




NATIONAL BUREAU OF STATISTICS

POVERTY PROFILE FOR NIGERIA



Federal Republic of Nigeria
2005

CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
LIST OF POVERTY MAPS.....	xi
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	xv
 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
GEOGRAPHY, GOVERNANCE AND POPULATION	1
Social Economic Performance	1
Poverty Policies and Programmes and National Economic Empowerment Development Strategy	5
 CHAPTER TWO: SURVEY METHODOLOGY	
Objectives of the Survey	9
Coverage and Scope	10
Survey Instruments	10
The Pilot Test	10
Sample Design and Implementation	10
Training	10
Data Collection for Main Survey	11
Supervision and Quality Control	11
Retrieval	12
Preparation for Data Entry and Data Analysis	12
 CHAPTER THREE: POVERTY INDICATORS	
Poverty Concepts.....	14
Objective Measure of Poverty (Food Energy In-take)	14
Dollar per Day (Absolute)	16
Subjective Measure of Poverty	17
Relative Measure of Poverty	19
Trends in Poverty (Relative Poverty Measure)	20
Other Poverty Indicators 2004	24
 CHAPTER FOUR: HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	
Human Development Dimensions of Poverty	31
Health	31
Education and Poverty	37
Housing and Quality of Life.....	39
Water Supplies and Sanitation.....	42
 CHAPTER FIVE: POVERTY AND AGRICULTURE	
Poverty and Agricultural Sector.....	44
Incidence and Profile of Poverty among Farmers.....	45
Farmland Ownership	48
Ownership of Farmland with Deed	48

Ownership of Livestock.....	49
Primary Crops Grown in last 12 Months Preceding Survey	50
Use of Agricultural Inputs	50
Processing of Reed Crops	50
Sources of Raw Materials	51
Sale of Agricultural Produce	51
 CHAPTER SIX: GENDER AND POVERTY	
Nature and Trends of Relative Poverty by Gender, Zone	53
Occupational Groups	55
Education	57
School Attendance	58
HIV/AIDS and Reproductive Health	58
Time Use	59
 CHAPTER SEVEN: EXPENDITURE AND ASSETS	
Expenditure	61
Terminology and Methodology	61
Assets	65
 CHAPTER EIGHT:	
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS ...	67
APPENDIX A: Statistical Tables	69
APPENDIX B: Poverty Measures and Inequality	88
APPENDIX C: Sample Design	91
APPENDIX D: Weighting Processes and Estimation	93
APPENDIX E: Price Deflators	94
APPENDIX F: Concepts and Definitions	97

PREFACE

The national initiatives at poverty tracking started in Nigeria in the early 1990s between the then Federal Office of Statistics [now National Bureau of Statistics] and the World Bank. At inception, the National Consumer Surveys dataset series for 1980-1996, which charted the profile of poverty in Nigeria, were analysed. This culminated in a Poverty Profile for Nigeria Report (1980-1996) which has since served as bench-mark for monitoring and evaluation of various Government anti-poverty programmes and policies. The Poverty Profile for Nigeria, 2004 is the latest follow-up to the previous one.

With the recognition by the Nigerian Government of the multi-sectoral and multi-dimensional nature of poverty, a number of coordinated programmes and policies had been formulated to combat poverty in all its ramifications. Among the programmes are National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP), the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These programmes require a framework for poverty statistics production, management and tracking.

The Nigeria Living Standard Survey institutionalised by the National Bureau of Statistics provided a major survey mechanism framework for regular production, management and tracking of poverty programmes and policies. The recent Profile of Poverty for Nigeria as elucidated in this report is a commendable effort in providing current, timely and credible poverty statistics and indicators for monitoring and evaluation of anti-poverty programmes and policies. The findings of the report cover the magnitude, nature, character and dimensions of poverty in Nigeria in 2004.

I give special thanks to the key stakeholders who contributed immensely to the success of the survey and the report. The stakeholders are the European Union, World Bank, Department for International Development and National Planning Commission.

I have to commend the efforts of the National Bureau of Statistics in the provision of survey mechanism, infrastructure and personnel that ensure effective statistical delivery of the survey and the report.

Osita Ogbu Ph.D

Economic Adviser to the President &
Chief Executive, National Planning Commission
2006

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is a follow-up of the Poverty Profile for Nigeria (1980 – 1996). One of the principal objectives of the Nigeria Living Standard Survey 2003/2004 is to produce a stand-alone Poverty Profile of Nigeria. The poverty profile report is aimed at providing poverty statistics and indicators for monitoring and evaluation of anti poverty programmes and policies.

The survey implementation involved a combination of key stakeholders and with an immense technical and funding support from the International Agencies. However, the efforts of the following individuals and agencies must be acknowledged and commended.

The Office of the Economic Adviser to the President oversaw the completion of the survey, with necessary support and encouragement.

The European Union provided funding support in addition to technical commitment through independent monitoring and evaluation outfit for monitoring and evaluation of the survey with the aim of improving the quality and quantity of data and scope of the survey. The World Bank gave both funding and technical support for the previous surveys and this exercise. Mr. John Ngwafon of the World Bank played a prominent role in project document development, questionnaire design, evaluation and data analysis.

The Department for International Development (DFID) provided technical and funding support in the pilot study programme, analysis and report writing. In addition, the DFID Consultant, Geoffrey Greenwell worked with the National Bureau of Statistics teams in the areas of processing, analysis and report writing.

The following agencies and organisations are also acknowledged for their contributions during conceptualization of the survey and questionnaire formulation: National Planning Commission, State Statistical Agencies, Federal Ministry of Finance, Federal Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Development, Federal Ministry of Education, Federal Ministry of Health, Federal Ministry of Labour & Productivity, Federal Ministry of Women Affairs, Nigeria Labour Congress and the Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association.

Personnel of the NBS who were actively involved in the planning and implementation of the survey were: J.O. Oladoye (Director, Corporate Planning & Technical Coordination); Mr. S.J. Mayaki (Director Census & Surveys), G. O. Adewoye (Director, Social & Economic Analysis), J. K. Balogun (Director, Field Services and Methodology), J. Nwokoroku (Deputy Director, Household Surveys), Mrs. A.N. Adewinmbi (Deputy Director, Computer Management & Information Services), Mrs. A.U. Nwosu (Chief Statistician, Social Statistics Division), E. O. Ekezie (Chief Statistician, Data Banking & Archiving Division), Mrs. S. M. Akinretoy (Assistant Chief Programmer Analyst, Computer Management & Information Services); Y. I. Afolabi (Principal Statistician, Household Surveys)

and R. F. Busari (Principal Programmer/Analyst Computer Management & Information Services).

Special thanks also go to the following individuals in the analytical and report writing team: Messrs. G. O. Adewoye, J. Nwokeroku, Mrs. A. N. Adewinmbi, Mrs. A. U. Nwosu, E. O. Ekezie, Mrs. S. M. Akinretoye, Y. I. Afolabi, R. F. Busari and the DFID Consultant, Geoffrey Greenwell who worked assiduously to make this report possible. Baba Madu, Mrs. F. B. Ajayi and Mrs. H. I. Ogunkoya gave the secretariat support.

The report presented poverty statistics and indicators critical to effective planning, monitoring and evaluation of the various Government anti-poverty programmes and policies and also provides framework for improvements in tackling the problem.

