HER Vol. 28 No. 2, December 2021, pp. 69-83

Poverty Change and Mobility in Urban and Rural Areas of Geopolitical Zones in Nigeria: A Decomposition Analysis

Idika, E.O.[1]; Nwosu, E. O.[2]; Nji, I. A.[1]& Ejimonye, J. C.[1]
[1]Department of Social Science Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka
[2]Department of Economics, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Abstract

This paper analyzed the poverty change and mobility, then decomposition of dynamics in urban and rural areas as well as by other household characteristics. The study applied decomposition techniques proposed by Ravallion and Lokshin (2006), which involves growth, poverty, inequality decomposition, and sectoral decomposition of poverty on General Household Panel Survey collected between 2010 and 2013.The study was carried out using the six Geopolitical zones in Nigeria. The population for the study is in three waves for the three years 162.8, 167.2, 171.8 million respectively. The sample strategy used for data collection is a stratified two-stage probability sample which was designed to be representative at the geopolitical zones (both in urban and rural) level while being nationally representative as well. The results show that poverty increased over the period under review as the change in the headcount index was positive with growth and inequality contributed to this increase overall. When these decompositions were done in the six geopolitical zones in Nigeria, we found reductions in headcount poverty in the North Central and South West mostly accounted for by the growth and distribution components. Sectoral decomposition of poverty also shows increase in the overall headcount index over the two periods for which data were collected and total intra-sect-oral effect, population shift effect, and interaction effect all contribute to the observed change in poverty. The policy implication of these findings is that government should intensify policies efforts towards poverty reduction and these policies must ensure that inequality is reduced and growth will be more inclusive.

Keywords: Poverty, Change, Mobility, Urban, Rural, Decomposition, Predict

Introduction

Poverty has continued to be one of the leading global development challenges for the past three decades after the Millennium Declaration. Before the declaration, it was discovered that large number of households were living on less than $1 a day and this prompted the United Nations and allied institutions to come up with

measures to mitigate the rate of poverty and vulnerability worldwide. The Concept led to the failure to achieve certain minimum standards of life. The United Nations (1995) defined Poverty as a condition that portrays some attributes that are necessary for human living such as access to food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter and education. This indicates mere lack of basic needs that makes a living.Maxwell (1999) described poverty in terms of income or consumption poverty, human under development, social exclusion, ill-being, lack of basic needs and relative deprivation. Poverty is characterized by lack of participation in decision making, in civil, social and cultural life (UN, 1995). Poverty can be viewed as a severe and impairing condition that is caused by many different risk factors working together to affect the mind, body and soul. Thus, poverty can be defined as limitation to accessible basic standard of living which includes food, shelter, health and water which is not constant but changes.

Poverty alleviation programmes have become popular in the developing world and yet not much progress has been made in this regard. Poverty tends to increase over time.Poverty mobility is the movement within the poverty line. The proportion of people moving into poverty year after year is far greater than the proportion that escapes poverty. In countries where households managed to move out of poverty, still remain highly vulnerable to it.

Poverty has an underlining attribute between the rural and urban areas (Titin, 2016). Pateman (2011) identified three characteristics features of urban and rural areas which are population size, population concentration and remoteness. These measure the relationship to each other. This study tends to consider changes in poverty in urban and rural areas considering these characteristics. Literature shows that poverty change focus on the shift in structure of poverty as a result of inequalities (Hills, 1985) and growth components on poverty population (Datt and Ravallion 1992; Kakwani 2000). Poverty change is viewed as that effect on redistribution and growth components on the impact of total population. This study seeks to explore the decomposition effect of poverty, poverty change and mobility in the total population.

Given concern over persistence of poverty changes in length of time spent below the poverty line can be viewed as an important measure of changes in the extent of poverty. Mobility on the other hand reflects on the movement in family's ranking towards becoming wealthier in society though the ranks change continuously (Ellewood, Bogle, Acs, Mikelson, and Popkin, 2016). At a particular period, people tend to escape poverty during periods of aggregate rise in poverty rate and then transit into poverty during periods of aggregate decline in the poverty rate (Dapel, 2018). Thus, in poverty mobility interest to identify the proportion of the entire population

that transits in and out of poverty and those that stay in poverty and out of poverty is of almost importance. According to Bane and Ellwood (1986) poverty mobility describes the experiences of people who ever slipped into poverty and of people who currently are poor. Bane and Ellwood identified that although many people have very short spells of poverty few are with very long spells account for the bulk of all poverty and represent the majority of the poor at any given time.

