family's total income falls below the poverty level, they are considered impoverished. A person's or a family's level of financial poverty is correlated with factors such as marital status, family size, age, gender, ethnicity, and place of residence (Schiller, 2008). According to Saith (2001), a person is considered to be in capacity poverty when they are unable to perform some basic duties. The capacity approach states that people's quality of life can be enhanced by financial resources. Financial resources are viewed as an essential but insufficient precondition to break the unintentional cycle of poverty (Laderchi et al., 2003). Consequently, the capability approach emphasises the use of both financial and non-financial resources to develop or achieve capabilities. According to Alkire (2007) and Darling (2002), those who lack human capability are more economically vulnerable when confronted with adverse circumstances such as losing their job, becoming ill, or going through changes in their family.

Household Consumption

The consumption of products and services is a significant indicator of economic well-being and, consequently, a critical indicator of poverty level (Slesnick, 2000). Wealth and income (through the savings that income generates) can support both current and future spending. It is essential to comprehend the relationships among the three elements of the broader concept of economic well-being: wealth, consumption, and income (OECD, 2013). If everything else is equal, a person who consumes more is considered to be more financially well-off than someone who consumes less. Consumption demands can be satisfied by borrowing, spending, or depleting wealth (OECD, 2013).

Consuming products and services can meet the material requirements and desires of both

individuals and households, and it is necessary for one to participate in society. To calculate the total value of this consumption, one must add the value of the consumption of goods and services produced at home, the value of the consumption of goods and services received by households despite receiving rewards from the government and non-profit organisations, the value of the consumption of individuals living in institutions or without a regular place of residence, and the value of the purchasing habits of private family units (modified as needed to account for goods purchased in one period to be consumed in a later period) (OECD, 2013). Consumption expenditure is the amount of money spent on goods and services that a household consumes or purchases to directly meet its needs (OECD, 2013). Food, clothing, housing services (rents), power, transportation, durable goods (especially cars), health care, recreation, and other services are examples of household last-minute expenses, regardless of whether they are produced domestically or abroad. Although a variety of other imputed costs are also included, such as agricultural items produced for personal use, owner-occupiers' imputed rents are frequently the most significant imputation (OECD, 2013). In-kind remuneration, in which employees receive goods and services as part of their salary at incredibly low prices or for free, is the other major expense that is imputed, all of the products and services that households purchase to fulfil their own daily requirements—aside from housing—are frequently categorised as final consumption. The gross fixed capital creation includes the purchase of a home. Household final consumption includes fractional contributions for goods and services "provided" by the full government. Examples of situations where families must pay a share of the costs of public services include prescription drugs and medical treatments that are partially funded by the government (OECD, 2013).

Institutional Theory

The founding publications that examined how organisational building and shift were impacted more by external variables and symbolic actions than by functional considerations are credited with establishing the study tradition known as institutional theory (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). These papers drew on concepts of constrained rationality that are fundamental to behavioural theories and presented a broad range

of potential research problems. However, by emphasising environmental factors like the adoption of new standard procedures among enterprises, a large body of subsequent research moved away from the corporate concentration on behavioural ideas of organisation.

A fresh method for examining social, political, and economic processes is provided by institutional theory (DiMaggio & Powell, 2000). Institutions establish social norms (North, 1991). These regulations apply to both formal and informal organisations, such as the government, the business community, and extended families. Traditional sociological theories are being expanded upon by new institutional concepts (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott, 1995). These fresh perspective highlight the influence of the institutional setting in which businesses operate, which is thought to have an impact on the behaviour of entrepreneurs (Scott, 1995).

When the institutional system is operating effectively, entrepreneurs may experience a reduction in transaction costs, uncertainty, and risk. Legal frameworks also affect bankruptcy regulations and market accessibility. However, growth may be hampered by an inadequate or subpar legal framework. Entrepreneurial corruption and objective behaviour may result, especially when institutional flaws allow for capricious behaviour (Puffer, McCarthy, & Boisot, 2010; Smallbone & Welter, 2001). Furthermore, institutional constraints promote informal relationships like local networks (Khanna & Palepu, 1997). Thus, without official recognition, entrepreneurship can flourish (Klapper, Laeven, & Rajan, 2006).