V.O. Akinyosoye
Director General/Chief Executive
National Bureau of Statistics
2006

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

TABLE

Gross Domestic Production Growth Rate (%) in Real Terms 2002-2004.....	3
Percentage Distribution of Sectoral Contribution to GDP in Real Terms 2002-2004.....	3
Inflation Rate and Deficit to GDP Ratio.....	4
Social Indicators for Nigeria	4
Poverty Head Count by Year.....	5
The Poor and the Core Poor by Year.....	6
Poverty Trends by Sector.....	6

CHAPTER THREE

TABLE

Adult Equivalent Scale	15
Expenditure Levels and Equivalent Calories Intake.....	15
Poverty Incidence by Sector and Zone.....	16
Dollar per day based on PPP by Sector and Zone.....	17
Self Assessed Poverty by Sector and Zone.....	18
Primary Coping Mechanism for Poverty.....	19
Trends in Poverty Levels 1980-2004.....	21
Percentage Distribution of Population in Poverty.....	21
Relative Poverty Incidence by Sector (1980-2004).....	22
Relative Poverty Incidence by Sector (Rural & Urban).....	22
Trends in Poverty Level by Zone 1980-2004.....	22
Double Poverty Line Table by Zone.....	23
Relative Poverty Incidence by Size of Household.....	23
Relative Poverty Incidence by Occupation Level of	24
Contribution by Sector and Zone to National Poverty.....	25
Contribution by Household Size.....	25
Contribution by Educational Level of Head of Household.....	26
Inequality Measure by Sector and State.....	27
States with Highest Incidence of Poverty.....	29
Six States with Lowest Incidence of Poverty.....	29
Quintile Distribution of Annual Per Capita	30

CHAPTER FOUR

TABLE

Health Care Consultation by Quintile	32
Health Consultation by Service Provider and by Quintile.....	32
Vaccination of Children by Quintile.....	33
Post Natal Consultation by Standard of Living Quintile	33
Breastfeeding by Standard of Living Quintile.....	34
General Health Conditions in the Past Two Weeks by Quintile.....	34
Type of Illness Suffered in the Past One Year	35
HIV/AIDS Responses by Quintile.....	36
Source of Information of HIV/AIDS by Quintile	37
Ever Attended School by Quintile.....	37
Ability to Read and Write in English Language by Quintile	38

Ability to Read and Write in English Language by Sector	38
Type of School Attended.....	39
Highest Level of Education Attained by Quintiles.....	39
Housing by Dwelling Type and Standard of Living Quintile	40
Occupancy Status by Standard of Living Quintile	40
Main Sources of Fuel for Cooking by Quintile.....	41
Access to Safe Drinking Water.....	42
Type of Refuse Disposal System.....	42
Access to Sanitary Means of Excreta Disposal.....	43

CHAPTER FIVE

TABLE

Agricultural Participation by Zone and Gender.....	44
Educational Levels by Occupation (Agric. and Non-Agric.)	45
Relative Poverty Incidence by Occupational Group.....	46
Agricultural Population by Sector and Relative Poverty Incidence...	46
Agricultural Population by Zone and Relative Poverty Incidence...	46
Agriculture Population by Sex and Relative Incidence	47
Agricultural Population by Educational Level and Relative Poverty	47
Agricultural Population by Age Group and Relative Poverty Incidence	47
Ownership of Farmland by Zone.....	48
Ownership of Farmland by Sex and Quintile	48
Ownership of Farmland with Deed by Quintile	48
Ownership of Livestock by Sector.....	49
Ownership of Livestock by Sex.....	49
Sources of Raw Materials by Sex.....	51
Sale of Agriculture Produce by Quintile, Sex and Education	51

CHAPTER SIX

TABLE

Poverty and Gender of Household Head.....	54
Per Capita Expenditure by Sex of Household Head 2004	55
Occupational Groups by Gender 2004.....	55
Occupational Groups by Sex and Quintile.....	56
Ability to Read and Write in English or Any Nigerian Language	57
Literacy in English, Nigerian Language and both Languages by Quintile and Sex	57
School Attendance by Sex and Quintile	58
HIV/AIDS Indicators.....	58
Reproductive Health Indicator.....	59
Primary Methods of Contraceptive.....	59
Preferred Sex of next Child.....	59
Time use on Household Activities by Sex.....	60

CHAPTER SEVEN

TABLE

Expenditure by Quintile.....	61
Welfare Aggregate: Primary Heading.....	62
Household Per Capita Expenditure on Food and	

Non-Food by Sector	63
Household Per Capita Expenditure on Food and Non-Food by Zones	63
Per Capita Annual Expenditure Characteristics of the Head of Household.....	64
Per Capita Annual Expenditure Characteristics of the Head of Household	66

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER ONE

FIGURE

GDP Growth Rate Per Cent in Real Terms 2002-2004.....	2
Trend of Sectoral Contribution to GDP in Real	3

CHAPTER THREE

FIGURE

Poverty Incidence by Zone Using Objective Measures (FEI)	16
Dollar per day based on PPP by Zone.....	17
Self-Assessed Poverty by Zone.....	18
Trends in Poverty Levels (1980-2004).....	21
Lorenz Curve.....	26

CHAPTER FOUR

FIGURE

Place of Vaccination of Children.....	33
Type of Illness Suffered in the Past One Year.....	35

CHAPTER FIVE

FIGURE

Participation in Agriculture by Sector.....	44
Poverty Incidence by Occupational Group.....	45
Sale of Produce by Quintile	51

CHAPTER SIX

FIGURE

Poverty Pyramid.....	53
Relative Poverty of Head by Gender.....	54
School Attendance by Sex and Quintile.....	58

CHAPTER SEVEN FIGURES:

Household Per Capita Expenditure by	
Household Size	64
Household Per Capita Expenditure by the Educational Level	
by Household	65

LIST OF POVERTY MAPS

MAPS

Poverty Incidence Map of Nigeria by State	20
Distribution of Poverty Inequality by States	28

LIST OF APPENDICES

TABLE

Poverty Incidence by State.....	69
Poverty Incidence using 2900 unit plus a component of Non-Food expenditure of 7760 Naira by State.....	70
Poverty Incidence based on Dollar Per Day on an Adjusted Purchasing Power Parity (PPP).....	70
Self-Assessment of Poverty by State.....	71
Primary Reason for Poverty by Self-Assessment	72
Poverty Figures by Sector, Zone and State.....	73
Place of Vaccination of Children by Standard of Living Quintile .	74
Place of Consultation by Quintile.....	74
Main Source of Lighting by Quintile.....	74
Material Used for Construction of Wall by Quintile.....	75
Main Flooring of Living by Quintile.....	75
Main Roofing Materials by Standard of Living Quintile.....	75
Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Occupation by State.....	76
Age Group by Relative Poverty Incidence.....	77
Ownership of Livestock by Zone.....	77
Ownership of Livestock by Occupational Group.....	78
Primary Crops Grown by Zone.....	79
Primary Crops Grown by Quintile.....	80
Primary Crops Grown by Sex.....	81
Primary Crops Grown in Last 12 Months by Means of Obtaining Land	82
Sex of Holder by Means of Obtaining Land.....	82
Use of Agricultural Inputs by Quintile	83
Use of Agricultural Inputs by Sex.....	84
Processing of Food Crops by Quintile.....	85
Processing of Food Crops by Zone.....	85
Processing of Food Crops by Sector.....	86
Asset Distribution by Quintile.....	87
National Aggregate Value by Assets by Quintile.....	87

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
CBN	Central Bank of Nigeria
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CCA	Common Country Assessment
CMIS	Computer Management and Information Services
COP	Consumption Of Own Production
CWIQ	Core Welfare Indicator Questionnaire
DFID	Department for International Development
EA	Enumeration Area
EPI	Expanded Programme on Immunisation
FCT	Federal Capital Territory
FEI	Food Energy Intake
FGM	Female Genital Mutilation
FMOE	Federal Ministry of Education
FMOF	Federal Ministry of Finance
FMOH	Federal Ministry of Health
FMOI	Federal Ministry of Industry
FMOLP	Federal Ministry of Labour & Productivity
FOS	Federal Office of Statistics
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GHS	General Household Survey
HIV	Human Immune Deficiency Virus
MICS	Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey
NAPEP	National Poverty Eradication Programme
NBS	National Bureau of Statistics
NCS	National Consumer Survey
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NISER	Nigeria Institute of Social and Economic Research
NISH	National Integrated Survey of Households
NLC	Nigeria Labour Congress
NLSS	Nigeria Living Standard Survey
NMB	National Manpower Board
NPA	National Programme of Action

NPC	National Planning Commission
NRDCS	National Resources Development Conservation Scheme
PPP	Purchasing Power Parity
RIDS	Rural Infrastructure Development Scheme
SAP	Structure Adjustment Programme
SOWESS	Social Welfare Services Scheme
SSA	State Statistical Agency
UPE	Universal Primary Education
WB	World Bank
YES	Youth Empowerment Scheme

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The scourge of poverty on a significant proportion of the Nigerian Population has been charted in the past by a series of four Consumer Expenditure Surveys Implemented by the then Federal Office of Statistics: in 1960, 1985, 1992 and 1996. Over the 16-year period, the report of the surveys indicated that poverty was most widespread in the rural areas and also feminised.