In a study, carried out by Dapel (2018) on three decades of poverty mobility in Nigeria on trapped, the freed and the never trapped found out that both transient and chronic poverty was higher in 1996 to 2010 than in 1980 to 1992. This means that poverty increased from year to year beginning from 1996 few escaped poverty. Sa'idu and Roslan(2010) conducted a study on poverty reduction in Nigeria 20 years using Pooled, Fixed effects, random effects and weighted least square models and found out that a unit increase in per capita gross Domestic Product (GDP) will lead to a 0.6% increase in poverty. Rufai, Ogunniyi, Salman, Oyeyemi, and Salawu (2019) conducted a study on migration, labour mobility and household poverty in Nigeria, the study shows that more male migrants travelled for greener pastures (employment reasons) while marriage arrangements made more flames travel.

In Nigeria, however, very little is known about poverty change and poverty mobility after many years of research on poverty and income distribution, partly because of lack of panel data. Recent waves of panel household surveys have however, made it possible for this kind of analysis to be carried in Nigeria. This paper therefore contributes to knowledge by looking at the dynamics of poverty within the framework of growth and inequality decomposition proposed by Gaurav, Datt and Ravallion (1996).

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study was to investigate issues in growth and inequality decomposition of poverty change within households at the national, geopolitical zones and urban-rural levels of Nigeria. Specifically, the study:

1. analyzed the poverty distribution in Nigeria across the Geopolitical Zones
2. analyzed the distribution of poverty in Nigeria's Geopolitical zones by gender
3. predicted the probability of falling into poverty in Urban and Rural areas as moderated by gender.
4. predicted growth and poverty decompositions in Nigeria's Geopolitical Zones.

Methodology

Design of the study: The designs adopted for this analysis is growth and inequality decomposition proposed by Lokshin and Ravallion (2006). According to this approach, the change in poverty between two years could be decomposed into three components.

The growth component is the difference between the two poverty indices keeping the distribution constant. The redistribution component is the change in poverty if the mean of the two distributions is kept constant. The interaction component (residual) shows the change in poverty due to interaction of growth and inequality. This decomposition technique was earlier applied by Gaurav Datt and Martin Ravallion (1992) on a study relating to growth and redistribution components of Changes in Poverty to Brazil and China in the 1980s.

Area of the study: The study was carried out using the six Geopolitical zones in Nigeria. The choice of this area is Nigeria is said to be the biggest economy and the giant of Africa but yet a large number of the population lives below an average life as shown by the World Bank's standard for an average life.

Population of the Study: The population for the study is inthree waves for the three different years used for the study 162.8, 167.2, 171.8 million respectively. This constitutes the population of Nigeria for the years 2011, 2012, and 2013 respectively.

***Sample for the study*:** The sample strategy used for data collection is a stratified two-stage probability sample which was designed to be representative at the geopolitical zones (both in urban and rural) level while being nationally representative as well. In the first stage, the enumeration areas (EAs) were the primary sampling units (PSUs). In all 500 EAs were finally selected using this method. The selection was based on probability proportional to size (PPS) of the total EAs in each state and FCT and also based on the total households listed in those EAs. The second stage involves the selection of the households using the systematic selection method in which 10 households were randomly selected from each EA. This resulted in the sample of 5,000 households the panel component of the data. A population weight variable (wght) was calculated and included in both the household and the panel datasets. When applied, the weight will raise the sampled households and individuals to national values by making adjustments for population concentrations in various areas (NBS, 2013).

Source of Data: The dataset used for this study was extracted from the Nigeria General Household (GHS) panel survey waves one and two collected by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) Nigeria and was funded by development partners particularly the World Bank. According to the NBS report in 2013, this is a survey covering 22,000 households nationwide that is carried out annually in the country. The panel component of the called GHS-Panel is carried out very two years and applies to 5,000 households of the GHS. The panel component of the survey is based largely on the Harmonized National Living Standards Survey (HNLSS) and the National Agricultural Sample Survey (NASS). The first wave was carried out in two

visits to the panel households (which comprises post-planting visit between August and October 2010 and post-harvest visit between February and April 2011). Similarly, the second wave also comprises two visits again to the panel households accordingly in 2012 and 2013. It is important to stress that the GHS survey covered all the 36 states of the federation including the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja.

