ISSN 2664-3995 (Print) & ISSN 2664-6757 (Online)
South Asian Research Journal of Business and Management
Abbreviated Key Title: South Asian Res J Bus Manag

| Volume-8 | Issue-3 | May-Jun- 2026 | **DOI: https://doi.org/10.36346/sarjbm.2026.v08i03.005**

Original Research Article

Socioeconomic Determinant of Poverty in Pakistan

Zaib-un-nisa[1]*
[1]Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author:** Zaib-un-nisa
Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan

Article History
Received: 28.02.2026
Accepted: 23.04.2026
Published: 13.05.2026

Abstract: This study examines the impact of the determinants of poverty in Pakistan. This article uses five independent macroeconomic. that are public expenditure, budget deficit, unemployment rate, exchange rate and inflation rate are studied. The methodology used is the Ordinary least Square (OLS) method. It uses time series data consisting of 19 observations, compiled from different sources such as (WDI) and (The Global Economy.Com). Using this model, we investigated the effect of public expenditue, the budget deficit, the unemployment rate, exchange rate, and the inflation rate on poverty in Pakistan. Public expenditure and the budget deficit have an inverse relationship, while the OLS has a direct relationship with poverty in Pakistan. Furthermore, in this model, we examine the impact of inflation rate and exchange rate, which helps us demonstrate a negative relationship with poverty, while inflation also has a direct relationship. Five variables were used in this thesis; three of each has a negative relationship and the other two have a positive relationship with poverty. Theoretically, we demonstrated the relationship between these macroeconomic variables with the help of reference articles and historical data collection, using Pakistan's perspective on these variables.

Keywords: Poverty, Unemployment, Inflation Rate, Budget Deficit, And Inflation Rate, Pakistan.

INTRODUCTION

Poverty is a key problem for developing nations. Globally, over the past 30 years, economic growth has been accompanied by an increase in the proportion of poor people. In 1960, the richest 20% of countries had 30 times mor than the poorest 20% of their inhabitants. The International Labour Organization defines poverty as a condition in which a person is unable to meet their basic needs. Poverty is an immoral act or a fundamental evil that describes a certain percentage of people who are unable to obtain a minimum standard of living.

The poor gamble their entire lives to satisfy their basic needs, while the rich consume luxury goods and satisfy their desires and needs. On the other hand, if they produce desires in society, the poor suffer. The poor are powerless to exercise their rights, while money and the upper classes destroy their rights for their own benefit. Many international organizations like the United Nations and Banco Mundial profit from poverty reduction.

Banco Mundial statistics show that 1.29 billion people lived in absolute poverty in 2009. Approximately 650 million people lived in India, Pakistan, China, Bangladesh, and Africa; the highest rate is 47%, which is below absolute poverty.

Darcon (2001) examines the determinants of changes in poverty and growth. Experimental results show that total consumption increases and poverty decreases significantly over time under the deliberation. He argues that the key factor that raises input deviations is comparative price deviations.

Krishnan and Dercon (1998) assessed different levels of poverty in 1989 and 1995 and also tested the magnitude of mean variation on the problem of combined poverty lines and the effect of the ambiguity of the inflation rate medicine.

This is based on the fact that poverty declined between 1989 and 1994, but continued with almost no effect between 1989 and 1994, and that people with considerable physical and human capital and access to better cities and roads have low poverty levels and are expected to achieve the best outcomes during the period. We also find that the entry of human capital into cities and roads decreases the variation in poverty throughout the period.

Poverty is a condition in which the lack of water at home and basic necessities or a lack of resources forces people to reach and consume a certain minimum amount of water. Water means clothing, food, living, and other basic necessities. Current poverty is a global problem.

Please note that the description and presentation evoke the well-being of people. They exist when people are unable to meet their basic needs, which are important for survival.

In 2006, 23.9 percent of the population lived under the shadow of poverty calculated by the Program of United Nations for Development (PNUD). At that time the government calculated the shadow of poverty at 25.7 percent. The Economic Study of Pakistan 2014-2015 informed that 34% of the population lives under the shadow of food poverty. In Pakistan, a large part of the family allowance goes towards food. The gas consumption level of the hogarettes is used to satisfy the food needs of the hogar at the national level.