The desire and commitment of the government to tackle the deplorable high incidence of poverty pointed to the need to develop a baseline survey, the Nigeria Living Standard Survey, 2003/2004 for the monitoring and evaluation of the various governments anti-poverty programmes such as National Poverty Eradication Programme (NPEP), National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) and Nigeria Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The findings of this report cut across the various nature, dimensions and characteristics of the poor. The report provided valuable poverty statistics as well as indicators for poverty policy and programme monitoring and evaluation.

Poverty Trends and Inequality

Relative Poverty Measure

The national incidence of relative poverty increased sharply both between 1980-1985 and between 1992 and 1996. The national incidence of relative poverty dropped from 65.6 per cent in 1966 to 54.4 per cent in 2004 representing 11.2 per cent decline over the period. The disaggregation by sector showed a sharper decline in the urban areas between 1996 and 2004. In the urban areas it declined from 58.2 per cent in 1996 to 43.2 per cent in 2004, which represented a decline of 15.0 per cent. In the rural areas, it declined from 69.8 per cent in 1996 to 63.3 per cent, representing 6.5 per cent decline.

Objective Poverty Measure (Food Energy In-take)

The result of the 2003/2004 survey revealed that the national incidence of poverty using food consumption of 2900 calories limit was 36.6 per cent but when disaggregated by sector gave 26.5 per cent and 44.1 per cent for urban and rural areas respectively.

However, the national incidence of poverty combining food consumption of 2900 calories with a component of non-food was 54.7 per cent. Further sectoral disaggregation showed urban poverty rate of 43.1 per cent and rural poverty rate of 63.8 per cent.

Usage of Adjusted Dollar per day

The dollar per day gave a national poverty incidence of 51.6 per cent. The urban poverty incidence was 40.1 per cent compared with rural poverty incidence of 60.6 per cent.

Subjective Poverty Measure

The subjective measure of poverty, which was a self-assessment, indicated a national incidence of poverty of 75.5 per cent, which disaggregated into 70.7 per cent for urban areas, and 79.2 per cent for rural areas. This measure generally increased poverty results because it is based on perception of the people.

Inequality Measure

The Gini Co-efficient was used as a measure of inequality in the report. The national Gini co-efficient was 0.4882, while those for urban and rural areas were 0.5541 and 0.5187 respectively. These high figures at all levels are manifestations of poverty and inequality in the distribution of income.

Human Development Dimensions of Poverty

Health

The status of health is a strong indication of human development and can also serve as an indicator for poverty. The survey result revealed that about 8.0 per cent of the population consulted health care providers because of low level of awareness, poor facilities and high cost.

The quintile analysis showed that about a quarter (25.56 per cent) of population in the first quintile (the poorest) and more than half of the population (56.0 per cent) in the fifth quintile (least poor) consulted medical doctors.

The same survey indicated reasonable consultation of traditional healers by all levels of quintiles. About 12.0 per cent of the population of the first quintile and 8.0 per cent of the population of the fifth quintile consulted traditional healers.

HIV/AIDS

Nine in ten households surveyed were aware of HIV/AIDS among the population. The awareness increased with the level of quintiles from 90.2 per cent in the poorest households to 96.0 per cent in the least poor households.

The main source of information on HIV/AIDS was radio, which was 82.0 per cent. Radio, Television and friends accounted for about 90.0 per cent of the source of information from the survey findings. In all the levels of quintiles four in five household members had information from radio.

In the same vein, more than forth-fifth (83.5 per cent) of the households protected themselves from HIV/AIDS and other STDs. About 5.0 per cent of the households had undergone tests for HIV/AIDS.

The overall rate for knowledge of HIV/AIDS centres was 56.0 per cent. About eight in ten of the members of the households used condom for protection.

Education

Education is a good measure of human development. The correlation of levels of education with levels of poverty serves as a good measure for manifestations of poverty across the quintiles.

The findings showed increasing trend of ever attending school with increasing level of quintile. About 70.0 per cent of the surveyed households had ever attended school.

The ability to read and write in English language could determine the 'voicelessness' and powerlessness of the population. The results showed that about half (52.1 per cent) of the households could read and write in English language. The quintile results showed an increasing figure with increasing levels of quintile. The poorest quintile had 40.1 per cent compared with 66.1 per cent of the least quintile.

On the highest level of education attended, about half (48.0 per cent) of the households in the first quintile had no education compared with about 25.0 per cent of the households in the fifth quintile.

Housing Conditions

The housing conditions of households can also serve as proxy for welfare measurement.

About two-thirds (66.0 per cent) of the households lived in single rooms, while about one-quarter (24.1 per cent) of the households lived in whole buildings.

Seventy per cent of the households used firewood as the main source of fuel for cooking, more than a quarter (26.6 per cent) used kerosene, while only 1.1 per cent used gas.

The use of mud for wall construction was highest (58.5 per cent) for the poorest households, while the use of cement or concrete was highest (66.0 per cent) for the least poor households.

The overall access to safe water in the households was 60.0 per cent. The usage of unprotected well or rainwater was highest (23.0 per cent) in the poorest quintile while the usage of pipe-borne water was highest (28.0 per cent) in the least poor quintile, the fifth quintile.

Poverty and Agriculture

Poverty in Nigeria is a rural phenomenon where agricultural activities are most predominant.

More than four-fifths (86.5 per cent) of the households participated in agriculture in the rural areas compared with only 14.0 per cent in the urban areas. Gender-wise, more males participated in agriculture. Twenty-eight per cent and 15.3 per cent of males and females respectively participated in agriculture.

The poor participated more in agriculture than non-agriculture. Twenty-five per cent of the core poor households were in agriculture, while 20.0 per cent were in non-agricultural activities. A similar pattern was revealed among the moderately poor households. The non-poor households participated less in agriculture (about 37.0 per cent), with 46.1 per cent in non-agriculture.

More than four-fifth (81.0 per cent) of the livestock were owned by rural households, while 91.1 per cent of the ownership were the male-headed households. This is an indication of 'feminisation' of poverty.

Gender and Poverty

Male-headed households were more likely to be in poverty. The trend results showed for male-headed households that relative incidence of poverty varied increasingly from 29.2 per cent to 58.2 per cent from 1996 to 2004. The results for the female-headed households also varied increasingly from 26.9 per cent to 43.5 per cent from 1998 to 2004.

The literacy rate was highest for the males who could read and write in English. The rates were 59.8 per cent and 44.6 per cent for male-headed and female-headed households respectively. The overall average of school attendance was 54.00 per cent for males and 46.0 per cent for females.

On time-use on household activities, the females devoted more of their time in this order: child care (17.2 per cent), cooking (10.1 per cent), care of the elderly (9.8 per cent) and recreation (8.3 per cent). The males used more of their time too on childcare (9.9 per cent), recreation (8.2 per cent), care of the elderly (8.2 per cent), going to market (6.67 per cent) and cooking (6.62 per cent).

Household Expenditure

The quintile analysis showed a high degree of disparity on expenditure pattern. The poorest per capita expenditures were ~~N~~4,291.00 on food and ~~N~~3,520.00 on non-food, while the least poor per capita expenditures were ~~N~~29,489.00 on food and ~~N~~39,543.00 on non-food.

