

บทความวิจัย**การประเมินความยากจนตามหลักเกณฑ์ลักษณะครอบครัว:
กรณีศึกษาครัวเรือนชนบทในจังหวัดปัตตานี**

พาสี๊ะ หลีกอย *

ประภาพร ยางประยงค์ **

บทคัดย่อ

บทความฉบับนี้ได้ศึกษาถึงปัจจัยที่มีผลกระทบต่อความยากจนของครัวเรือนชนบทในจังหวัดปัตตานี ซึ่งตั้งอยู่ทางใต้สุดของประเทศไทย กลุ่มตัวอย่างทั้งสิ้นจำนวน 600 ครัวเรือนที่ได้รับการคัดเลือกโดยผ่านขั้นตอนการสุ่มตัวอย่างแบบหลายชั้น ข้อมูลที่ได้มีการวิเคราะห์โดยใช้สถิติเชิงพรรณนา ดัชนีการวัดความยากจนของฟอสเตอร์ เกร และโทเบค (FGT) (1984) และ โพรบิท โมเดล (probit model) ผลการวิเคราะห์แสดงให้เห็นว่า ค่าใช้จ่ายเฉลี่ยต่อหัว (MPCEHH) ของครัวเรือนชนบทในจังหวัดปัตตานีประมาณ 2,450.71 บาทต่อเดือน นอกจากนี้ผลการวิเคราะห์ยังพบอีกว่า อัตราความยากจนของครัวเรือนชนบทในจังหวัดปัตตานีเท่ากับ 33.33 เปอร์เซ็นต์ (หรือประมาณ 200 ครัวเรือนที่ยากจน) เมื่อเทียบกับเส้นความยากจน 1633.81 บาท อย่างไรก็ตามการวิเคราะห์โดยใช้สมการโพรบิท แสดงให้เห็นว่าลักษณะของครัวเรือน เช่น เพศของหัวหน้าครอบครัว สถานภาพการสมรสของหัวหน้าครอบครัว อาชีพของหัวหน้าครอบครัว ขนาดของครอบครัว และการออมทรัพย์ มีผลกระทบต่อความยากจนของครัวเรือนชนบทในจังหวัดปัตตานี

คำสำคัญ: ความยากจน, ครัวเรือนชนบท, เอฟจีที (FGT), โพรบิท โมเดล, ใต้สุดของประเทศไทย

* ดร. (เศรษฐศาสตร์), มหาวิทยาลัยอุตราละมาเลเซีย

** ดร. (เศรษฐศาสตร์), ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์สาขาเศรษฐศาสตร์, คณะวิทยาการจัดการ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสงขลา

RESEARCH

Poverty Assessment on the Basis of Household Characteristics: An Empirical Study of the Rural Pattani Province, Southernmost Thailand*Pha-isah Leekoi***Prapaporn Yangprayong*****Abstract**

Using the rural households in Pattani province located in the southernmost of Thailand, this paper investigates the factors affecting poverty incidence among people living in rural areas. A sample size of 600 households was selected through multi-stage sampling procedures. The data obtained were analyzed using descriptive statistics, the Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (FGT) poverty index (1984) and probit model. The finding indicates that the Mean Per Capita Expenditure of the Household (MPCEHH) in rural Pattani province was 2,450.71 Baht. At the poverty line 1,633.81 Baht, the study showed that the incidence of poverty among the Pattani province sampled population is 33.33 percent (or 200 households were poor). Further use of the probit regression shows that the characteristics of households such as gender of household head, marital status of household head, occupation of household head, household size and savings significantly influenced poverty incidence.