Poverty comes in many forms, but two of the most extreme are relative poverty, in which a person cannot survive at the lowest standard of living in a given society. The government determines the low level of income based on where that person lives. The second type is absolute poverty, which refers to the lack of basic human needs, commonly including food, water, clothing, housing, health, and education. It simply means that people who cannot earn two dollars are considered and live in absolute poverty. In our study examining the determinants of poverty in Pakistan, our finding is that, in perspective, 40% of households are poor at the national level

Research Question

Whether public gas, exchange rate, interest rate, budget deficit and inflation rate significantly determine Pakistan's poverty or not?

Objective of the Study

This study is:

i. To explore the relationship between poverty and its five determinants: public expenditure, exchange rate, the budget deficit, unemployment rate and the inflation rate.
ii. To give some suggestion to government of Pakistan for the reduction of poverty in Pakistan.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Huma and Imran (2014) studied the determinants of poverty in Pakistan and demonstrated the impact of macroeconomic variables. In their research paper, they considered five variables and used model specifications, applying the ordinary least squares methodology. Their study analyzed the effect of the assumed deficit, public gas, and the model on poverty in Pakistan. They demonstrated that the relationship between the model and poverty is positive, and that public gas and the assumed deficit show a negative relationship with poverty. In the second model, they studied the effects of the exchange rate and the inflation rate on poverty. The exchange rate shows a positive relationship with poverty, as does the inflation rate. They described that the relationship between these variables is statistically significant and demonstrated the theoretical insight.

Danese (2013) examines the determinants of poverty in Pakistan in his study. He examined the dynamics of poverty and its determinants in the context of Pakistan. He examined the relationship between poverty and its five main determinants: poor governance, corruption, health, and desire.

Javid *et al*., (2012) demonstrated the determinants of poverty in Pakistan and the effect of inflation on it. They compiled time-series data from the period 1973–2010 and applied the ARDL technique. They demonstrated that the impact of inflation is positive and significant. They demonstrated that inflation has a significant and statistically significant impact on poverty reduction.

Sikandar and Rizvi (2013) demonstrated in their study that the effect of agricultural growth, the direct relationship between trade, and labor on poverty reduction, reconstructing time series data from 1980 to 2010. They applied an error integration and correlation model, as proven in their work, stating that all variables have a significant and statistical impact on poverty reduction.

Public gas has a positive effect on poverty, but a public mayor generates a pre-supposed deficit, which leads to inflation in many declining countries. This generates unemployment and slows private inversion in large numbers. Fan and Rao (2003) showed the impact of public food in 45 countries, broken down to demonstrate different types of public food and their different effects on economic progress.

However, consumption in the agricultural sector is trying to catch up with the growth of crops in the economy. Much of the population in developing countries and rural areas has a single source of ingredients: agriculture, which will increase production and reduce poverty in these areas.

Mahmood and Chaudhry (2012) determine the effect of FDI on poverty reduction. They compiled time series data from 1973 to 2003. They used ARDL correlation and error models, obtaining results in short- and long-term interactions. The study finds that the variables are completely significant and have a negative effect on poverty.

Egbe and Clement (2011), in their thesis "The Influence of Macroeconomic Policies and Programs on the Problem of Poverty," describes the impact of certain macroeconomic policies on poverty in Nigeria during the period 1990–2002. They highlight the causes of poverty in the state, along with the measures adopted by the government to mitigate their impact. They analyze the data, apply regression models on poverty and GDP, describe the policies and programs, and demonstrate that macroeconomic variables do not influence poverty-reducing trends in the state.

Hassan, Chaudhry, and Malik (2009) examine the effect of socioeconomic and demographic variables on poverty. A case study analyzed the impact of these variables on poverty. Primary data and poverty profiles were used and findings were analyzed using an economic approach. They demonstrated that home dependence, land ownership, home size, number of winning heads, and land ownership influence the incidence of poverty. We suggest that socioeconomic factors should be promoted and that land should be allocated to landless households.