The urban households expended more on food and non-food compared with rural households. The urban households per capita household expenditure on non-food almost doubled that of the rural households. The figures were ~~N~~25,101.00 and ~~N~~13,058.00 respectively. The per capita household expenditures on food were ~~N~~18,099.00 and ~~N~~16,568.00 in urban and rural areas respectively which still showed higher expenditure in urban areas. The rural households expended more of their income on food.

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Geography, Governance and Population

Geography and Governance

Nigeria lies between 4°16' and 13°53' north latitude and between 2°40' and 14°41' east longitude. It is located in West Africa bordered on the west by the Republic of Benin, on the north by the Republic of Niger and on the East by the Republic of Cameroon. To the south, the country is bordered by approximately 800 kilometres of the Atlantic Ocean, stretching from Badagry in the west to the Rio del Rey in the east. It occupies a land area of 923,768 kilometres and the vegetation ranges from mangrove forest on the coast to desert in the far north.

Administratively, Nigeria consists of 36 States and a Federal Capital Territory. Each State is further divided into Local Government Areas (LGAs). There are presently 774 Local Government Areas in the country. After independence in 1960, Nigeria spent a total of over twenty-nine years under military rule. It was returned to democratic rule in May 1999 under a presidential system of Government with three tiers: Federal, State and Local. The Federal Government comprises an executive arm, a bicameral legislative arm and the judiciary. Each State has its own executive arm and house of assembly, while each Local Government has a chairman and councillors.

Population

The total population of Nigeria according to the 1991 Census was 88,992,220. Applying the growth rate of 2.83 per cent per annum, the National Population Commission estimated the current population of Nigeria to be 126 million as at 2003. Nigeria is the most populous country in Africa and the tenth most populous in the world. The population is still predominantly rural, accounting for approximately two-thirds of the population.

Social Economic Performance

According to the NEEDS, Poverty reduction is the most difficult challenge facing Nigeria and its people and the greatest obstacle to pursuit of sustainable socio-economic growth. Inadequate growth is the main cause of poverty in Nigeria. The lack of growth is compounded by the volatility of the oil sector, which affects a range of activities in the economy. Unemployment is an added problem, which has escalated the proportion of the poor. Other factors that have contributed to the evolution of poverty in the country include problems in the productive sector, widening income inequality, weak governance, social conflict, gender, inter-sectoral and environmental issues.

There have been sharp contrasts between economic potential and achievements in Nigeria due to a number of factors prevailing with the advent of oil boom in the 1970s, which peaked in 1981 and then declined up to 1995. However, some recovery has since taken place. The dependency on oil, a single commodity, notorious for sharp price fluctuations in the world market led to Dutch disease in Nigeria. The Dutch disease led to decline of agriculture and hindered the development of manufacturing.

The non-adjustment to the decline in oil earnings and the onset of the debt crisis in the early 1980s culminated in acute balance of payments pressures, large government deficits and high rate of inflation. The introduction of Structural Adjustment Programme in the mid-1980s provided a therapy which was short-lived and insufficient to make impact on the prevailing failing socio-economic conditions in Nigeria.

Macro-Economic Performance

With the advent of the civilian democratic regime in 1999, some progress has been made to restore macro-economic stability. Table 1.1 shows the Gross Domestic Product Growth Rate in real terms, 2002-2004


TABLE 1.1
GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCTION GROWTH RATE (%) IN REAL
TERMS, 2002-2004

	2002	2003	2004
Agriculture	4.25	6.47	6.5
Oil & Gas	-5.71	23.9	3.3
Distributive Trade	6.48	5.76	9.7
Manufacturing	10.07	5.66	10
Others	17.67	-1.34	7.2
GDP	3.49	10.23	6.09

Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)

Note: Others include Solid Mineral Mining, Utilities, Hotels & Restaurants, Transportation, Communications, Finance & Insurance, Business Services and Government Services.

FIGURE 1.1
GDP GROWTH RATE (%) IN REAL TERMS, 2002-2004



The overall GDP growth rate rose sharply from 3.49 per cent in 2002 to 10.23 per cent in 2003 and then declined sharply to 6.09 per cent in 2004 (fig. 1..1) The sharp increase and fall of the overall GDP growth rate was attributed to the fluctuating fortune in the oil and gas sector.

Nevertheless, agriculture still showed a strong growth rate of 6.5 per cent with manufacturing accounting for 10.0 per cent. Distributive trade rose steadily from 6.48 per cent in 2002 to 9.7 per cent in 2004. Manufacturing still required a boost to grow between 20 and 30 per cent annually in order to make impressive contribution to the growth of GDP.


Table 1..2 and figure 1..2 depicted the trend figures of percentage distribution of sectoral contribution to GDP in real terms (2001-2004).

TABLE 1.2
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SECTORAL CONTRIBUTION TO GDP IN
REAL TERMS, 2001-2004

Sectors	2001	2002	2003	2004
Agriculture	29.66	29.85	28.85	31.46
Oil and Gas	32.65	29.75	33.44	32.56
Distributive Trade	12.85	13.22	12.68	13.12
Manufacturing	4.33	4.62	4.41	4.59
Others +	20.51	22.56	20.49	18.27
Total	100	100	100	100

Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)

Note: Other include Solid mineral mining, Utilities, Hotels & Restaurants, Transportation, Communications, Finance & Insurance, Business Services and Government Services. Since 2003, there has been decline in the contributions of these sectors to real GDP



The trend figures showed that oil and gas had the highest contribution of about one-third in each year. Agriculture, Oil and Gas accounted for up to about two-thirds of the contribution in each year. The trends also revealed that manufacturing is not

making significant contributions to the GDP. Inflation rate still remained as 2 digits (Table 1.3). The overall aim of the government is to have a 1-digit inflation rate.

Table 1.3
INFLATION RATE AND DEFICIT TO GDP RATIO

Inflation Rate	2002	2003	2004
12-Month average	12.2	14.0	15.0
Year-on-Year	12.9	23.8	10.0
Deficit to GDP Ratio	-	-	1.94

The 12-month average inflation rate increased marginally across the period from 12.2 per cent in year 2002, 14.0 per cent in Year 2003 and 15.0 per cent in Year 2004. However, the year-on-year inflation rate showed a fluctuating trend during the same period. The rate rose sharply from 12.9 per cent in 2002 to 23.8 per cent in 2003 and declined sharply to 10.0 per cent in 2004.

The Deficit to GDP ratio still stood at 1.94 per cent in 2004.

Social Performance

The level of social development is still not improving based on the available statistics and indicators.

TABLE 1.4
SOCIAL INDICATORS FOR NIGERIA

	1999	2003
1. Under-five mortality rate	168/1000	201/1000
2. Under five mortality rate (Urban)	129/1000	-
3. Under five mortality rate (Rural)	192/1000	-
4. Infant mortality rate	90/1000	100/1000
5. Stunting prevalence	30.0%	38.0%
6. Accessible to safe water	54.2%	42.0%
7. Literacy rate	52.7%	60.4%
8. Contraceptive prevalence	8.6%	13.0%
9. Net primary school enrolment rate	56.8%	60.1%
10. Maternal mortality rate	704/100,000	-
11. Maternal mortality rate (Urban)	351/100,000	-
12. Maternal mortality rate (Rural)	828/100,000	-
13. Total Fertility rate	5.2	5.7

Source: Combination of NDHS, MICS 1999, NDHS 2003,(NpopC)

Under five-mortality rate increased to 201/1000 in 2003 from 168/1000 in 1999. Infant mortality rate has equally worsened. The rate stood at 90/1000 in 1999 and rose to 100/1000 in 2003. Likewise stunting has deteriorated from 30.0 per cent in 1999 to 38.0 per cent in 2003. Accessibility to safe water declined from 54.2 per cent to 42.0 per cent during the same period. The maternal mortality rate was 704 per 100,000 in 1999, with urban and rural rates of 828 per 100,000 and 351 per 100,000 respectively. The various statistics and indicators presented gave a gloomy picture of the level of social development in Nigeria, which must be addressed so as not to further aggravate poverty. Also the increase in the level of total fertility rate to 5.7 in 2003 from 5.2 in 1999 has further worsened socio-economic growth.