***Data collection methods*:** The data collection was largely carried out in the rural areas data were also collected from the urban enumeration areas (EAs). Also, it is important to point out that the household questionnaire which was administered to all households was designed to collect information on household demographic characteristics; education; health; labour and time use; household expenditure; household nonfarm income-generating activities; food security and exposure to shocks; safety nets; housing conditions; assets; information and communication technology; and other sources of household income. Household location is geo-referenced with latitude and longitude which can also be used to produce thematic maps. This dataset is suitable for analyzing poverty dynamics.

Data analysis techniques: The study adopted decomposition analysis using Lokshin and Ravallion (2006) approach and Kakwani (2000), in which poverty change is decomposed into its contributing parts namely the growth component and inequality component over two periods. Further analysis was done by decomposing poverty change by sectors to ascertain inter-sectoral shift effect, population shift effect and interaction effect while probability of falling into poverty was calculate from random probity estimation. Descriptive analyses were used to calculate the distribution of poverty by geopolitical zones and by rural and urban areas.

Results

The decomposition of head count poverty index using FGT approach is reported in Tables 1, 2, and 3. Tables 1 and 2 depict decomposition of head count poverty index by urban and rural areas, Table 3 shows the probability of falling into poverty in a four-way table involving urban and rural, gender of the head, and year.

Table 1: Distribution of Poverty in Nigeria's Geopolitical Zones by Sector and Year

ZONE	Sector and Year			
	Urban		Rural	
	2010-2011	2012-2013	2010-2011	2012-2013
North Central	0.528	0.414	0.819	0.792
North East	0.356	0.463	0.770	0.815
North West	0.545	0.725	0.863	0.918
South East	0.272	0.346	0.639	0.705
South South	0.435	0.459	0.636	0.625
South West	0.424	0.316	0.726	0.572

***Source**: Authors'' computations with data from the NBS 2010-2013*

Table 1 shows the distribution of poverty by geopolitical zones and years. It can be observed that in 2010 -2011 poverty was highest in the North Central and lowest in South East. In the year 2012-2013 Poverty was highest in the North West and lowest in the South west while in 2010-2011 poverty was highest in North West and lowest in South South whereas in 2012-2013 poverty was highest in same North West and lowest in South South.

Table 2: Distribution of Poverty in Nigeria's Geopolitical Zones by Gender of the Household Head and Year

ZONE	Sex and Year			
	Male		Female	
	2010-2011	2012-2013	2010-2011	2012-2013
North Central	0.751	0.713	0.644	0.534
North East	0.706	0.768	0.522	0.444
North West	0.807	0.891	0.636	0.556
South East	0.551	0.629	0.527	0.581
South South	0.576	0.583	0.576	0.560
South West	0.494	0.389	0.565	0.406

Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) Nigeria, 2013

Table 2 shows the distribution of poverty by gender of the household head. First it can be observed that in the North Central poverty rate in male-headed households were respectively 75.1 and 71.3 percent in wave 1 and wave 2 of the panel survey, while the corresponding figures for female-headed households were 64.4 and 53.4 percent for the two waves respectively. In the South West, poverty rate in male-headed households were

respectively 49.4 and 38.9 percent in wave 1 and wave 2 of the panel survey, while the corresponding figures for female-headed households were 56.5 and 40.6 percent for the two waves respectively. Both sexes experienced poverty decline in their households over the two periods in North Central and South West. The reverse is the case in the other four geopolitical zones as was also reported in urban and rural areas situation.

Table 3: Predicted Probabilities of Falling into Poverty in Urban and Rural Areas of Nigeria by Gender and Year from Random Probity Estimation

SECTOR and ZONE	Sex and Year			
	Male		Female	
	2010-2011	2012-2013	2010-2011	2012-2013
Urban				
North Central	0.5301	0.4354	0.5268	0.4988
North East	0.3722	0.3101	0.3669	0.1648
North West	0.7367	0.7347	0.8348	0.7631
South East	0.2447	0.2142	0.2912	0.2197
South South	0.2992	0.2550	0.3383	0.2623
South West	0.2758	0.2360	0.3176	0.2074
Rural				
North Central	0.9101	0.8846	0.8883	0.8605
North East	0.8334	0.8267	0.8146	0.7184
North West	0.9693	0.9746	0.9701	0.9788
South East	0.7581	0.7386	0.7477	0.6932
South South	0.7740	0.7379	0.7592	0.7219
South West	0.7696	0.7592	0.8097	0.7236

Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) Nigeria, 2013

Table 3 shows that the probability of falling into poverty is very high in rural areas compared to the urban areas and this is not surprising giving that rural households are more vulnerable to poverty relative to the urban households. For most of the urban households, the probability of falling into poverty is less than 0.5 regardless of whether it is male or female headed household. On the other hand, for all the rural households, the probability of falling back into poverty is above 0.5 and on average 0.72 and this is true in households that are male-headed or female-headed. These are true for the waves of panel surveys.