Even while entrepreneurship research has given more emphasis to institutional theory, the majority of these studies are conducted in industrialised nations. On the other hand, institutional theory-led research is increasingly focussing on emergent situations. The majority of these studies have illuminated the market and government deficiencies of nations, allowing various kinds of entrepreneurs to operate (Littlewood & Holt, 2018; Rivera-Santos, Holt, Littlewood, & Kolk, 2015). The private sector's land ownership and government control, outdated infrastructure, static-centric systems, restricted information availability, and onerous startup procedures are a few examples (Saini & Bhatia, 1996; World Bank, 2019a). Even though it is impossible to interview every entrepreneur in a

nation, efforts have been made to learn about their experiences in developing nations (cf. Abdallah & Eijdenberg, 2019; Eijdenberg et al., 2019; Khavul, Bruton, & Wood, 2009; Littlewood & Holt, 2018). By bringing entrepreneurial endeavours in under-represented academic fields to life, hearing these stories helps bridge the gap between big and small firms.

Nonetheless, this work is grounded on institutional theory since social innovation is a process and outcome of institutional change. The social issues that social innovation aims to solve frequently involve a wide range of diverse actors from different fields, spanning systems with multiple interdependencies. Furthermore, whether social innovations take the shape of new products, processes, or business models, they must change or have an impact on the relational and social structures that currently exist, including routines, resource and authority flows, governance, and values. Given that social innovation involves "the revisiting negotiations of preexisting institutions or the building of new ones," institutional theory presents an alluring prism for enhancing perspectives on social innovation theory and comprehension. By giving enough consideration to structuration challenges, it also takes seriously the idea that "rules, norms, and beliefs are socially constituted, negotiated orders, which can be renegotiated to promote social innovations" (Giddens, 1984).

Empirical Review

In their paper "The Role of Social Innovation in Tackling Global Poverty and Vulnerability," Millard and Fucci (2023) emphasise the significance of social innovations in combating poverty. A thorough quantitative and qualitative assessment of 1,005 social innovation projects globally was part of the approach used in the SI-DRIVE research project. IBM SPSS and MS Excel were used for data analysis, and statistical methods like Chi-Square analysis and One-Way ANOVA were used. NVivo word clustering software was used to extract qualitative insights. The results highlight the critical role played by civil society organisations and other actors in these projects by revealing that social innovation efforts largely concentrate on immediate needs including employment, income support, and community aid.

The study conducted by Arejiogbe et al. (2023) was titled "Bolstering the Impact of Social

Entrepreneurship and Poverty Alleviation for Sustainable Development in Nigeria." Purposive sampling was used in this study to gather information from 300 social entrepreneurs, and structural equation modelling was used to analyse 262 replies. The results highlight the potential of social entrepreneurship to generate employment and stimulate economic growth by showing that social innovation, social value, and social impact are strong predictors of poverty alleviation. The report ends with suggestions for how the Nigerian government may encourage social innovation through the creation of policies, the availability of funds, and partnerships with business owners.

"Paths Out of Poverty: Social Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Development" is examined by Zeng et al. (2022). Through case studies from different nations, the function of social entrepreneurship in reducing rural poverty is examined. The researchers distinguished between three forms of poverty—social, economic, and ecological—by examining nine rural social entrepreneurship cases. They also showed how social enterprises may incorporate farmers into value chains to produce a variety of advantages. In order to effectively address rural poverty, the report recommends that social businesses concentrate on generating long-lasting social, economic, and ecological value. It also supports a sustainable development framework that prioritises long-term solutions and stakeholder involvement.

Methodology

Research Design

With an emphasis on the efforts of non-governmental organisations to reduce poverty among farmers in the chosen areas, the study investigates the effect of social innovation on poverty reduction in a few Nigerian states. To collect accurate, pertinent information straight from the intended respondents (farmers), a cross-sectional survey design was used. Using this design will provide a comprehensive and accurate summary of the study's procedures and activities.