Nevertheless, a steady improvement was observed on literacy, net primary school enrolment and contraceptive usage. The literacy rate was 60.4 per cent in 2003 compared to 52.7 per cent in 1999. The net primary school enrolment rates were 56.8 per cent and 60.1 per cent in 1999 and 2003 respectively. The contraceptive prevalence rate increased to 13.0 per cent (2003) from 8.6 per cent (1999).

The maternal mortality rate of 704 per 100,000 in 1999 was high which disaggregated into 351/100,000 in urban areas and 828/100,000 in rural areas. The huge urban and rural disparity revealed higher poverty conditions in the rural areas. According to Human Development Report 2004, the life expectancy at birth for Nigeria in year 2002 was 51.6 and the Human Development Index for Nigeria was 0.466 with 151st position out of the 177 countries surveyed.

Poverty Policies and Programmes and National Economic Empowerment Development Strategy

Generally, Nigeria emerged from colonial status as a poor country. Her situation is weakened by poverty, disease and ignorance. Poverty in Nigeria is multi-faceted, multi-dimensional and multi-disciplinary. The Nigerian economy, until recently, has been characterized by the paradox of growth without poverty reduction and the trickle down effect of growth on the poor, slow response of government to the endemic and persistent problem of poverty and poor governance. Thus far, this characterization of the economy requires articulation for the purpose of designing programmes that are truly poverty reducing.

Publications and several studies have provided graphical details of the escalating poverty situation in Nigeria between the period of 1980 and 1996. These reports revealed marked deterioration in the quality of life of Nigerians over the years since independence, resulting in steady increase in the number of Nigerians caught below the poverty line. Also, higher concentration of the poor live in the rural areas and the urban fringes.

Poverty statistics showed that poverty level declined from 46.3 per cent in 1985 to 42.7 per cent in 1992, it rose sharply to 65.8 per cent of the population in 1996 (FOS, 1998). However, in absolute terms the population of the poor Nigerians increased four-fold between 1980 and 1996.

TABLE 1.5
POVERTY HEAD COUNT BY YEAR

Year	Poverty Incidence (%)	Est. Pop (Million)	Pop. In Poverty (Million)
1980	28.1	65	17.7
1985	46.3	75	34.7
1992	42.7	91.5	39.2
1996	65.6	102.3	67.1

Source: Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)

The moderately poor rose from 28.9 per cent in 1992 to 36.3 per cent in 1996 while the percentage of the core poor more than doubled from 13.9 per cent in 1992 to 29.3 per cent in 1996.

TABLE 1.6
THE POOR AND THE CORE POOR BY YEAR

Year	Non Poor (%)	Mod. Poor (%)	Core Poor (%)
1980	72.8	21.0	6.2
1985	53.7	34.2	12.1
1992	57.3	28.9	13.9
1996	34.4	36.3	29.3

Source: Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)

Nigerians in terms of Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI) scored 38 per cent in 1991. The Human Development Index (HDI) was 0.391 in 1998 ranking the country as 142 out of the 174 countries surveyed. In the year 2000, the HDI score for Nigeria was 0.439 which ranked Nigeria in the 151st position among 174 countries (UNDP 2000). In 2002, the HDI score was 0.466 which categorized Nigeria in the Low Human Development Countries) in the 151st ranking among 177 countries (UNDP 2004).

Further characterization of poverty showed that majority of the poor are resident in the rural areas (Table 1.7).

TABLE 1.7
POVERTY TRENDS BY SECTOR

Year	Urban (%)	Rural (%)
1980	17.2	28.3
1985	37.8	51.4
1992	37.5	46.0
1996	58.2	69.8

Source: Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) Poverty Profile in Nigeria, 1996

In 1980, 1985, 1992 and 1996, 17.2, 37.8, 37.5 and 58.2 per cent were in the urban areas respectively, while the corresponding figures for the rural areas were 28.3, 51.4, 46.0 and 68.8 per cent. In Nigeria, poverty is also a rural phenomenon where agricultural activities are concentrated. According to Poverty and Agricultural Sector in Nigeria Report (FOS, 1996), in 1985, 51.4 per cent of the population in the rural areas was poor. It declined to 46.0 per cent in 1992 and thereafter increased to 69.8 per cent in 1996. On the other hand, the proportion of the poor in the urban areas was 37.8 per cent in 1985, 37.5 per cent in 1992 and grew to 58.2 per cent in 1996. In Nigeria, poverty situation was worsened by the rapid annual population growth rate with the attendant feminization of gender.

In general, Government has not been unaware of the poverty situation in Nigeria. In spite of all these efforts poverty is still on the increase as observed in the period 1985-1996. However, the government past efforts can be categorized into three main areas including the efforts of the present civilian government which came to power in 1999.

Activities of Past Governments to Alleviate Poverty (Pre-Structural Adjustment Programme)

The activities include the provision of basic amenities such as social and economic infrastructure programmes to generate employment, enhance income earnings, increase productivity and those targeted at more equitable distribution of income.

Others include increased production and supply of food, increased economic activities. These programmes were aimed at meeting the needs of the poor.

The Structural Adjustment Programme

The Structural Adjustment Programme stressed greater realization of the need for policies and programmes to alleviate poverty and provide safety nets for the poor. The programme failed because it had no human face in its implementation and it did not emphasize on human development which thereby aggravated socio-economic problems of income inequality, unequal access to food, shelter, education, health and other necessities of life. It ended up aggravating poverty especially among the vulnerable. Government efforts then could be categorized into nine groups: These were Agricultural Sector Programmes; Health Sector Programmes; Nutrition-related Programme; Education Sector Programmes; Transport Sector Programmes; Housing Sector Programmes; Financial Sector Programmes; Manufacturing Sector Programmes and Cross-Cutting Programmes.

Dispensation of the Present Democratic Administration, 1999-2007

Consequent upon the experiences of the past, the civilian government initiated a number of programmes and policies directed at reducing poverty. The first programme was the Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP) which was targeted at correcting the deficiencies of the past efforts at alleviating poverty through the overall objective of providing direct jobs for 200,000 unemployed persons and hence stimulate production within a period of one year. This programme later metamorphosed into the Poverty Eradication Programme (PEP) because of the need to improve participatory approach for sustainability, for effective coordination at all levels of government and proper focusing of the programme. The core programmes of Poverty Eradication Programme were Youth Employment Scheme; Social Welfare Services Scheme; Rural Infrastructure Development Scheme and Natural Resource Development and Conservation Scheme.

The World Bank (2001/2002) later had to assist Nigeria in formulating poverty strategy programmes and policies through Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (IPRSP) with the aim of building on the gains of the earlier efforts on poverty programmes (PAP and PEP).

In the face of the growing concern to sustain the gains of the poverty efforts, the present government came up with a comprehensive home-grown poverty reduction strategy known as **National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS)** in 2004. The NEEDS also builds on the earlier two years' efforts to produce the interim PRSP. The NEEDS as conceptualized is a medium term strategy (2003-2007) which derives from the country's long term goals of poverty reduction, wealth creation, employment generation and value re-orientation. The NEEDS is a national coordinated framework of action in close collaboration with the state and local governments and other stakeholders. The equivalent of NEEDS at State and Local Government levels are State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (SEEDS) and Local Government Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (LEEDS). The NEEDS, in collaboration with the SEEDS will mobilize the people around the core values, principles and programmes of the NEEDS and SEEDS. A coordinated implementation of both programmes will reduce unemployment, reduce poverty and lay good foundation for sustained development.