Table 4: Growth and Poverty Decompositions in Nigeria's Geopolitical Zones

Growth and Inequality Poverty Decomposition: All Zones			
	2010-2011	2012-2013	Average effect
Poverty rate (P0)	64.806	66.122	
Change in P0	1.316	1.316	1.316
Growth component	1.065	0.662	0.864
Redistribution component	0.654	0.251	0.452
Interaction component	-0.403	-0.403	0
Growth and Inequality Poverty Decomposition: North Central			
Poverty rate (P0)	73.946	69.261	
Change in P0	-4.686	-4.686	-4.686
Growth component	-0.766	-0.778	-0.772
Redistribution component	-3.907	-3.919	-3.913
Interaction component	-0.012	-0.012	0
Growth and Inequality Poverty Decomposition: North East			
Poverty rate (P0)	70.028	75.616	
Change in P0	5.588	5.588	5.588
Growth component	4.972	3.973	4.472
Redistribution component	1.615	0.616	1.116
Interaction component	-0.999	-0.999	0
Growth and Inequality Poverty Decomposition: North West			
Poverty rate (P0)	80.271	88.386	
Change in P0	8.115	8.115	8.115
Growth component	3.495	4.994	4.245
Redistribution component	3.121	4.62	3.87
Interaction component	1.499	1.499	0
Growth and Inequality Poverty Decomposition: South East			
Poverty rate (P0)	54.381	61.26	
Change in P0	6.879	6.879	6.879
Growth component	4.897	5.63	5.263
Redistribution component	1.249	1.982	1.615
Interaction component	0.733	0.733	0
Growth and Inequality Poverty Decomposition: South South			
Poverty rate (P0)	57.584	57.756	
Change in P0	0.172	0.172	0.172
Growth component	-0.268	-0.277	-0.273
Redistribution component	0.449	0.441	0.445

Table 4Contuned			
Interaction component	-0.009	-0.009	0
Growth and Inequality Poverty Decomposition: South West			
Poverty rate (P0)	50.939	39.23	
Change in P0	-11.709	-11.709	-11.709
Growth component	-9.637	-9.843	-9.74
Redistribution component	-1.866	-2.072	-1.969
Interaction component	-0.206	-0.206	0

Table 4 shows the results for growth inequality decomposition using Ravallion and Lokshin (2006) approach in the six geopolitical zones and for the aggregate of all the zones or the national data. As the table shows, the national poverty measured by the headcount poverty index was 64.8 percent in 2010-2011 period and this increased to 66.12 percent in the 2012-2013 period. The average change in the headcount index was 1.316 percent. The growth component contributed 0.864 while the redistribution or inequality component contributed 0.452 and the interaction effect was 0. This implies that economic growth was not pro-poor over this period and hence left the poor on the sideline, while high inequality contributed to higher poverty over this wave of panel household survey in the country. This however, does not tell the entire story of what happened across the six geopolitical zones.

A close look at the table shows that poverty declined in the North Central geopolitical zone from 73.946 percent to 66.122 percent, that is, a decrease of 4.686 percentage points. Of this decrease, growth component on average contributed 0.772 of the decrease, while the inequality or redistribution component on average contributed about 3.913 of the decrease and thus dominated the growth effect. This suggests that the decrease in poverty that we saw in the North central over the two panel surveys was largely due to decrease in inequality or due to more equitable redistribution of income. Another zone that saw a decrease in head count poverty index over the period is the South West where poverty decreased from 50.94 to 39.23 so that the total decline was 11.709 percentage points. The difference between the South West and North Central is that the reduction in poverty in the South West was largely driven by the growth component than by the redistribution component. This suggests that growth was poor and dominant while there was a redistribution of income to the benefit of the poor as well.