Amal (2006) studied the relationship between desire, growth, and poverty in Pakistan at a macro level. I determined that there was a positive relationship between the desire for ingredients, GDP per capita, and wage gap in different sectors of the economy, and the effect of corruption in the terms of trade on desire. I also examined that a low level of desire for ingredients contributed to the reduction of poverty and explained the measures to control and reduce it. Iqbal and Zahid (1998) show the effects of the presupuestario deficit and paper in their study. There is a negative correlation between the presupuestario deficit and productivity. In their study, they demonstrated that increasing burdens in the economy affected public gas and decreased private inversion. Mahmood and Sadiq (2010) determine the high presupuestario deficit of any government. There are two options to cover your assumed deficit: one is to resort to external sources that improve the exchange rate and reimburse the interest in excess cash. The demand for foreign currency.

The currency increases and devalues the local currency, and the government also increases its stimulus, thus reducing population inversion. This situation occurs in the Pakistani economy when exports decline and the currency devalues. The second option is for the government to engage internally with other countries, which significantly increases the interest rate, since the type of exchange is the element of interest, which will increase the interest rate in the economy. People will begin to abhor the high interest rates, which will impact the country's vested power and money circulation.

Data Variable and Methodology

Data Variable

The factor responsible for poverty has created a foundational document for poverty reduction in developing countries like Pakistan. In this thesis, we use five variables to evaluate our impact on poverty in Pakistan. For these variables, data are obtained from the World Development Index (WDI) and the Pakistan Economic Survey. Time series data are used, consisting of 19 observations. The variables and their implications are presented below:

1. Poverty is measured by the Head count ratio (POV).
2. Public Expenditure is equal to the percentage of GDP.
3. The Budget deficit is calculated in millions of rupees.
4. Unemployment rate.
5. Inflation tax.
6. Exchange rate in US dollars.

METHODOLOGY

This study will use the ordinary least squares (OLS) method to investigate the degree of relationship, as well as the degree of the relationship (positive or negative) for these variables.

Economic Theory or Estimated Sign

Public Expenditure is measured to a percentage of GDP. Economic theory suggests that public expenditure and poverty are negative, since increasing agricultural expenditure improves crop growth in desert countries, as the majority of the population lives in rural areas, whose source of income is agriculture. As a result, poverty will decrease.

Budget Deficit is calculated in millions (RS). Economic theory suggests a negative correlation between budget deficits and poverty, since increased taxes and spending reduce private investment. When spending decreases, poverty increases.

Unemployment Rate

That calculated sign is the increase in unemployment and consequently will increase poverty, so economic theory suggests that a positive sign be calculated for the coefficient.

Inflation

The main problem is increasing poverty. When inflation rises in a country, consumption decreases; as consumption decreases, aggregate demand decreases, leading to a decline in living standards. Poverty increases, so economic theory suggests a positive correlation between inflation and poverty. Exchange rate. Economic theory suggests that exchange rates and poverty have a negative correlation, since changes in the exchange rate indirectly affect poverty.

Exchange Rate

The economic theory suggest that exchange rate and poverty have negative correlation because of variation in exchange rate indirectly effect poverty.

Data and its Source

For our thesis, data were collected from secondary sources such as the Pakistan Economic Survey (WDI), the Pakistan Economic Statistics Handbook, and GlobalEconomy.com. We used annual time series data and a multiple regression model.

Econometric Model

In this study, we will use multiple regression methods to explore the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. Using the OLS method, we will estimate the coefficient of the independent variable.

$$POV = f(GE, BD, UNE, INFR, ExR) \quad (1)$$

Now the econometrics model are below:

$$POV=\beta_0 + \beta_1 BD + \beta_3 UNER + \beta_4 INFR + \beta_5 ExR+E \quad (2)$$

In this study, we will use multiple regression methods to explore the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. Using the OLS method, we will estimate the coefficient of the independent variable.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This article investigates the relationship between variables and their impact on poverty in Pakistan. We explore the determinants: government spending, measured as a percentage of GDP; the budget deficit, calculated in millions of rupees; the inflation rate; the exchange rate; and the unemployment rate. In this study, we determined whether there is a positive or negative relationship with poverty. If the relationship is positive, we determined whether it is statistically significant. Therefore, we accepted the null hypothesis and rejected the alternative hypothesis based on the econometric model.

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics help to give us the analysis of data signify or summarize, or represent data using brief set of statistics that indicate a meaningful measure of central tendency, such as the mean, median, standard deviation, minimum and maximum values, kurtosis, and skewness. Descriptive statistics are essential because, if we simply presented time series data, it would be difficult to visualize the data displayed. They allow us to represent data more meaningfully, making it easier to interpret. The descriptive statistics table is shown below (Table 1).