Population of the study

Although the chosen NGOs' head offices are in Lagos and Abuja, their operational offices are in the states of Adamawa, Kano, and Oyo. The study's target population consisted of farmers participating in the agricultural programs of NGOs in Nigeria that aim to reduce poverty. They are Alliance for Green Revolution Farmers, Technoserve, and Kickstarter Agro. As of 2021, the Kickstart Agro NGO had 4000 trained farmers (Organisation Representative, 2021), Technoserve had 6000 trained farmers (Organisation Representative, 2021), and the Alliance for Green Revolution Farmers had 4700 trained farmers (Organisation Representative, 2021). This farmer population is shown in the table below.

Poverty Reduction Agricultural NGOs	Number of Farmers
Kick Started Agro	4000
Alliance for a Green Revolution Farmers	4700
Technoserve	6000
Total	14700

Source: Author's design, 2025

Sample Size and Sampling techniques

4 farmers who had received training in poverty reduction from the chosen agricultural NGOs made up the sample size for this study. Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) methodology was used to determine the sample size. This is shown below:

$$s = \frac{X^2 NP(1-P)}{d^2(N-1) + X^2 P(1-P)}$$

Where: s is the required sample size; X^2 is the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841); N = the population size (14,700); P = the population proportion (assumed to be .50); d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05)

$$s = \frac{3.841 \times 14,700 \times 0.50(1-0.50)}{0.05^2(14,700-1) + 3.841 \times 0.50(1-0.50)}$$

$$s = \frac{14115.675}{36.7475 + 0.9604}$$

$$s = \frac{14115.675}{37.7079}$$

$$s = 374.3426$$

$$s \approx 374$$

The respondents from each NGOs were selected based on pro-rata basis. This is shown below:

Table 1 Sample size from each NGO

Name of NGOs	Population	General Sample size	Pro-rata basis	Sample size of each NGOs	Percentage
Kick Started Agro	4000	374	$\frac{4,000}{14,700} * 374$	102	27.2
Alliance for a Green Revolution Farmers (AGRA)	4700	374	$\frac{4,700}{14,700} * 374$	120	32.0
Technoserve	6000	374	$\frac{6000}{14,700} * 374$	152	40.8
Total	14,700			374	100

Source: Author's computation, 2025

The number of samples taken from each NGO and the methodology used to determine the sample size are displayed in table 1 above. On a pro rata basis, 102 trained farmers under poverty reduction NGOs were selected from Kick Started Agro NGO, which has the lowest percentage at 27.2% since, among other NGOs, it has the fewest trained farmers. The Alliance for Green Revolution Farmers (AGRA) NGO provided 120 taught farmers under poverty reduction NGOs on a pro rata basis, accounting for 32% of the total. This is the next-highest percentage because the NGO has the second-highest number of trained farmers under its NGOs among others. On a pro rata basis, Technoserve NGO provided 152 trained farmers under poverty reduction NGOs, accounting for 40.8% of the total. This organisation has the most trained farmers among the others.

Simple random selection methods were employed to choose the farmers from each NGO's total population. This was chosen since all farmers who have received training from NGOs are able to provide accurate and useful information about them. This implies that every farmer has an equal chance of being chosen.

Data collection Method and Instrumentation

A closed-ended questionnaire was used as the data collecting instrument to obtain the necessary information from the farmers who answered, producing primary data.

Reliability and Validity of Research Instrument

The Cronbach alpha coefficient was used to assess or verify the dependability of the instruments. Utilising software known as the Statistical Package for Service Solution (SPSS), the Cronbach alpha coefficient was examined. After analysis, the result shows 0.88, which is higher than the 0.70 threshold recommended by Nunnally (1978). This demonstrated the validity of the study tool.

Table 2: Reliability Statistic

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standard Items	No of Items
.0.898	0.888	20

Before being administered, the study tool (questionnaire) underwent both face and content validity tests conducted by subject-matter experts.