The North East, North West and South East all saw an increase in the headcount index over the period and the positive contributions of growth and redistribution components suggests that growth was not pro-poor and income redistribution affected the poor adversely. In all these zones, the

growth component dominated the inequality component which implies that growth was not sufficient to carry the poor along but instead was hurting the poor. This may be case if growth was occurring in sectors where the poor were not part of. For example, growth happening in the oil sector, and the like might not benefit the poor more than the growth happening in the agricultural sector. The South-South presents a unique case in which there was marginal increase in head count poverty index from 57.584 to 57.756, that is, an increase of just 0.172. In this zone, while the growth component was benefitting the poor, the dominant redistribution component was hurting the poor. This means high income inequality in the South-South geopolitical zone is the major driver of poverty and not income growth.

Table 5: Sectoral Decomposition of Change in Poverty: Sector and Zones

Sectoral Decomposition of a Change in Poverty:		**Headcount**	
Poverty in period 1	HeadCount	64.8061	
Poverty in period 2	HeadCount	66.1223	
Sector	Population share in period 1	Absolute change	Percentage change
North Central	16.68	-0.7816	-59.39
North East	15	0.8381	63.68
North West	18.9	1.5335	116.51
South East	16.53	1.1372	86.4
South South	15.87	0.0274	2.08
South West	17.02	-1.9931	-151.43
Total Intra-sectoral effect		0.7614	57.85
Population-shift effect		0.3226	24.51
Interaction effect		0.2321	17.64
Change in poverty (HC)		1.3161	100
URBAN	31.89	-0.4102	-31.16
RURAL	68.11	1.1427	86.83
Total Intra-sectoral effect		0.7326	55.66
Population-shift effect		0.5345	40.61
Interaction effect		0.0491	3.73
Change in poverty (HC)		1.3161	100

Table 5 presents the decomposition results from the perspective of sectoral decomposition of change in poverty looking at the rural and urban sectors and in the six zones. the poverty rates for period 1 and period 2 are reported

in the first two rows and they are the same as what we reported in table 4 for national poverty. The sector decomposition shows the population share in period 1, the absolute change and percentage change in the headcount poverty index in the geopolitical zones and in urban-rural setting. In each of the decomposition either by geopolitical zones or by urban and rural the total change in headcount index (HC) was decomposed into intra-sect-oral effect, population-shift effect, and the interaction effect. The population shift effect shows how changes in the distribution of poverty across sectors contributed to the change in overall poverty. The decomposition by zone shows that the total change in the headcount poverty was 1.3161. Total intra-sect-oral effect contributed 0.7614, the population shift effect contributed 0.3226, while the interaction effect contributed 0.2321. On the other hand, decomposition by urban and rural arrears shows that Total intra-sect-oral effect contributed 0.7326, the population shift effect contributed 0.5345, while the interaction effect contributed 0.0491. This means that for decomposition by zones, total intra-sect-oral effect contributed 57.85%, the population shift effect contributed 24.51%, while the interaction effect contributed 17.64%. For rural-urban decomposition, total intra-sect-oral effect contributed 55.66%, the population shift effect contributed 40.61%, while the interaction effect contributed 3.73%. Thus, differences across sectors (geopolitical zones and urban-rural compositions) contributed more to national poverty than changes in population. But in rural-urban decomposition the effect of population change on poverty is higher than that of decomposition by geopolitical zones. This suggests that changes in population especially in the rural areas are causing poverty to increase, but differences in economic opportunities across geopolitical zones or between urban and rural areas contribute more to poverty increase than population changes.

Discussions

Table 1 shows distribution of poverty in urban and rural areas in wave 1 and wave 2 of the panel using inflation adjusted 2010 poverty line for Nigeria. It can be seen from the table that poverty is predominantly in rural and much more pronounced in the North geopolitical zones. The finding is in line with the findings of Dapel (2018) that chronic poverty is not as common in oil producing states and more prevalent in the northeast region of the nation. For example, while about 81.9 percent of the rural households in North Central were in poverty in 2010-2011 periods, this decreased marginally to 79.2 percent in 2012-2013 periods when the second wave of the survey was carried out. Probably, the reason for high poverty rate in the Northern part of Nigeria could be as a result poor human capital development. Omoniyi (2018) explained that the reasons for high rate of poverty in the north region was as a