Keyword: Poverty, Rural Households, FGT, Probit model, Southernmost Thailand

* Ph.D (in Economics), Universiti Utara Malaysia,

** Asst. Prof. Ph.D (in Economics), Lecturer at Faculty of Management Science, Songkla Rajabhat University, Songkla, Thailand

Introduction

The Asian economies have been acknowledged for their remarkable growth over the past few decades. According to Balisacan and Fuwa (2007), the Asian countries have maintained a consistent growth in their gross domestic product (GDP). This remarkable growth happened during the past thirty years, making these countries outpaced those of other countries in the rest of the world. The growth is noticeable given that during the period in which the Asian countries' maintained a GDP growth rate averaged 4.0 percent per year, the developed countries and the world grew only by 2.6 percent and 2.7 percent, respectively. Kuznets (1955), the renowned economist has observed that, although the economic benefit of the growth is not always equally distributed, it should, nonetheless lead to a decrease in poverty incidence. In this sense the growth rate of the economy is to the eventual benefit for substantial number of the citizen. In other words, even in situation where the benefit of growth is not equally distributed, it should still lead to a decrease in poverty incidence. Since the Asian countries have achieved this growth, it is reasonable to expect these Asian countries particularly those comprising the East Asia and Southeast Asia, to have achieved reduction in poverty problems facing their people. However, the growth rate in GDP notwithstanding, many of the countries in the East Asia and Southeast Asia region are wallowing in poverty. This is evident in the 60 percent the Asian continent share from the 1.1 billion poor people of the world. Those categorized as poor are those people living on less than a dollar a day of expenditure level. In the specific case of Thailand, the percentage of Thailand's poor population, during the last decades has witnessed a reduction from 32.6 percent in 2002 to 13.2 percent in 2011 which is reduction of more than half of the previous level of poverty in the country. However, during the same period, the statistics from the office of the National Statistical Office, NSO (2013) (In Thailand, poverty incidence is measured at the household level by comparing per capita household income against poverty line, which is the income level that is considered sufficient for an individual to enjoy the society's minimum standards of living. In 2012, poverty line for the whole kingdom in Thailand was set as 2,492 Baht per capita per month which is a small rise from the previous year (NSO, 2013). An individual is classified as poor, if his or her income is below the poverty line (NESDB, 2005)) indicate that the proportion of poor households in rural areas rose to 16.7 percent. Several reasons have been advanced as possible factors that have brought uneven growth, poverty and backward condition that are observable among the rural areas of Thailand. The National Economic and Social Development Board, NESDB (2006) has maintained that the rural (The rural area is defined as all villages situated outside the urbanized enclosures of sanitary (suka-piban) and municipal (tesa-ban) districts (Thailand Development Research Institution (TDRI), 1996). People are classified as living in an urban area if the households are registered under local municipality administration, Flood, 2000)

communities were left behind economically because they were not linked to metropolitan urban centers where they can be connected to the outside world. Such linkages open up the rural dwellers to necessary economic opportunities that bring development. It can also be argued that the top down planning approach adopted by the Thailand authorities whereby rural development policies in general and agriculture policies in particular are implemented in this country. This perhaps is why the implementation does not enjoy the support of the people because they do not generally correspond to what are needed by the local communities in term of development. A glaring example is when the government introduced modern production technologies to poor farmers. This initiative was obviously intended to increase their productivities, but rather resulted in higher levels of debt being contracted among the rural households. The reason for this turn of event is attributable to the high risk factor attached to these technologies. Consequently, debt mounted among the farmers leading to loss of farm-lands by some farmers especially the marginalized ones due to their inability to repay their debts (NESDB, 2006).

The implication of these entire events is the stark reality that in the case of Thailand, rather than abated, poverty remains as one of the persistent social issues plaguing its population. However, government is not folding its arm as the Thai government has continuously formulated and implemented programs and strategies aimed at eradicating poverty and meant to help the poor to sustain their livelihood. Among the measures that were implemented include the one-district-one-product program, debt suspension for farmers, village and community fund, improved capacity in sustainable agriculture, financial support of 500 Baht (Exchange rate: 1 US\$= 32.03 Thai Baht; in 2013.) per month for the elderly, the 30-Baht Health Care Programme and bank of the poor. Most of these programs did take into account the fact that rural areas are particularly affected by the poverty issue and therefore, they were specifically aimed towards the population living in this area.