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics Sample: 1995-2013

	POV	GE	BD	UNER	INFR	EXR
Mean	32.39515	14.25637	1603.730	5.973111	8.421469	62.78262
Median	30.70000	13.28000	1461.872	5.600000	7.600000	59.71270
Maximum	62.70000	25.35000	9366.723	7.700000	20.20000	96.71610
Minimum	17.10000	8.280000	-3381.414	4.800000	2.800000	31.63160
Std. Dev.	12.16411	4.766578	2785.156	1.073275	4.417869	19.28559
Skewness	0.956355	0.811502	0.640782	0.531877	0.860307	0.341626
Kurtosis	3.478546	2.827706	4.201072	1.645870	3.525167	2.216314
Jarque-Bera	3.142665	2.642121	2.647776	2.371817	2.620017	0.844483
Probability	0.205517	0.254420	0.255640	0.302668	0.261158	0.641834
Sum	614.4100	262.9600	31261.24	113.6000	150.1000	1183.951
Sum Sq. Dev.	2612.208	418.2227	1.51E+07	21.15416	357.5722	6602.416
Observations	19	19	19	19	19	19

Table 2 shows the various statistics for the variables used in our regression analysis. It provides an overview of the data. Descriptive statistics include the mean, median, maximum, and minimum to determine the center and extremes of the data; standard deviation is provided as a measure of dispersion; and skewness is used to measure the distribution of values around the mean, both to the left and right.

Correlation Table

Correlation is a statistical technique/method that shows whether pairs of variables are correlated and to what degree, or represents a standardized measure, with a range from -1 to +1, of the strength of the association between two variables. Correlation can be perfectly positive or perfectly negative, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Correlation Results

	POV	GE	BD	UNER	INFR	EXR
POV	1.000000	-0.711284	-0.081373	0.123434	0.021548	-0.897388
GE	-0.711284	1.000000	0.274289	-0.538733	0.262250	0.902765
BD	-0.081373	0.284477	1.000000	-0.638895	0.716410	0.067704
UNER	0.123434	-0.537833	-0.638885	1.000000	-0.632770	-0.322121
INFR	0.021548	0.272150	0.715410	-0.631270	1.000000	0.118649
EXR	-0.897388	0.902675	0.067704	-0.312111	0.118649	1.000000

Table 2 presents the correlation coefficient between poverty and its determinants, which are independent variables. Holding all other variables constant, public spending shows a negative correlation with poverty, with a coefficient of -0.711284. The other variable, the budget deficit, also shows a negative correlation with poverty, as shown in the previous table, with a value of -0.081373. Unemployment, however, shows a positive correlation with poverty, with a coefficient of 0.123434. The exchange rate and the inflation rate show a positive correlation, so all the determinants, i.e., the independent variables, show their effect and their relationship with poverty in the correlation table above.

Regression Table

Regression analysis shows the dependence of one variable on others. There are two basic types of regression: linear regression and multiple regression. In this case, we use multiple regression, which refers to the relationship between more than two variables.

Table 3: Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	73.25371	12.22010	6.08735	0.0000
GE	1.606249	0.607305	2.631811	0.0204
BD	-0.001487	0.000416	-3.020013	0.0096
UNER	-1.077046	1.501425	-0.714518	0.4714
INFR	0.632032	0.328627	1.945083	0.0613
EXR	-0.945323	0.136331	-6.947579	0.0000
R-squared	0.927871	Adjusted R-squared		0.876720
F-statistic	29.38211	Durbin-Watson stat		2.012521
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000001			

Dependent Variable: poverty index. Method: Least squares. Observations included: 19.

Applying the ordinary least squares (OLS) method, the regression model results show the connection between several independent variables and the dependent variable, namely poverty. In the previous table, the coefficient for public spending (GE) shows a negative relationship with poverty, with a p-value of 0.0204, indicating a significant effect. The relationship between poverty and budget deficit is also negative, with a p-value of 0.0096, indicating a significant effect on the coefficient. Therefore, we found that as spending increases, public spending and the budget deficit decrease poverty. The relationship between unemployment and poverty is positive, but its effect on the coefficient is negligible, with a p-value of 0.4714. This is above the 5% significance level, so its effect on the coefficient is negligible, but its relationship is positive, meaning that increasing unemployment increases poverty. On the other hand, the exchange rate and poverty have a negative relationship, since an increase in the exchange rate due to currency depreciation causes poverty, with a negative relationship and a significant effect. Its p-value is 0.0000, lower than the significance level of the coefficient, as shown in the table above, while inflation and poverty show a positive relationship with a p-value of 0.0613.