result of these factors high level of illiteracy, attitude to economic prosperity, child distinction, income inequality, ethnic clashes and economic road map. Similarly, the corresponding urban households for the North Central experienced a decline in poverty from 52.8 percent to 41.4 percent. According to Dapel, the reason for people to remain in chronic poverty is because they get trapped and transiency to poverty which becomes difficult to get out of poverty. The South West geopolitical zones also experienced decline in poverty over the two waves of the panel, where poverty in the rural areas declined from 72.6 percent to 57.2 percent and for the urban households, it declined from 42.4 percent to 31.6 percent. Though, according to findings of Dapel (2018) was contrary, explained that transient which may be a hidden factor to high poverty in the South west despite their oil. For the North East, this may be attributed to displacement of rural agricultural households by continuous terrorist attacks and farmers-herdsmen clashes in the zone and for the south may be dependent on oil wealth as an asset rather than sorting for other means of living. This findings in a way agrees with Olaniyi and Ikechukwu (2019) that poverty is a significant cause of herdsmen attacks in Nigeria.This may also shows that 74 percent of those never trapped in poverty have more than high school education.Another interesting revelation in the finding is that over the two waves of data and across male and female headed households in urban and rural areas, the probability of falling into poverty declined significantly in the urban areas but marginally in the rural areas. This finding is in line with that of Rufai, Ogunniyi, Salman, Oyeyemi and Salowu (2019) that more male migrant travelled for employment reasons while marriage arrangements made more flames travel, probably that have increased population in the urban area having more than half of the migrants and morehouseholds seekers of jobs where doesn't exist poverty rises. Additionally, the findings with the assertion of Zuhumnan (2018), that chronic poverty tend to be higher for households living in rural areas than those in urban areas. The study shows that labour mobility increases the amount of remittances sent to households and that of labour mobility reduces the extent of poverty. This findings is in line with Rufai, Ogunniyi, Salman, Oyeyemi and Salawu(2019), who opined that variations in labour movements across such that movements influences the amount of remittance sent and reduce poverty levels among households. Therefore, diversification of economic activities and household's consumption expenditure in engaged different activities form different income earning to move away from poverty.

Conclusion

This study has investigated poverty dynamics in Nigeria within the framework of growth-equity

decomposition in Nigeria's geopolitical zones and in urban and rural sector. The decomposition was also calculated at the national level. We found that looking at aggregate decomposition masks differences in that exist across the zones with respect to the contributions of growth and inequality components in poverty change over time. We found that for average change in national poverty, the contributions of the growth component and the inequality component were positive suggesting that both contributed to increase in headcount poverty observed over the period under investigation. Decomposition by geopolitical zones shows that the North Central and the South West are where the growth component and inequality component contributed to poverty reduction, whereas in the remaining geopolitical zones both components were the drivers of higher poverty except in the South-South where the growth component or change in the mean income of the households contributed to poverty reduction although this was over shadowed by high inequality in the zone.

The sectoral decomposition shows that differences in economic opportunities contributed more to poverty differences across the geopolitical zones and between urban and rural sectors over time. However, the population shift effect was found to contribute more to urban-rural poverty change than it contributed to poverty change across the geopolitical zones.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

- This finding should draw the attention of policy makers to the zones where growth is poor and where income inequality is high. In these zones, inclusive growth strategies should be put in place in order to ensure that the poor benefits from economic growth such as entrepreneurial initiatives.
- Also, the gap between the rich and the poor should be narrowed with specific policies such as progressive taxation and revenue generated should be invested in infrastructure other areas that could help the poor and the vulnerable households.
- Finally, there is the need to check population growth in Nigeria which has been exploding over the past two decades. This can be done by implementing birth control measures and by counseling poor households on the need to have the number of children they can maintain. This will help to minimize rising cases of child neglect in the society.

References

Bane,M.J.& Ellwood, D.T.(1986). Slipping into and out of Poverty: The Dynamics of Spells. *The Journal of Human Resources.*21 (1), 1-23

Blackorby C. & Donaldson, D. (1987).Welfare ratios and

distributional Sensitive Cost-benefit analysis. *Journal of Public Economics* 34(2), 265-290.

Dapel, Z. (2018). Three Decades of Poverty Mobility in Nigeria: The trapped. The freed, and the Never trapped. *Center for Global Development working paper 485 June 2018*.RetreievedfromResearchgate.*net/publications/326756601three_decades_of_poverty_mobility_in_nigeria_the_trapped_the_freed_the_never_trapped*

Datt, G&Ravallion M. (1992). Growth and redistribution Components of change in poverty measures: A decomposition with applications to Brazil and India in the 1980s. *Journal of Development Economics* 38(2), 275-295

Ellwood, D.T., Bogle, M.,Acs,C., Mikelson,K. Popkin,S. (2016).US Partnership on Mobility from Poverty. Retrieved from *2000906-creating-mobility-from-poverty-An-overview-of-strategies(1)pdf-AdobeReader*.