Method of Data Analysis

Multiple regression analysis, an inferential statistical tool, was used to assess the degree of variation in the dependent variable that results from changes in the independent variable in the hypotheses. The statistical product and service solution (SPSS) is the statistical software that will be utilised for this analysis.

Variable Description and Measurement

Variables	Description	Measurement
Independent Variables	New Farming Practices	Sowing Planter (SP)
		Harvest Automation (HA)
		Silo Storage (SS)
		Mixed Farming (MF)
	New Farming Process	Hybrid Fertilization (HF)
		Biological weed control (BWC)
		High-Yielding Variety (HYV)
		Soil preparation (SP)
Dependent Variables	Poverty	Household Income Generation
		Household Consumption

Model Specification**Hypothesis One**

H₀₁: New farming practice has no significance influence on household income generation

$HIG = f(SP, HA, SS, MF)$

$HIC = \alpha + \beta_1 SP + \beta_2 HA + \beta_3 SS + \beta_4 MF \dots + \varepsilon$

Where: HIC = Household Income Generation

α = constant

β = slope of each variable

Sowing Planter (SP)

Harvest Automation (HA)

Silo Storage (SS)

Mixed Farming (MF)

ε = error term

H₀₂: New farming process has no significance influence on household consumption.

$HC = f(HF, BWC, HYV, SP)$

$HIC = \alpha + \beta_1 HF + \beta_2 W + \beta_3 HYV + \beta_4 SP \dots + \varepsilon$

Where: HC = Household Consumption

α = constant

β = slope of each variable

Hybrid Fertilization (HF)

Biological weed control (BWC)

High-Yielding Variety (HYV)

Soil preparation (SP)

ε = error term

Data Presentation and Analysis**Hypothesis 1**

H₀₁: New farming practice has no significance influence on household income generation.

Hypothesis Two**Table 3: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.941 ^a	.885	.884	.45398

a. Predictors: (Constant), Mixed farming, Sowing planter, Harvest automation, Silo storage

Source: SPSS Printout, 2022

Table 3 above provides a model explanation of how new agricultural practices increase household income generation. The table shows that the correlation coefficient (R) and R-squared are 0.941 and 0.885, respectively. This explains the substantial and positive correlation between modern farming practices and the production of household income. Consequently, this variable

explained around 88.5% of the variation in family income generation, with the remaining 11.5% coming from other variables not in the model. It follows that improved farming methods will raise household income, which will lower the percentage of farmers living in poverty

Table 4: Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.465	.153		-3.049	.002
	Sowing planter	.389	.069	.312	5.623	.000
	Harvest automation	.164	.078	.148	2.111	.035
	Silo storage	.911	.083	.790	11.006	.000
	Mixed farming	-.463	.086	-.310	-5.387	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Household income generation

Source: SPSS Printout, 2022

The regression coefficient table in table 4 above demonstrates that, with a probability value less than 0.05, sowing planters, harvest automation, silo storage, and mixed farming were statistically significant for the generation of household income. The creation of household income is significantly influenced by the aspects related to contemporary agriculture practices.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis—that new farming methods have a significant impact on household income generation—is now accepted.

H₀₂: New farming process has no significance influence on household consumption.

Table 5 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.961 ^a	.924	.923	.28366

a. Predictors: (Constant), Soil preparation, Biological weed control, High-yield varieties, Hybrid fertilization

Source: SPSS Printout, 2022

Table 5 above provides a model summary of the impact of new agricultural practices on domestic consumption. The table shows that the correlation coefficient (R) and R-squared are 0.961 and 0.924, respectively. This explains why family consumption and new farming practices have a substantial and favourable link. Consequently, this

variable explained approximately 92.4% of the variations in family income generation, with the remaining 7.6% coming from other variables not in the model. It follows that new farming methods will raise household consumption, which will lower the farmers' poverty rate.