Although the programmes are designed generally for the rural populace, the level and persistence of incidence of poverty among the three southernmost provinces of Thailand including Pattani have been cited as one of the main factors behind the disturbance in the region. The insurgency mounted by the Muslim separatist against the Thai government is cited as an example and evidence of the connection between violence and economic fortune of the people. Due to the activities of the group, the region has recorded the killing of more 50,000 people. The unabated violence has taken its toll on the social and economy life of the people in the area

Several attempts have been made by researchers to study and examine the issues of poverty in Thailand (See for example Sricharoen and Buchenrieder (2005), War (2008), Thuvachote (2011), Kurita and Kurosaki (2011), Suwannarat (2011), Yanya (2012) and Vora-Sittha (2012) on the discussion on poverty and related issues in Thailand). However, it is noteworthy that very few studies have examined the issue of poverty in the Southern Region of Thailand (Among the studies that examined the issue of poverty in South Thailand are

Jitpiomsri and Sobhonvasu (2006) and Taneerasanon (2014).). The significance of concentrating research efforts in this region is because there is marked difference in the demographic features of the region to that of the other region. This difference includes the population size and rate of economic growth.

On the basis of issues highlighted above, this study is designed to further identify and investigate the predisposing factors that are responsible for the high level of poverty incidence among rural households in Pattani province, southernmost Thailand.

Therefore this paper will discuss in sequential order the concept of poverty as well as empirical studies on poverty. This will be followed by a description of method of data collection research the methodology used in this study. The results of data analysis and discussion are presented in the next section while the concluding part will provide summary for the paper.

Literature Review

The Concept of Poverty

As a concept, poverty is a phenomenon that describes a situation of economic deprivation such as lack of income (Alwang, Siegel and Jorgensen, 2001). Two dimensions are used to classify the poor. A poor person may belong to the absolute poverty category when he is deprived of basic needs like food consumption, housing etc. On the other hand, he is classified as belonging to the relative poverty category with regard to his level of income. Despite the many dimensions of poverty, the poor can be quantified relatively easily ex-post.

At another level of classifications, two different types of poverty are notable and these are *transient poverty* and *chronic poverty*. Transient poverty depicts a fleeting situation resulting from exposure to certain risk which makes it difficult for the families to uphold their level of consumption when encountering fluctuation in income (Jalan and Ravallion (1998), while *chronic poverty* is a situation where, for a considerable time period, the income per capita or consumption levels is persistently below the poverty line (Gaiha and Deolalikar, 1993).

Chronic poverty, (the “always poor”), according to McKay and Lawson (2002), is persistent poverty experienced over a reasonably long period of time. In the case of transient poverty (the “sometimes poor”) depicts a temporary condition when the households are experiencing movements into and out of poverty. Furthermore, a population or persons are in the grip of *chronic poverty* occurs when there is scarce human capital and the people are incapable of ownership of physical assets. In addition, there is low-paid labour as well as poor location of residence while the demographic composition of households remains unfavourable. Transient poverty is a situation when economic activities is seasonal, the household is temporarily destabilised as a result of government transfer, family size, migration or life cycle.

The Empirical Studies on Poverty

The phenomenon of poverty has attracted scholar attention. Literatures have examined issues at different dimensions and perspectives. Decades ago, Ravallion (1988) in a study on poverty and using a sample from the ICRISAT, concluded that transient poverty constituted about half of total poverty in the area under study. Similarly, Jalan and Ravallion (1998) in a rural population in China was able to show that half of the mean squared poverty gap is transient. Even when different definitions of transient poverty are used, similar outcomes are obtained. As an example, Gaiha and Deolalikar (1993) carried out a study based on data gathered over a period of 9 years and using the ICRISAT income data, revealed that approximately one fifth of the total households in the area were considered as poor in each year while another 12 percent of the sample have never been poor. The findings of the study also suggested that majority of households may belong to transient poverty category as those surveyed were poor only for some time during the period of the study.

The study conducted by Balogun (2011) in the in South–Western States parts of Nigeria, in the Africa, investigated the factors that influence poverty among rural households. The finding from the study indicated that demographic features such as age, household size, asset value and presence of toilet facility significantly affected poverty. Similarity, evidence were found in the study of Amao, Ayantoye, and Fadahunsi (2013) who investigated the evidence and alleviation strategy of absolute poverty among households in Osun State, Nigeria. A sample size of 105 respondents were random selected using the FGT 1984 poverty index and probit regression model, the data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, The study showed that the poverty incidence was found to be 99 percent, the poverty depth/gap was found to be 98.9 percent and the poverty severity was found to be 98.8 percent. Furthermore, the findings showed that the size of household has positive significant influence over poverty in the study area. But household income and primary occupation were found to have negative significant influence poverty in the study area.