This level is below the significance level, so its effect on the coefficient and the positive relationship due to the increase in inflation caused by poverty is significant. In this case, $R^2 = 0.92$ means that 92% of the variation is due to the explanatory variable and the remaining 9% to the error term. According to the F-statistic, the overall model is significant. Its F-statistic value is greater than 2.

In this case, the F-statistic is 29.38 and the p-value is 0.000001, meaning the model is significant. In this case, the Durbin-Watson value is 2.01, meaning there is no autocorrelation. When the value is exactly 2, it means there is no autocorrelation, while when it is less than 2, it means the autocorrelation is negative. With this result, we find that all the determinants are related to poverty, so we reject the null hypothesis H0 and accept the alternative hypothesis H1, since all the relationships satisfy the alternative hypothesis H1.

Figure 1 shows the relationship between the dependent and independent variables the dependent variable is poverty, measured by the population index, and the independent variable is government spending, measured as a percentage of GDP (GE). The budget deficit is measured in Million Pakistani Kroner (BD), as are the unemployment rate (UNER), the inflation rate (INFR), and the exchange rate (ExR). All five variables were used in this thesis. Three of them have a negative relationship with poverty, while the other two have a positive relationship. Government spending, the budget deficit, and the exchange rate have a negative relationship.

There is a significant relationship between unemployment, inflation, and poverty. Therefore, when the government adopts a fiscal policy and increases public spending, whether through subsidies or development investments such as roads, schools, and hospitals, employment increases in the economy, resulting in a reduction in poverty. A budget deficit occurs when public spending exceeds public revenue. To address this problem, the government draws on external and internal sources to cover its expenses. If the budget deficit is due to productive activities such as social assistance and subsidies, poverty is reduced. Therefore, all the independent variables used in the regression model were found to have a strong impact on poverty.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Through this research, we uncovered the determinants of poverty in Pakistan. Poverty is currently a serious problem in all countries. The primary objective of the study was to identify the factors that determine poverty in Pakistan and study their impact, whether positive or negative, by observing the outcomes. We then analyzed the process of developing appropriate policies related to the determinants of poverty.

The data were collected from secondary sources, such as the World Development Indicator (WDI) and TheGlobalEconomy.com. The OLS estimation methodology was used. This study used five variables—government spending, budget deficit, unemployment rate, exchange rate, and inflation—that determine poverty, and explored the relationship between macroeconomic variables and poverty. A relationship between poverty and government spending was found for all five variables: the budget deficit has a negative or inverse relationship with poverty, while unemployment has a positive relationship with poverty. This is because fiscal policies have a direct effect on government spending.

When government spending increases through subsidies and investments in the development of schools, roads, and hospitals, employment increases, and incomes and spending rise as a result of poverty reduction. In other words, if government spending increases more than government revenue in a given year, a fiscal deficit occurs. Budget deficits and poverty have a significant negative relationship in Pakistan. This means that government involvement in development projects or subsidies leads to a reduction in unemployment. This, in turn, leads to poverty reduction thanks to subsidized goods prices, thus lowering poverty levels. Inflation and poverty also have a positive relationship. If the budget deficit is due to productive spending, such as social welfare, then it reduces poverty; otherwise, unproductive spending, such as defense spending, cannot contribute to poverty reduction.

The exchange rate and poverty have a negative relationship that significantly affects the model's coefficient. The depreciation of one currency against another can be beneficial for foreign currency earners, but for the economy as a whole, its effect is an increase in inflation. When inflation occurs due to currency devaluation, companies purchase expensive inputs from other countries, thus increasing the prices of goods and worsening poverty. The exchange rate is considered a variable that influences poverty, while inflation is another factor that increases it. When the general price level increases, purchasing power or consumption decreases, leading to a decrease in aggregate demand and thus in the standard of living.

As a result, poverty increases, which is always positively correlated with poverty. The government must implement sound policies to reduce poverty and undertake productive activities that can help eliminate it. The government must improve the agricultural sector and productivity due to the large population.