Table 6 Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.221	.090		-2.467	.014
	Hybrid fertilization	.578	.083	.559	6.938	.000
	Biological weed control	.277	.084	.272	3.312	.001
	High-yield varieties	-.162	.040	-.219	-4.097	.000
	Soil preparation	.344	.043	.361	7.916	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Household consumption

Source: SPSS Printout, 2022

With a probability value less than 0.05, hybrid fertilisation, biological weed control, high-yield varieties, and soil preparation were statistically significant to household consumption, according to table 6 above, which displays the regression coefficient table. It is enough to say that new factors in the farming process have a big impact on home consumption. Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is supported, indicating that the new agricultural method has a major impact on household consumption.

Discussion of Findings

According to the results of objective one, there was a substantial correlation between the creation of household income and innovative farming practices. Because of their p-value of less than 0.05, which indicates that all of the variables significantly contribute to the increase in household income and, consequently, the reduction of poverty among farmers, the variables of new farming practices, such as sowing planters, harvest automation, silo storage, and mixed farming, have an impact on the generation of household income. This is consistent with Christian and Shih-Hsin's (2019) argument that social innovation can effectively strengthen legislation and transform urgent community demands into long-term outcomes like a decrease in poverty. Therefore, innovative farming practices, which are a component of social innovation, are important for farmers' household income generation. By implementing these practices, farmers can raise their standard of life in general.

According to the examination of the second goal, there was a substantial correlation

between household consumption and the new farming technique. Due to their p-value being less than 0.05, which indicates a significant contribution from the variables to the increase in household consumption and, consequently, the reduction of poverty among farmers, the new farming process variables—such as hybrid fertilisation, biological weed control, high-yield variety, and soil preparation—have an effect on household consumption. This result is consistent with Sijabat's (2015) findings, which found that social entrepreneurship that incorporates social innovation empowers people and lessens social problems like poverty. This indicates that social innovation platforms are an effective means of raising farmers' standards of living and lowering their poverty levels.

Conclusions

Both new farming practices and new farming processes are helpful variables for raising the standard of life among farmers in the chosen states, according to the results as previously said. The results showed that modern agricultural methods have a beneficial effect on household income generation, meaning that households may use the money to meet their daily needs and provide for their families. In terms of the quantity and quality of food that farmers can obtain for daily consumption, modern agricultural practices also have a positive effect on household consumption. According to the study's findings, both new agricultural methods and practices raised farmers' standards of living, which in turn decreased poverty.

Recommendations

In light of the aforesaid result, the following suggestions were

1. In order to raise farmers' incomes and lower poverty rates, government and non-governmental organisations that support social entrepreneurship should encourage social innovation among farmers, particularly in the areas of new farming practices like harvest automation, sowing planters, silo storage, and mixed farming.
2. The study also suggests that government policy and non-governmental organisations should concentrate on introducing new farming practices that are in line with global practices, such as hybrid fertilisation, biological weed control, high-yield varieties seedling, and soil preparation, in order to improve farmers' quality of consumption and lower the level of poverty among farmers and raise their standard of living.