Still on the determinants of poverty in rural areas, Jha, Kang, Nagarajan, and Pradhan (2012) examined what determines poverty in rural India by using a probit model. The study covered the periods of 1999 and 2006. The findings reveal that a household headed by a female has relatively lower probability of poverty in 2006 than a household headed by a male. Higher share of more educated members, larger size of land and more irrigated land tend to reduce household probability of poverty while both more female members and younger or older members would increase the probability of poverty.

In a similar study by Bahta and Haile (2013), using the probit model and descriptive analysis; investigated the possible factors that determine the poverty status among Zoba Maekel population of Eritrea. From the report of their study, several factors that include that educational status, residency type land size are identified as determinant of poverty status. Other factors identified are number of meal, remittance, access of

credit from relatives, credit institutions, opinion to credit, rain fed crop, irrigated crop, income from agriculture. However, the findings of the study indicated that income made from non-agriculture products negatively associated with food self-sufficiency which is used as a proxy of poverty. On the other hand, there is positive correlation between the family size, number of children, children at school age and rent of land.

Che Mat, Abu Bakar and Abdul Jalil (2011) design a study that examined the impact of non-farm income on poverty in Kedah, Malaysia. Their findings were emphatic that non-farm income reduces the level, depth and severity of poverty in Kedah. They also revealed that non-farm income has a greater impact on reducing the severity poverty as opposed to the level of poverty and depth poverty in Kedah.

Data and Methodology

Data

The data for this study was collected from population living in rural Pattani province, southernmost Thailand. The motivation for using the population was the need to further examine the poverty situation in Pattani province in order to understand its roots and causes and how they may differ from other provinces. Through multi-stage sampling procedure twenty villages from five regions (northern, southern, eastern, western and central) of Pattani province were chosen in this study. A sample size of 600 was selected through proportionately sampling to determine the sample size for each village according to the number of households residing in those respective villages. This approach was diligently implemented to ensure that every region is represented adequately. However, total six hundred (600) questionnaires distributed have meaningful information for analysis.

Methodology

The data collected were analysed through descriptive statistics, the Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (FGT) poverty index (1984) and probit model.

Poverty measure

Due to their consistency in measuring poverty, research often adopted the Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (FGT) poverty index (1984) for their simplicity, ease of computation and also additively decomposable (Foster *et al.*, 1984; Balogun, 2011). The FGT poverty measure in this study defined as follows (equation 1):

$$P_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\frac{z - y_i}{z} \right)^{\alpha}, \alpha \geq 0 \quad (1)$$

Where Z = poverty line was defined as $2/3$ of the Mean Per Capita Expenditure of the Household (MPCEHH) (Baiyegunhi and Fraser, 2010; Adepoju, Yusuf, Omonona, and Okunmadewa, 2011; Balogun, 2011; Adepoju and Yusuf, 2012; Amao, *et al.*, 2013), y_i = the value of per capita of poverty indicator/welfare index of the household, in this case defined as per capita expenditure of the household i ($i=1,2,...,600$), n = total number of households in the sample, q = the number of household below poverty line (the number of poor people), using the FGT index that takes values of 0,1, and 2 when it is used as the poverty aversion parameter. The application is that when parameter $\alpha=0$, $P_0=q/n$ it simply refers to the head count index or poverty incidence (that's the relative size of households that are poor among the sampled population). On the other hand when $\alpha=1$, P_1 here it refers to the poverty gap index or how deep is the level of poverty (in other words, the measure of the relative size of the shortfall in expenditure from the poverty line). Furthermore, when $\alpha=2$, P_2 this refers to the poverty severity index (the quantity of transfer of expenditure needed from a poor to a poorer to alleviate his/her poverty level).