The country is largely rural, and its income comes from agriculture. The government should promote transparency, provide better healthcare services, and offer social assistance to low-income people, as well as tax the rich and help the poor. The government should also provide job opportunities, introduce microfinance in rural areas, offer free education, and provide assistance to low-income people.

Indeed, there are numerous issues that contribute to poverty, but we used time-series data, took five variables, and ran multiple regression models that showed a 90% variance in poverty in Pakistan. Therefore, in the model, unemployment is negligible and has no effect on poverty, but with other variables, it has a significant effect.

REFERENCES

- Anwar. T, Ali. S and Qureshi. S.K. (2002),” trend in absolute poverty in Pakistan: 1990-91 and 2001. The Pakistan development review. 41:4 part II (winter 2002) pp, 859-878.
- Azam, M. (2011). Causes and measurement of poverty reduction in Pakistan. Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business. 2 (11): 76-83.
- Azam, M., Haseeb, M., & Samsudin, S. (2016). The impact of foreign remittances on poverty alleviation: global evidence. *Economics and Sociology*, 9(1): 264-281.
- Batool. S. Mainkahil. (2013).” Causes and Consequences in Pakistan. Journal managerial of economics. Qurtaba university of pakistan. Vol 2. Number 1.
- Cheema. A.R. (2014).” Poverty and its determinants in Pakistan: Evidence from Pslm 2010-11. Journal of poverty and development. Vol.5 2014 Dercon, (2001); economic reform, the poor and growth: evidence from rural
- Chudhry. I. Sharif. (2009).” Poverty Alleviation in Southern Punjab (Pakistan): An Empirical Evidence From the project Area of Asian Development Bank. international research journal of Finance and Economics –Issue 23 (2009)
- Ethiopia,....series paper 2001-08african economies, oxford.
- Haseeb, M., N.H. Hartani, N.A.A. Bakar, Azam M. & S. Hassan, (2014). Exports, foreign direct investment and economic growth: Empirical evidence from Malaysia (1971-2013). American Journal of Applied Sciences, 11: 1010-1015.
- Irfan. M. (2011). “Remittances and poverty linkages in Pakistan: evidence and some suggestion for further analysis. Pakistan institute development economics. Vol. 5, NO.1 pp, 34.
- Javid et. al. (2012) the determinants of poverty and effects of inflation in Pakistan;…pslm 2010-11 journal of poverty and development. Vol, 5, 2014.
- Krishnan and Dercon (1996); income portfolio in rural Tanzania and Ethiopia:Journal Of development studies (6) 32: 850-875.
- M Danish (2001): determinants of poverty in Pakistan;the Pakistan development review,
- Mahmood and Chaudrey (2012); the effect of FDI on poverty; ……the project area of Asian development bank. International journal of finance and economics- issue23 (2009)
- Majeed. M.T. and Malik. M.N. (2014).” Determinants of household poverty: empirical evidence from Pakistan. Quaid-i-Azam university, Islamabad, Pakistan
- Muhammad, A., & Khan A.Q., (2017). Growth-Corruption-Health Triaca and environmental degradation: Empirical evidence from Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research,* 24 (2017), 16407–16417.
- Pervez. S. and Rizvi. S.B. Hussain. (2014).” An empirical analysis on determinants of poverty: A co-Integration Analysis. J. Glob. & Sci. Issues, Vol, Vol 2, Issues 1, (March 2104).
- Pervez. S. and Rizvi. S.B.H. (2014),” Determinants of poverty in case of Pakistan”. International research journal. Vo. 5(6) pp. 192-201, July, 2014.
- Shoaib. M. Danis. (2013)” Determinants of poverty in Pakistan. University of Gujrat Chakwal and Department of Economics.
- Sikender and Rizvi (2013); the effect of agriculture growth trade directness and employment poverty reduction:….. J

Globe. & Sci. Issues, 1, (March 2014).

- Usman, Mubasher." Socio-Economic Determinants of Poverty. A Case of Pakistan. Development and International Relations, Aalborg University, Denmark pp. 7-8.univirsity of Gujrat. Economics department.
- Yousaf. H. and Ali. I. (2014). "The determinants of poverty in Pakistan. International journal of economics and empirical research. 2(5), 191- 202.