The main strategies of NEEDS are anchored on a tripod: Empowering People (Social Charter or Human Development Agenda); Promoting Private Enterprise and Changing the Way the Government Does Its Work (Reform Government and Institutions). However, the social charter underpins the NEEDS programme. It is aimed at all aspects of the people's socio-economic life with the aim of reducing poverty and inequality. Despite her great natural wealth, Nigeria is still considered poor and social development is limited. If the present trends continue, the country is not likely to meet the Millennium Development Goals. Under NEEDS, reforms are ongoing in the key sectors of the economy with the objective of poverty reduction through anti-poverty programmes and policies. The positive effects of the reforms are gradually impacting on the people and efforts should therefore be continued for their sustainability and continuity. The findings of the Poverty Profile for Nigeria Report (2003/2004) from the Nigeria Living Standard Survey 2003/2004 showed the positive impact of the recent government anti-poverty reforms. The findings showed declining poverty rates compared with past figures. Nevertheless, anti-poverty efforts must be sustained and accelerated for their impact to be felt.

Chapter Two

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Objectives of the Survey

The Nigeria Living Standard Survey was part of the efforts of the Federal Government to provide statistical information on the eradication of worrisome problems of poverty in the country. The survey was designed to collect information needed to identify and classify target groups and provide basic welfare indicators for monitoring poverty alleviation programmes. The specific objectives are:

- Provide valid and reliable data for the development of effective intervention and provision of important tools for designing, implementing and monitoring of economic growth and poverty reduction.
- Generate qualitative and quantitative data on poverty and welfare situations at the Federal and sub-national (State) levels.
- Collect baseline information on the character and nature of poverty for monitoring and evaluating impact of poverty reduction programmes.
- Identify priority indicators of living standards for the households and household members.
- Establish a data base on poverty monitoring system that will be updated on continuous basis through establishment of poverty survey systems, that include the core welfare indicator questionnaire and multiple indicator cluster surveys.
- Provide a comprehensive analysis for identification and targeting of the poor by different localities.
- Present and disseminate National Poverty Report, giving the highlights of statistical findings and results of in-depth analysis, thereby enhancing the knowledge and understanding required to promote a sustainable campaign against poverty at the National and State levels.
- Produce poverty statistics time-series data that will facilitate the assessment of impact and effectiveness of policies and actions on poverty eradication and the formulation of new improved policies and schemes.
- Give in-depth enquiry into the structure and distribution of incomes and expenditures of Nigerian households.
- Provide comprehensive benchmark data on workers' compensation and conditions of work of the country's Labour Force.

Coverage and Scope

Coverage

The survey covered the urban and rural areas of all the 36 States of the Federation and the Federal Capital Territory. Ten Enumeration Areas (EAs) were studied in each of the States every month while 5 EAs were covered in Abuja.

Scope

To achieve the above stated objectives, in-depth data were collected on the following key elements: demographic characteristics, educational skill and training, employment and time use, housing and housing conditions, social capital, agriculture, income consumption expenditure and non-farm enterprise.

Survey Instruments

The questionnaire development was a joint effort of the National Bureau of Statistics, the World Bank and National Planning Commission. After series of meeting and two consultative workshops, seven survey instruments were developed: Questionnaire Part A: Household Questionnaire; Questionnaire Part B: Household Consumption Questionnaire: Prices Questionnaire and Household Diary Record Book. Two survey manuals were also developed, namely, the interviewer's and supervisor's manuals. Occupation and Industry Code Booklets were also developed.

The Pilot Test

The survey instruments were subjected to several stages of review, development and pilot test.

The main objectives of the pilot test were:

- (i) Ascertain the quality, adequacy and usability of the survey instruments.
- (ii) Use the findings of the pilot test to fine-tune the survey instruments.
- (iii) Cross-check the adequacy of field arrangements and logistics.

The pilot test covered three States, namely, Kano, Kwara and Lagos representing the Northern, Central and Southern parts of Nigeria respectively. Ten housing units were pilot tested in each of the States covering urban and rural areas.

Sample Design And Implementation

Sample Design

The NLSS was designed to give estimates at National, Zonal and State levels. The first stage was a cluster of housing units called Enumeration Area (EA), while the second stage was the housing unit.

Sample Size

One hundred and twenty EAs were selected and sensitised in each State, while sixty were selected in the Federal Capital Territory. Ten EAs with five housing units were studied per month. This meant that fifty housing units were canvassed per month in each State and twenty-five in Abuja.

Training

Three levels of training were organized, namely, Headquarters Training of Trainers (TOT), Zonal level training and State level training.

Headquarters Training of Trainers (TOT)

The first level of training at the headquarter consisted of three categories of officers, namely, the trainers at the zonal level, fieldwork monitoring officers and data processing officers who were crucial to the successful implementation of the survey. The intensive and extensive training lasted for five days.

Zonal Level Training

The training took place in the six zonal FOS [now NBS] offices representing the six geo-political zones of the country. These are Ibadan (South West) Enugu (South East), Calabar (South South), Jos (North Central), Maiduguri (North East) and Kaduna (North West).

The composition of the team from each State to the six different zones were the State officer, one scrutiny officer and two field officers, making four persons per state. Two resource persons from the headquarters did the training with the zonal controllers participating and contributing during the five-day regimented and intensive training.

State Level Training

The third level training was at the State level. A total of 40 officers were trained, comprising 20 enumerators, 10 editing staff and 10 supervisors. The State Statistical Agencies, as a matter policy, contributed 5-10 enumerators. The ten-day exercise was also regimented, intensive and extensive because the enumerators were also crucial for effective implementation of data collection.

Data Collection for Main Survey

Data Collection

The NBS permanent field staff who were resident in the enumeration areas were responsible for data collection during the survey. These interviewers conducted interviews with the households. There were seven interviewer visits to each selected household at a minimum of four-day interval in a cycle of 30 days. A diary of daily consumption and expenditure was used to support the interviews.

Composition of the Team for data Collection

Every State had 20 roving teams, while FCT, Abuja operated with 10 teams. A team was made up of one supervisor and one enumerator.

The teams were structured into two groups, which worked alternatively each month to cover the selected EA.

Supervision and Quality Control

A number of measures were put in place to ensure that the NLSS data were of good and acceptable quality. For instance, a supervisor was attached to each team to observe interviews and confirm the pre-selected households. He was to verify and edit completed questionnaires. The State officers and zonal controllers conducted regular monitoring visits to the EAs. Headquarters monitoring groups also visited states on quarterly basis, for on-the-spot assessment of the quality of work. An independent firm was engaged to monitor the fieldwork in the States from the commencement to the end of the survey.

A World Bank Mission team from Washington also took part in the monitoring exercise.

Retrieval

Completed Questionnaires were sent to zonal offices from the States for onward transmission to the NBS headquarters for data extraction and data processing. The retrieval of records was done on a monthly basis.

Preparation for Data Entry and Data Analysis

Training for Manual Editing Staff

The then Federal Office of Statistics organised training for the Questionnaire Editors. Forty experienced officers were trained.

Training for Data Entry Staff

Thirty officers were trained on computer data entry and editing.

Data Analysis Preparation

The then FOS worked with the World Bank Mission to undertake system development for data analysis. This involved data dictionary development, data entry procedure and data editing.

Computer Edits

There were five levels of computer edits before analysis took place. This was critical to ensuring the quality and acceptability of the data.

Level 1: **Control Edits:** These were to ensure the sample integrity. The total households captured must match with master sample list.

Level 2: **Inter-Questionnaire Structure:** These were required in order to compute the Standard of Living (SOL), quintile distribution or compute per capita value. Mismatches and duplicates were reconciled.

Level 3: **Intra-Questionnaire:** This was required for sectoral analysis. Information from the roster (age and sex) was matched with respective sections in the questionnaire. Since the household roster was the primary source for computing the universe of subsequent sections, these had to be consistent. Mismatches and duplicates of household members' identification were rectified.

Level 4: **Edits:** These checks monitor the intra-record consistency. It was important that logical responses and skip patterns were followed.