Probit model

When research is dealing with binomial response variables, probit model, as a regression analysis; has been found to be useful. The application of probit model is suitable in regression analysis where the dependent variable usually have two values, as in the case of measuring success or failure, married or not married. Probit model also complied with the underlining assumption that the error terms are independent and that the data is normally distributed. This form of probit model is given by equation (2):

$$\Pr(y_i) = \alpha + \sum \beta_i X_i + \varepsilon, \varepsilon \sim N(0,1) \quad (2)$$

From the foregoing explanation of probit model, this study employed the model as the method use in determining the factors that are affecting poverty incidence among the rural households in Pattani province. This research adopts the probit Model to enable us carried out assessment of the per capita consumption expenditure of household. The aim is to determine whether the household consumption expenditure is below the poverty line, conditioned on a vector of household characteristics, X_i (Jha, *et al.*, 2012; Baiyegunhi and Fraser, 2010). The study adopted and adapted some measures from previous studies in order to measure the independent variables that are included in this study (Oni and Yusuf, 2008; Balogun, 2011; Adepoju and Yusuf, 2012; Amao, *et al.*, 2013).

Following equation 2, the equation (3) was subsequently estimated:-

$$\Pr(y_i) = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + \beta_9 X_9 + \varepsilon \quad (3)$$

Where y_i = dependent variable (probability of the poverty incidence); $y_i=1$ for those who are considered poor (the per capita expenditure of the household was below the poverty line), and $y_i=0$ for those who are considered non-poor (the per capita expenditure of the household was above the poverty line), α = the constant of the equation, β_1 - β_9 = the coefficient of the each independent variables, X_1 - X_9 = independent variables which include of X_1 = gender of household head (1= male, 0= female), X_2 = age of the households head (in years), X_3 = marital status of household head (1=married, 0=widowed/divorced), X_4 =occupation of household head (1=agriculturists/farmers/fishermen, 0=others such as government/state enterprise officials, trader, construction, etc.), X_5 = primary education of household head (1= primary education level, 0= no primary education level), X_6 = household size (a continuous variable refer to the number of members in the family), X_7 = house condition (1=poor house condition, 0=good house condition), X_8 = access to credit (1=access to credit, 0= no access to credit), and X_9 = Savings (1=savings, 0= no savings), ε = error term.

Findings and Discussion

Households Poverty Analysis

Analyzing the statistics of expenditure of households based on food and some basic needs as contained in Table 1, the Mean Per Capita Expenditure of the Household (MPCEHH) of the sampled population from the rural area of Pattani province, show a 2450.71 Baht. The computed poverty line for the study population areas is at 1633.81 Baht. This result is the basis for classifying the households as being poor on the basis of their mean per capita expenditure being less than 1633.81 Baht. Using the 1633.81 Baht as the base of poverty line, the result indicates that the headcount poverty indices of the households of the sample population is 33.33 percent of the households that are considered poor. This would mean that the incidence of poverty in Pattani province occurred among 200 households.

Table 1:

Average monthly expenditure of households sampled on Food and some Basic needs

Item	Average Monthly Expenditure (Baht)	Share in Total Expenditure (Percent)
Food	4,503.72	38.78
Clothing	618.93	5.33
Housing	261.50	2.25
Medical treatment	244.47	2.10
Education	3,095.97	26.66
Travel	1066	9.18
Electricity	612.11	5.27
House telephone	413.63	3.56
Individual expense	627.58	5.40
Others	141.75	1.22
Total non-food	7,082	60.97
Total food and non-food	11,585.72	100.00
Mean Per Capita Expenditure of the Household (MPCEHH)	2,450.71	
2/3 MPCEHH (poverty line)	1,633.81	
Poverty incidence	33.33 percent (200 Households)	

Sources: Author's calculation from survey data, 2013.

The factors affecting poverty incidence of rural households in Pattani province

The approach adopted for this analysis is the probit estimation which helps to show the factors that impact on rural households in Pattani province leading to poverty incidence. The empirical estimation of the probit analysis as contained in Table 2 shows that the Log likelihood is -287.705 and LR statistic is 188.41 which is significant at 1 probability level, and an indication that the model has a good fit.