Foster, J.E., Greer,J.&Thorbecke E. (1984). Notes and comments A class of decomposable poverty measures. *Econometrical* .52 (3), 761-766

Gaurav Datt and Martin Ravallion (1992) "Growth and Redistribution Components of Changes in Poverty: A Decomposition with applications to Brazil and China in 1980s", *Journal of Development Economics* 38(1), 275-295

Gordon D. (2005).Indicators of Poverty and Hunger Expert Group Meeting on Youth Development indicators United Nations Headquarters, New York. Retrieved from *https://www.un.org>unyinpdf...*

Hills M.S.(1985). The changing Nature of Poverty. *Annals of America Academy of Political and Social Science Sage Publications.* Retrieved from *deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/66979/10.//77_0002716285479001 03pdf?sequence=2* Jensen, K. (2021). Teaching with poverty in mind.Retrieved from*http://www.ascd.org>chapter>un*

Kakwani, N. (2000). On measuring Growth and Inequality Components of Poverty with Application to Thailand. Retrieved from **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**.

Maxwell, S. (1999). The meaning and measurement of Poverty.*Odi poverty Briefings*.

Mishra, S.(2014). Decomposing Poverty Change: Deciphering Change in Total Population and Beyond. *Review of income and Wealth* 61(4), 21-27.

Omoniyi, B.B (2017). An examination of the causes of poverty on economic growth in Nigeria. Africans *Public Service Delivery and Performance Review (APSDR).* 6(1), 41-55

Olaniyi E and Ikechukwu, K(2019). The Impact of poverty, unemployment, inequality, corruption and poor governance on Niger DeltaMilitancy, Boko Haram Terrorism and Fulani herdsmen attacks in Nigeria. *International journal of management Economics and social sciences*(IJMESS) 8(2), 58-80

Pateman,T. (2011). Rural and Urban areas. Comparing lives using rural and urban classification Regional Trends 43,11-86.Retrieved from *://linkspringen.com/article/10.1057/rt.2011.2*

Ravallion M. & Chen S. (2017). Welfare-consistent global poverty measures. Retrieved from *https;//nber.org/papers/w23739.pdf*

Ravallion, M and Lokshin, M(2006). Testing Poverty Lines. Review of Income and wealth. 52(3), 399-421

Sen, A.(1985).A Sociological Approach to the measurement of poverty: A reply

to Professor Peter Townsend. *Oxford Economics Paper* 37(1)669-679

Skeat, W. (2005). *An etymological Dictionary of the English Language.* Dove publications

Stevens, A. H. (1994). The dynamics of Poverty Spells: Updating Bane and Ellewood. *The American Economic Review* 84 (2)34-37

Sa'idu, B. &Roslan, A. (2010). Had poverty reduced in Nigeria 20 years after? *European Journal of Social Sciences.* 15. 7-17.

Rufai, M. Ogunniyi, A. Salman, K. K. Oyeyemi, M. &Salawu, M. (2019). Migration, labour mobility and household poverty in Nigeria: a gender analysis. Economies 2019, 7, 101;doi:10.3390/economies7040101, retrieved from *www.mdpi.com/journal/economies*.

Townsend, P. (1979). Poverty in the United Kingdom. Retrieved from *google.com/search?works+on+Townsend+on+poverty&sxsrf=Alekkooe7.vjfSGJUUkqseN-tpv6f-H4WA.1596897422.*

Titin, S. (2016). 5 differences and5 similarities between rural and urban livelihood.Retrieved from*https:// brainly.in/question/940760*

United Nations (1995). Eradication of poverty. Department of Economic and Social Affairs Social inclusion. Retrieved from *un.org/development/desaldspd/world-summit-for-social-development-1995/wssd-1995-aggreements/pawssd-chapter*.

World Bank (2015). Distribution of global poor region and country 2015.Washington D.C Retrieved from *http://www.research.worldbank.org/poval. Net*

Zuhumnam, D (2018). Three Decades of poverty Mobility in Nigeria: The Trapped, the Freed, and the Never Trapped. Working paper 485. Center for Global Development; University of Dunde, Scotland and Woodrow Wilson International center for scholars.