Level 5: **General Edits:** This checked for outliers and corrections were made through static or dynamic imputation.

Data Analysis

The Staff of Computer Management and Information Services (CMIS) of the NBS carried out the data entry of the edited questionnaire and ran programmes to further detect inconsistencies and other related errors as part of the final editing. Tables were then generated from the analyses.

Also at the request of the then Federal Office of Statistics, under the British Council Economic Management Capacity Building (EMCAP) Project, a DFID Consultant came to Nigeria to provide technical assistance in the evaluation of dataset.

The consultancy covered the following areas: Computer Edits, Tabulations and Capacity Building. Generally, IMPS was used for data entry, IMPS and CSPro for data editing and SPSS for data analysis and tabulations.

Chapter Three

POVERTY INDICATORS

Poverty Concepts

The issue of poverty has for some time now been of great concern to many nations, rich and poor alike. As a result, poverty reduction strategies (PRSP process) have been at the centre-stage of development programmes. Poor nations are more eager than ever to get out of poverty while the rich nations are increasingly aware of the need to promote security through poverty reduction.

Traditional poverty analysis makes use of certain indicators. The most commonly used and understood is a *poverty line*. This has become the standard tool of policy makers for poverty monitoring. In a poverty line, people are counted as poor when their measured standard of living falls below a minimum acceptable threshold. There are various measures that can be used to define this minimum level of welfare and much controversy surrounds the choice of poverty line. Whatever methods used to define this threshold, the poverty line is a relatively arbitrary divider of poor and non-poor.

In this report four different concepts of poverty measures have been examined: Absolute or objective referred to as Food Energy Intake (FEI), Dollar per day, subjective and relative. Although the use of the FEI method is becoming more acceptable, this report will focus on the use of a relative poverty line. This is done in order to maintain a trend with previous surveys. It may also be an opportune moment to transit to the objective method.

Objective Measure of Poverty (Food Energy In-take)

The goal of this method is to define the level of consumption that will enable the household to obtain enough food to meet its basic energy requirement. This approach computes the cost of acquiring a given food basket providing adequate calories for the individuals in the household. The following steps are used to compute the objective poverty line:

- Compute a national food basket based on the consumption patterns of the poorest 40percent of the population.
- The bottom 40percent is computed by dividing per capita expenditure into quintiles (20percent brackets) and examining food preferences of the bottom two quintiles.
- Compute the amount of food expenditure required to attain 2900 calories¹ per day based on the national basket for the poorest 40percent.
- Food consumption is a function of age and sex composition of the household. Infants and younger children do not require the calorie intake that adults do. This means the measure is based NOT on per capita expenditure but per equivalent adult expenditure (See table 3.1).

¹ 2900 calories per day requirement is defined by the WHO. The given choice of calories depends upon the country, its habits and customs.

Table 3.1
FAO Adult Equivalent Scale

Age	Sex	
	Male	Female
0-1 yrs	0.27	0.27
1-3 yrs	0.45	0.45
4-6 yrs	0.61	0.61
7-9 yrs	0.73	0.73
10-12 yrs	0.86	0.78
13-15 yrs	0.96	0.83
16-19 yrs	1.02	0.77
20 and above	1.00	0.73

This table attributes a proportion of an adult depending upon age and sex and perceived caloric requirements.

NBS calculated a minimum annual expenditure required per equivalent adult as 21,743 Naira on food to attain 2900 calories per day. This expenditure on food constitutes threshold for extreme poverty.

This gave an extreme poverty incidence of 36.6 per cent


- A non-food component was added by examining the average non-food expenditure for those households (+ or – 100 households) around the core poverty line. This computed to 8,385 Naira.
- This is added to the food expenditure for a total expenditure threshold of 30,128 Naira. This gave a poverty incidence of 54.7 percent

The table and the graph below illustrated the incidence of poverty by urban/rural sector and geographic zone. The results showed that Northeast zone had the highest poverty incidence with 67.3 per cent followed by the Northwest with 63.9 per cent while the lowest poverty rates were recorded for Southeast at 34.2 per cent followed by Southwest with 43.0 per cent. Poverty rates for the Southern states fell below the national average. The northern zones clearly have poverty incidence above the national rate. For more information see the table in Appendix A Table 2

TABLE 3.2
POVERTY INCIDENCE BY SECTOR AND ZONE

	Poor	Non-Poor
Sector		
Urban	43.1	56.9
Rural	63.8	36.2
Total	54.7	45.3
Zone		
South-South	51.1	48.9
South East	34.2	65.8
South West	43.0	57.0
North Central	63.3	36.7
North East	67.3	32.7
North West	63.9	36.1
Total	54.7	45.3

FIGURE 3.1
POVERTY INCIDENCE BY ZONE USING OBJECTIVE MEASURE (FEI)



Dollar Per Day

The dollar per day has become an acceptable standard for measuring poverty across countries for international comparability. It is defined in terms of deflated Dollar per day. This process of establishing parity in the acquisitive power of a Dollar is called Purchasing Power Parity or PPP. In this analysis, the 2002 World Bank Purchasing Power Parity for one Dollar per day was adopted². The following procedures were followed in its computation

- Used an adjusted measure of the 2002 World Bank Purchasing Power Parity.
- The 2002 PPP for Nigeria 46.2 Naira to the Dollar.
- This was adjusted for 2003 using inflation rates and exchange rate changes.
- This computed to 59.2 Naira (PPP) to the Dollar.
- This was annualised and gave a total expenditure threshold of 21,608 Naira per person. Those who fall below this expenditure threshold were considered poor.

This gave a poverty incidence of 51.6percent

Note: However, there is an on-going International Comparison Programme (ICP) for the year 2006 in Nigeria. The findings from this survey will readjust the PPP.


At the national level the poverty rate was given as 51.6 per cent, while 48.5 per cent was non-poor. In the urban the rate of poverty was calculated to be 40.1 per cent while in the rural areas, the incidence of poverty was 60.6 per cent. Both the Dollar per day method and the 2900 calorie FEI provide comparable results.

² Find the publication with the data and site.

TABLE 3.3
DOLLAR PER DAY BASED ON PPP BY SECTOR AND ZONE

Sector	Poor	Non-Poor
Urban	40.1	59.9
Rural	60.6	39.4
Total	51.6	48.5
Zone		
South-South	47.6	52.4
South East	31.2	68.8
South West	40.2	57.8
North Central	58.6	41.4
North East	64.8	35.2
North West	61.2	38.8
Total	51.6	48.4

FIGURE 3.2
DOLLAR PER DAY BASED ON PPP BY ZONE



As in the previous example, the zones display the same patterns. The Northeast recorded the highest poverty incidence with 64.8 per cent followed by Northwest 61.2 per cent. The Southeast recorded the lowest poverty rate with 31.2 per cent followed by Southwest with 40.2 per cent.

Subjective Measure of Poverty

This method requires the individuals to assess what they consider to be a decent or minimally adequate standard of living. It is also known as a self-assessed level of poverty. This method is less widely used as people tend to over-state what they perceive to be a personal poverty level. During the survey the opinion of heads of households was sought on their perception and levels of poverty. Table 3.5 provides details by sector and zone.

The findings of the survey gave a poverty figure of 75.5 per cent.

The survey sought equally to identify the specific reason and associated coping mechanisms for poverty. The primary reason given for being in poverty was the high

cost of agricultural inputs at 28.5 per cent. This was followed by lack of capital to expand own business at 10 per cent and lack of capital to expand agricultural business at 7.5 per cent. (See Appendix 3.4)

TABLE 3.4
SELF-ASSESSMENT OF POVERTY BY SECTOR AND ZONE

Sector	Poor %	Non-Poor%
Urban	70.7	29.3
Rural	79.2	20.8
Total	75.5	24.5
Zone		
South- South	74.8	25.2
South East	77.6	22.4
South West	71.5	28.5
North Central	80.0	20.0
North East	81.8	18.2
North West	71.9	28.1
Total	75.5	24.5

FIGURE 3.3
SELF-ASSESSMENT OF POVERTY BY ZONE




Table 3.6 provides details on the identification of the coping mechanism. The primary coping mechanism adopted when in poverty was given to be a reduction in the number of meals taken by the household. This was the response in 25.3 per cent of the households; followed by piece-work³ in agriculture at 16.5 per cent and informal borrowing from friends at 10.7 per cent.