Further analysis of the impact of gender of household head (χ_1), occupation of household head (χ_4) and household size (χ_6) as part of the model and their impact on poverty incidence, the result revealed that they are positively affecting poverty incidence in rural Pattani province. On the contrary, marital status of

household head (χ_3) and savings (χ_9) shows negative effect on the probability of poverty incidence in this study area.

When the value of marginal effect for gender of household head (χ_1) is 0.2486 as shown in Table 2, it can be interpreted as indication that when a household head is male, the probability of poverty incidence increase by 0.2486 units. In other words, there is high probability that male-headed households have significant higher probability of being poor. This result supports the findings of obtained of Jha *et al.* (2012). The implied meaning of the result shows that the marginal effect value of marital status of household head (χ_3) is -0.5673 is the probability of decrease in poverty incidence by 0.5673 units when the head of a household is a married person. On the whole, this finding is not surprising because it is in line with the expectation that a household whose head is a widow or a divorcee has high probability of being poor. This outcome of the study is consistent with earlier study such as the result obtained by Baiyegunhi and Fraser (2010).

This trend of findings continues if we examine the result that is contained in table 2 which indicates that the marginal effect value of occupation of household head (χ_4) is positively significant. This is an indication that when an agriculturist/farmer/fisherman is the households head, there is probability that the poverty incidence would increase by 0.2919 units. It follows therefore that if an agriculturist/farmer/fisherman is the head of a household it is more likely for the household to be poor than it would be if the head of the household is in other sector of the economy. This finding can also be understood in the light of the fact that majority of the households living in the rural areas are engaged in agriculture activities as the means of sustenance. For this reason, when agricultural activities which is their main source of income experienced fluctuation, as it often happens, among rural households due to various types of negative shocks, it can lead to serious discomfort for the rural dwellers. (Lipton and Ravallion, 1995; Seyi Olalekan, Olapade-Ogunwole, and Raufu, 2011). This finding is in line with result of Adepoju and Yusuf (2012).

Continue with the analysis, the marginal effect value for the household size (χ_6) shows positive effect on poverty incidence. The data in Table 2, indicates that the probability of being poor is higher by 1.7301 units for households with larger household size. This means that when there is increase in one unit of households' size there will be increase in the probability of poverty incidence. This outcome of the study aligned with the result of a study conducted by Balogun (2011) and Adepoju and Yusuf (2012).

At the level of savings as a variable, it is found that savings (χ_9) is one among the factors affecting poverty incidence. This is because the value of marginal effect is found to be negatively significant. The implication of this for the households with the ability to save is that there is the probability for the incidence of poverty to be lower by 0.2966 units when compared to those who have no savings. It is reasonable to assume that households that are able to keep appreciable level of savings are not likely to be poor because they can fall

back on their savings when the economic fortune is not favourable. This outcome is line with the findings of previous study as reported by Del Ninno and Marini (2005), also that of Dercon and Clarke (2009). In contrast to this trend of findings are the results of the analysis of the influence of age on household head (χ_2), primary education of household head (χ_5), house condition (χ_7) and access to credit (χ_8) on incidence of poverty. The result indicates that all of them are found to be statistically insignificant among the households in the study population.

Table 2:

Probit Estimation results for the factors affecting poverty incidence in rural Pattani province

Variables	Coefficient	Marginal Effect
Constant	-2.1087 ^{***} (-6.95)	
Gender of household head (χ_1)	0.3038 [*] (1.80)	0.2486 [*] (1.79)
Age of household head (χ_2)	0.0089 (1.54)	0.4770 (1.53)
Marital status of household head (χ_3)	-0.6085 ^{***} (-3.21)	-0.5673 ^{***} (-3.16)
Occupation of household head (χ_4)	0.4758 ^{***} (3.79)	0.2919 ^{***} (3.68)
Primary education of household head (χ_5)	-0.0476 (-0.35)	-0.0197 (-0.35)
Household size (χ_6)	0.2664 ^{***} (8.22)	1.7301 ^{***} (7.57)
House condition (χ_7)	0.2746 (1.63)	0.0475 (1.63)
Access to credit (χ_8)	-0.1727 (-1.27)	-0.0757 (-1.26)
Savings (χ_9)	-0.3599 ^{***} (-2.66)	-0.2966 ^{***} (-2.63)
Log likelihood	-287.705	
Number of observations	600	
LR χ^2 (9)	188.41	
Prob> χ^2	0.0000	

Sources: Author's calculation from survey data, 2013.