References

- Abdallah, G. K., & Eijdenberg, E. L. (2019). Entry and stay in the informal economy: Qualitative findings from a least developed country. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 27(02), 115-145.
- Ajakaiye, D., & Adeyeye, V. (2001). Concepts, measurement and causes of poverty. *Central Bank of Nigeria Economic and Financial Review*, 39(4), 8-44.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1975). A Bayesian analysis of attribution processes. *Psychological bulletin*, 82(2), 261.
- Ajzen, I., & Madden, T. J. (1986). Prediction of goal-directed behavior: Attitudes, intentions, and perceived behavioral control. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 22(5), 453-474.
- Amaechi, L. N. (2018). Food security and sustainable agricultural development in Nigeria. *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention*, 5((05):), 4765-4768. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsshi/v5i6.01> [Crossref].
- Amoo, E. O. (2018.) Introduction to special edition on Covenant University's perspectives on Nigeria demography and achievement of SDGs-2030. *African Population Studies*, 32, 1, 3993-3396. <https://aps.journals.ac.za/pub/article/view/1170> [Google Scholar]
- Amoo, E. O., Adekola, P. O., & Oladosun, M. (2019). Science, technology and poverty eradication: any connection with demography? *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology (IJCET)*, 10(2), 231-243. <http://www.iaeme.com/ijciet/issues.asp?JType=IJCET&VType=10&IType=02> [Google Scholar]
- Arejiogbe, O. E., Moses, C. L., Salau, O. P., Onayemi, O. O., Agada, S. A., Dada, A. E., & Obisesan, O. T. (2023). Bolstering the impact of social entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation for sustainable development in Nigeria. *Sustainability*, 15(8), 6673. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15086673>
- Atkinson, A. & Marlier, E., (2010). *Analysing and Measuring Social Inclusion in a Global Context*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA)
- Barrientos, A., & Hulme, D. (2016). *Social protection for the poor and poorest: Concepts, policies and politics*. Springer.
- Thornton, P.K., Jones, P.G., Owiyo, T., Kruska, R., Herrero, M., Kristjanson, P., & Omolo, A. (2006). *Mapping climate vulnerability and poverty in Africa*.
- Bassi, A. (2011). *Social Innovation: Some Definitions*. ESSE, Social Entrepreneurship in Global Context.
- Beegle, K., Christiaensen, L., Dabalen, A., & Gaddis, I. (2016). *Poverty in a rising Africa*. World Bank Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0723-7>
- Benyin, A. A., & Ugochukwu, D. A. (2015). Development and its challenges in Nigeria: A theoretical discourse. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(6), 275-283. Doi:<https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n6s2p275> [Google Scholar]
- Bhalla, A. S., & Lapeyre, F. (2016). *Poverty and exclusion in a global world*. Springer.
- Bradshaw, J., & Main, G. (2016). *Child poverty and deprivation*. The Wellbeing of Children in the UK, 31

- Burkett, I. (2010). Sustainable Social Enterprise: What does this Really Mean?. *Foresters Community Finance*, 1, 1-4.
- Cajaiba-Santa, G. (2014). Social innovation: Moving the field forward. A conceptual framework. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 82, 42–51.
- Caulier-Grice, J., Davies, A., Patrick, R., & Norman, W., (2012). *Defining Social Innovation*. TEPSIE. Retrieved from: www.tepsie.eu/index.php/publications.
- Cloutier J. (2003), Qu'est-ce que l'innovation sociale ?, Cahier de recherche du CRISES, n° ET0314, UQAM, novembre
- Danaan, V. V. (2018). Analying poverty in Nigeria through theoretical lenses. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 11(1), 20–31. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v11n1p20> [Crossref], [Google Scholar]
- Daniel, M. E., & LENAIN, P. (2014). The role of social entrepreneurship in the fight against poverty, exclusion and marginalization in Haiti. *UNIVERSITE PARIS-EST CRETEIL*.
- Darling, R. (2002). *Partnership models in human services: Sociological foundations and practices*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/ Plenum Publisher.
- Davies, A. (2014). *Social Innovation Process and Social Entrepreneurship*. [In J. Howaldt, A. Butzin, D. Domanski & C. Kaletka (Eds.)]. Theoretical Approaches to Social Innovation. Critical Literature Review. A deliverable of the project “Social Innovation: Driving Force of Social Change (SI-DRIVE) (60-78). Dortmund: TU Dortmund, Sozialforschungsstelle.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American sociological review*, 147-160.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (2000). The iron cage revisited institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. In *Economics meets sociology in strategic management*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Edwards-Schachter, M. E., Matti, C. E., & Alcántara, E. (2012). "[Fostering Quality of Life through Social Innovation: A Living Lab Methodology Study Case](#)," [Review of Policy Research](#), *Policy Studies Organization*, 29(6), 672-692.
- Edwards-Schachter, M. E., Matti, C. E., & Alcántara, E. (2012). Fostering quality of life through social innovation: A living lab methodology study case. *Review of policy research*, 29(6), 672-692.
- European Commission (2011), FP7 Cooperation Work programme 2011, theme 8, Socio-economic sciences and humanities.
- European Commission (2013). *The Guide to Social Innovation*. Regional and urban Policy, European Commission.
- Fougere, M., Segercrantz, B. & Seeck, H., (2017). A critical reading of the European Union. A social innovation policy discourse: (Re)legitimizing neoliberalism. *Organization*, 24, 819-843. 10.1177/1350508416685171
- Gallouj F., Djellal F. (eds) 2010, *The Handbook of Innovation and Services: a multidisciplinary perspective*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishers.
- Ganguli, B.N. & Gupta, D.B. (1976), *Levels of Living*, S. Chand & Co., New Delhi.
- Grootaert, C. (1995). Structural change and poverty in Africa: A decomposition analysis for Côte d'Ivoire. *Journal of Development Economics*, 47(2), 375-401. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3878\(95\)00018-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3878(95)00018-L)
- Howaldt, J. & Schwarz, M. (2010). *Social Innovation: Concepts, research fields and international trends*. Sozialforschungsstelle Dortmund, ZWE TU Dortmund.
- Howells J. (2007), “Services and innovation: conceptual and theoretical perspectives”, in Bryson, J. R. and P. W. Daniels (eds), *The Handbook of Service Industries*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 34-44.
- ILO (2012). ILO Global Estimate of Forced Labour: Rights and Methodology. ILO Special Action Programme to combat Forced Labour (SAP-FL) www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/declaration/documents/publications/wcms_182004.pdf.
- Jimmieson, N. L., Peach, M., & White, K. M. (2008). Utilizing the theory of planned behavior to inform change management: An investigation of employee intentions