Note: 1. Values of z-statistics are reported in parenthesis.

2. The dependent variable for the estimation is the Poverty incidence= the per capita expenditure of the household was below the poverty line (as such they are considered poor).

3. ***, denotes coefficient is significance at 1 percent level, **, at 5 percent level, *, at 10 percent level.

Conclusion

Based on the findings from this study, it can be concluded that among the Pattani province sampled population, the poverty incidence is 33.33 percent. Also, this study found that poverty incidence is influenced by gender of household head, marital status of household head, occupation of household head, household size and savings.

Flowing from this conclusion is the policy implications on tackling poverty in Pattani province. In order to reduce poverty incidence in rural Pattani province, it is important for the government and civil society organization in Thailand to embark on aggressive policy that is capable of fighting poverty to bearable level. Among areas and issue that need to be given attention is the budget distribution, and assistances to the target area. Also, the Thai government and development agencies must be pro active by enacting preventive measures to tackling the incidence of poverty among the household. The incidence of poverty in the province necessarily call for systematic and carefully implemented programmes that empowers the people and offers them better access to education, productive and meaningful job opportunities as well as public amenities.

Bibliography

- Adepoju, A.O., Yusuf, S.A., Omonona, B.T. and Okunmadewa, F.Y. 2011. **Vulnerability Profile of Rural Households in South West Nigeria**. Journal of Agricultural Science, 3(1), 128–139.
- Adepoju, A.O. and Yusuf, S.A. 2012. **Poverty and Vulnerability in Rural South-West Nigeria**. ARPN Journal of Agricultural and Biological Science, 7(6), 430–437.
- Alwang, J., Siegel, P.B. and Jorgensen, S.L. 2001. **Vulnerability as Viewed from Different Disciplines**. Social Protection Discussion Paper Series, 0115.
- Amao, J.O., Ayantoye, K. and Fadahunsi, O.D. 2013. **Poverty among Farming Households in Osun State, Nigeria**. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 3(21), 135–143.
- Baiyegunhi, LJS. and Fraser, GCG. (Eds.). 2010. **Determinants of Household Poverty Dynamics in Rural Regions of the Eastern Cape Province, South Africa**. Paper presented at the Joint 3rd African Association of Agricultural Economists (AAAE) and 48th Agricultural Economists Association of South Africa (AEASA) Conference. Cape Town, South Africa.
- Balogun, O. L. 2011. **Determinants of Poverty among Rural Households in South Western States, Nigeria**. International Journal of Agricultural Science, Research and Technology, 1(3), 99–104.
- Balisacan, A.M., and Fuwa, N. 2007. **Poverty and Vulnerability. In Reasserting the Rural Development Agenda: Lessons Learned and Emerging Challenges in Asia (Eds.)**. Singapore.
- Bahta, Y.T. and Haile, B.O. 2013. **Determinants of Poverty of Zoba Maekel of Eritrea: A Household Level Analysis**. International Journal of Food and Agricultural Economics, 1(2), 73–84.
- Che Mat, S.H., Abu Bakar, N. A. and Abdul Jalil, A. Z. 2011. **Non Farm Income and Poverty in Kedah, Malaysia**. Paper presented at the International Conference on Sociality and Economics Development (IPEDR), 10, 399–403.
- Del Ninno, C. and Marini, A. 2005. **Household's Vulnerability to Shocks in Zambia**. Social Protection Discussion Paper, 0536.
- Dercon, S. and Clarke, D. 2009. **Insurance, Credit and Safety Nets for the Poor in a World of Risk**. DESA Working Paper, 81.
- Flood, J. 2000. **Defining urban areas in Thailand**. Bangkok: Thailand. Office of National Economic and Social Development Board.
- Foster, J., Greer, J. and Thorbecke, E. 1984. **A class of decomposable poverty measures**. Econometrica, 52(3), 761–766.

- Gaiha, R., and Deolalikar, A. 1993. **Persistent, Expected and Innate Poverty: Estimates for Semi-Arid Rural South India 1975–1984**. Cambridge Journal of Economics, 17(4), 409–421.
- Jalan, J., and Ravallion, M. 1998. **Behavioral Responses to Risk in Rural China**. Policy Research Department, Policy Research Working Paper, 1978.
- Jha, R., Kang, W., Nagarajan, H.K. and Pradhan, K.C. 2012. **Vulnerability and Responses to Risk in Rural India**. ASARC working paper, 05.
- Jitpiromsri, S. and Sobhonvasu, P. 2006. **Unpacking Thailand's southern conflict: The poverty of structural explanations**. Critical Asian Studies, 38(1), 95–117.
- Kurita, K. and Kurosaki, T. 2011. **The Dynamics of Growth, Poverty, and Inequality: A Panel Analysis of Regional Data from the Philippines and Thailand**. Asian Economic Journal, 25(1), 3–33.
- Kuznets, S. 1955. **Economic Growth and Income Inequality**. The American Economic Review, 45(1), 1–28.
- Lipton, M. and Ravallion, M. 1995. **Poverty and Policy**. In J. Behrman and T. N. Srinivasan (Eds.), Handbook of Development Economics (Vol.3). Elsevier Science, B.V.
- McKay, A. and Lawson, D. 2002. **Chronic Poverty: A Review of Current Quantitative Evidence**. Chronic Poverty Research Centre. Working Paper, 15.
- National Statistical Office (NSO). 2013. **Data of the Household Socio-Economic Survey**. Bangkok: Thailand. Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board and Thailand Development Research Institute.
- National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB). 2005. **Poverty in Thailand. Knowledge Management and Poverty Reduction Policy Unit**. Bangkok: Thailand. Community Economic Development and Income Distribution Office.
- National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB). 2006. **The ninth national Economic and Social Development plan (2002–2006)**. Bangkok: Thailand. Office of Prime minister.
- Oni, O.A. and Yusuf, S.A. 2008. **Determinants of Expected Poverty among Rural Households in Nigeria**. African Economic Research Consortium, Nairobi (AERC) Research Paper, 183, 23–40.
- Ravallion, M. 1988. **Expected Poverty under Risk-Induced Welfare Variability**. Economic Journal, 98, 1,173–1,183.
- Taneerasanon, S. 2014. **Ultra-Poor Revisited: A case of Southern Thailand**. International Journal of Social, Education, Economics and Management Engineering, 8(4), 941–945.
- Thailand Development Research Institution (TDRI). 1996. **TDRI Report for The World Commission on Dams Pak Mun Case Study**. Bangkok: Thailand.

- Seyi Olalekan, O., Olapade–Ogunwale, F. and Raufu, M. O. 2011. **Shocks and Coping Strategies of Rural Households: Evidence from Ogo–Oluwa Local Government, Oyo State, Nigeria.** International Journal of Agricultural Management & Development (IJAMAD), 1(4), 259–266.
- Sricharoen, T. and Buchenrieder, G. 2005. **Principal component analysis of poverty in northern Thailand.** Conference on International Agricultural Research for Development, Stuttgart–Hohenheim, Germany.
- Suwannarat, P. 2011. **Agricultural Productivity and Poverty Reduction in Thailand.** Faculty of Economics, Thammasat University.
- Thuvachote, S. 2011. **Cooperatives and Poverty reduction in Thailand.** Department of Cooperatives, Faculty of Economics, Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Yanya, M. 2012. **Causal Relationship between Entrepreneurship Poverty and Income Inequality in Thailand.** International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance, 3(6), 436–440.
- Vora–Sittha, P. 2012. **Governance and Poverty Reduction in Thailand.** Modern Economy, 3, 487–497.
- Warr, P. 2008. **Poverty Reduction through Long–term growth: The Thai Experience.** Working Papers in Trade and Development, No. 2008/19.