- to support organizational change. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, 44(2), 237-262.
- Karnani, A. (2017). Marketing and poverty alleviation: The perspective of the poor. *Market, Globalization & Development Review*, 2, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.23860/MGDR-2017-02-01-05>
- Kesselring, A. & Leitner, M. (2008). *Soziale Innovation in Unternehmen*. ZSI. Retrieved from: https://www.zsi.at/attach/Soziale_Innovation_in_Unternehmen_ENDBERICHT.pdf.
- Kharas, H., Haml, K., & Hofer, M. (2018). Rethinking Global Poverty Reduction
- Khavul, S., Bruton, G. D., & Wood, E. (2009). Informal family business in Africa. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 33(6), 1219-1238.
- Klapper, L., Laeven, L., & Rajan, R. (2006). Entry regulation as a barrier to entrepreneurship. *Journal of financial economics*, 82(3), 591-629.
- Laderchi, C.R., Saith, R., & Stewart, F. (2003). Does it matter that we do not agree on the definition of poverty? A comparison of four approaches. *Oxford development studies*, 31(3), 243-274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/136008103200011698>
- Lallemand D. (2001), *Les défis de l'innovation sociale*, Issy-les-Moulineaux: ESF Editeur.
- Lettice F., and Parekh M. (2010). The social innovation process: Themes, challenges and implications for practice. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 51, 19-158.
- Littlewood, D., & Holt, D. (2018). Social entrepreneurship in South Africa: Exploring the influence of environment. *Business & Society*, 57(3), 525-561.
- Littlewood, D., & Holt, D. (2018). Social entrepreneurship in South Africa: Exploring the influence of environment. *Business & Society*, 57(3), 525-561.
- Loogma, K., Tafel-Viia, K., & Umarik, M. (2013). Conceptualizing educational changes: A social innovation approach. *Journal of Education Change*, 14(3), 283-301.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American journal of sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
- Millard, J., & Fucci, V. (2023). The role of social innovation in tackling global poverty and vulnerability. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 8, 966918. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2023.966918>
- Millard, J., Weerakkody, V., Missi, F., Kapoor, K. & Fernando, G. (2016). Social innovation for poverty reduction and sustainable development: some governance and policy perspectives. Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance. Montevideo, Uruguay, 153-162. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2910019.2910079>
- North, D. C. (1991). Institutions, ideology, and economic performance. *Cato J.*, 11, 477.
- OECD. (2013). *PISA 2015 draft questionnaire framework*. Paris: OECD
- Oeij, P., Torre, W., Vaas, F., & Dhondt, S. (2019). Understanding social innovation as an innovation process: Applying the innovation journey model. *Journal of Business Research*. 101. 243-254. 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.04.028.
- Omobhude, C., & Chen, S. H. (2019). Social Innovation for Sustainability: the case of oil producing communities in the Niger delta region. *Sustainability*, 11(23), 6767.
- Omobowale, A. O. (2014). Livelihood, agro ecological zones and poverty in rural Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 6(2), 103-113. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jas.v6n2p103>
- Oyekale, A.S. (2015). Environment-related factors influencing morbidity among economically active household members in urban and rural Nigeria. *Environmental Economics*, 6(4-1), 167-174
- Pearson, T. (2015). Poverty: The Other Risk Factor for Diabetes and Its Complications. *AADE in Practice*, 3(2), 8-10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2325160315572597>
- Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O'regan, N., & James, P. (2015). Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic

- review. *Group & Organization Management*, 40(3), 428-461.
- Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. 2008. Rediscovering social innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 6, 34-43.
- Phills, J., Kriss D., & Dale. M. (2008). Rediscovering Social Innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. 6.
- Pol, E. & Ville, S., (2009). Social innovation: Buzz word or enduring term?. *Journal of Socio-Economics*. 38. 878-885. 10.1016/j.socsec.2009.02.011.
- Puffer, S. M., McCarthy, D. J., & Boisot, M. (2010). Entrepreneurship in Russia and China: The impact of formal institutional voids. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 34(3), 441-467.
- R. Sijabat, (2015). "The Role of Social Entrepreneurship in Enabling Economic Opportunities for the Poor: A Synthesis of the Literature and Empirical Works," *Int. J. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 6, no. 11, pp. 35-41,
- Rivera-Santos, M., Holt, D., Littlewood, D., & Kolk, A. (2015). Social entrepreneurship in sub-Saharan Africa. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 29(1), 72-91.
- Room, G. (2016). *'New Poverty' in the European Community*. Springer.
- Saini, J. S., & Bhatia, B. S. (1996). Impact of entrepreneurship development programmes. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 5(1), 65-80.
- Saith, R. (2001). *Capabilities: The concept and its operation*.
- Schiller, R. B. (2008). *The Economics of poverty and discrimination*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Scott, P. (1995). *The meanings of mass higher education*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Shah, M.K. (2016). *The myth of community: Gender issues in participatory development*. ITGD Publishing.
- Slesnick, N. (2000). *Treatment manual: Ecologically-Based family therapy for substance abusing runaway youth*. [Unpublished manuscript].
- Smallbone, D., & Welter, F. (2001). The distinctiveness of entrepreneurship in transition economies. *Small business economics*, 16(4), 249-262.
- Thornton, P.K., Jones, P.G., Owiyo, T., Kruska, R., Herrero, M., Kristjanson, P., & Omolo, A. (2006). *Mapping climate vulnerability and poverty in Africa*.
- UNDP. (2016). Human Development Report: Human Development for everyone. New York: UNDP. http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2016_human_development_report.pdf
- UNDP. (2018). *Human development indices and indicators: 2018 statistical update*.
- Van der Have, R. & Rubalcaba, L., (2016) Social Innovation Research: an Emerging Area of Innovation Studies? *Research Policy*, 45(9), 1923-1935. 10.1016/j.respol.2016.06.010.
- World Bank (2017). *World Bank Report*. Washington, DC: World Development Indicators.
- World Bank. (2019). *Global financial development report 2019/2020: Bank regulation and supervision a decade after the global financial crisis*. The World Bank.
- World Food Programme (2016). *Hunger statistics*. United Nations. Rome. www.wfp.org/hunger/stats.
- World Poverty Clock (2018). The percentage of Nigerians living in extreme poverty could increase by 2030
- Worldometer (2020). World Population. Worldometer. <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/nigeria-population>
- Zeng, X., Shi, Y., Guo, Y., & Ding, Y. (2022). Paths out of poverty: Social entrepreneurship and sustainable development. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1062669. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1062669>