³ Piece-work is defined as occasional or casual labour. There is piecework for agricultural and non-farm activities.

TABLE 3.5
PRIMARY COPING MECHANISM FOR POVERTY

Coping Mechanism	%
Reducing Number of meals	25.27
Piecework agricultural work	16.54
Informal borrowing from friends	10.71
Substitute meals with fruits	10.83
Reducing other household items	5.85
Other piece-work	5.17
Work on food-for-work programme	4.60
Asking from friends	4.21
Others	3.60
Wild food	3.16
Relief food supplies	2.87
Sale of assets	2.84
Formal borrowing	1.73
Religious assistance	1.56
Petty vending	0.86
Pulling children out of school	0.41
NGO assistance	0.14
Public begging	0.09
Total	100.00

Relative Measure of Poverty

As previously mentioned, this report will further develop the Poverty Profile based on the relative poverty measure. This is based on a measure of mean per capita household expenditure. The steps for computing this line were outlined below:


- Aggregated and annualised food expenditures (food purchase and consumption of own produce).
- Aggregated non-food expenditure. This included imputation of rental values for all categories of non-rented homes including: owner occupied houses, rent-free houses, subsidized housing, etc. A component of use value for assets is also included. Greater detail on computing the aggregate is found in Chapter 7.
- Obtain total household expenditure (Food + Non-Food). Since this measure includes imputed own produce and other items, the aggregate tends to measure welfare. However, the term 'expenditure' is frequently used and is understood to mean welfare.
- Deflated to national prices using the CPI to the base year on January 2004. See Appendix E on computing the price deflators.
- Compute per capita household expenditure: total household expenditure divided by the household size.
- Sum all the per capita household expenditure across all the households and divide by the total number of households. Sample weights at the EA level are used to compute the figure. See Appendix D for further discussion.
- This gives the weighted mean per capita household expenditure.
- Average per capita household expenditure is 35,600 Naira.
- The poverty line was based on 2/3 of the average per capita expenditure or 23,733 Naira. All persons with per capita expenditure less than this amount are considered poor. Those equal to or above are non-poor.

- A core poor (or extreme poverty) was defined as 1/3 of the average per capita expenditure of 11,867 Naira. All persons with per capita expenditure less than this amount are considered extremely poor.
- All persons whose expenditures fall between 11,867 and 23,733 Naira are considered moderately poor.

This gave a poverty incidence of 54.4percent

Figure 3.1 illustrates this relative poverty by State on a poverty map. This map clearly shows the northern States as having a higher incidence of poverty than the south (with the exception of Lagos).

MAP 3.1
POVERTY INCIDENCE MAP OF NIGERIA BY STATE: 2004



Trends in Poverty (Relative Poverty Measure)

The findings of the survey were compared with those of the previous NCS surveys of 1980 to 1996 in order to measure the trend in poverty for the country across the period, 1980-2004.⁴ The following discussions evaluate trends in poverty by geographic division and characteristics of heads of household.

National Poverty Trends

During the period under review (1980-2004), the national poverty rates for the five surveys conducted were as follows: 28.1percent (1980), 46.3 per cent (1985), 42.76 per cent (1992), 65.6 per cent (1996) and 54.4 per cent for 2004. Poverty incidence in the country recorded increases between the period 1980 and 1985 and between 1992 and 1996. The results also show appreciable decrease in poverty rates between 1985 and 1992 and between 1996 and 2004. Even with the drop in poverty rates, the population in poverty has maintained a steady increase from 17.7 million in 1980 to 68.7 million in 2004. Figure 3.4 illustrates the trends in poverty during this period.


⁴ See the Report entitled *Poverty Profile for Nigeria 1980-1996*, published in April 1999.

TABLE 3.6
TRENDS IN POVERTY LEVELS 1980-2004

Year	Poverty Incidence	Estimated Total Population	Population in Poverty
1980	28.1	65 m	18.26 m
1985	46.3	75 m	34.73 m
1992	42.7	91.5 m	39.07 m
1996	65.6	102.3 m	67.11 m
2004	54.4	126.3 m	68.70 m

Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)

FIGURE 3.4
TRENDS IN POVERTY LEVELS (1980-2004)



Two Levels of Poverty

Considering the period, 1980-2004, the proportion of the core poor increased from 6.2 per cent in 1980 to 29.3 per cent in 1996 and then came down to 21.8 per cent in 2004. For the moderately poor the picture is quite different as the proportion recorded increased between 1980 and 1985 from 21.0 per cent, 34.2 per cent, and 1992 and 1996 28.9 per cent to 36.3 per cent but decreased during the periods 1985 and 1992 from 34.2 per cent to 28.9 per cent and 1996-2004 from 36.3 per cent to 32.4 per cent.

TABLE 3.7
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION IN POVERTY
(USING TWO BOUNDARIES)

Year	Core Poor	Moderately Poor	Non-Poor
1980	6.2	21.0	72.8
1985	12.1	34.2	53.7
1992	13.9	28.9	57.3
1996	29.3	36.3	34.4
2004	22.0	32.4	43.3

Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)

Poverty Trends by Sector

Table 3.8 illustrates poverty by sector. It can be seen that for each year poverty incidence has predominated in the rural areas. There has been a rise and fall of poverty incidence in both the urban and rural areas, in the period 1980-2004. Though the fall in poverty in the urban areas for the period, 1985 and 1992, was not significant (37.8 per cent, 37.5 per cent), it was quite significant for the rural sector (51.4 per cent and 46.0 per cent during the same periods, 1985 and 1992).

TABLE 3.8
RELATIVE POVERTY INCIDENCE BY SECTOR (1980-2004)

Year	Urban	Rural
1980	17.2	28.3
1985	37.8	51.4
1992	37.5	46.0
1996	58.2	69.3
2004	43.2	63.3

Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)

TABLE 3.9
RELATIVE POVERTY BY SECTOR (URBAN AND RURAL)

Year	Urban			Rural		
	Core Poor	Moderately Poor	Non-Poor	Core Poor	Moderately Poor	Non-Poor
1980	3.0	14.2	82.8	6.5	21.8	71.7
1985	7.5	30.3	62.2	14.8	36.6	48.6
1992	10.7	26.8	62.5	15.8	30.2	54.0
1996	25.2	33.0	41.8	31.6	38.2	30.7
2004	15.7	27.5	56.8	27.1	36.2	36.7

Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)

Poverty Trends by Zone

The Northeast zone had a higher incidence of poverty followed by Northwest and Northcentral for the period, 1980-2004. For the southern zone, poverty increased from 1980 to 1996, but dropped in 2004, apart from the South-south zone that had a drop in 1992.

TABLE 3.10
TRENDS IN POVERTY LEVEL BY ZONES, (1980-2004)

Zone	1980	1985	1992	1996	2004
South South	13.2	45.7	40.8	58.2	35.1
South East	12.9	30.4	41.0	53.5	26.7
South West	13.4	38.6	43.1	60.9	43.0
North Central	32.2	50.8	46.0	64.7	67.0
North East	35.6	54.9	54.0	70.1	72.2
North West	37.7	52.1	36.5	77.2	71.2

Source: National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)

TABLE 3.11
DOUBLE POVERTY LINE TABLE BY ZONE

ZONE	CORE POOR		MODERATE POOR		NON-POOR	
	1996	2004	1996	2004	1996	2004
South South	23.4	17.0	34.8	18.1	41.8	64.9
South East	18.2	7.8	35.3	19.0	46.5	73.3
South West	27.5	18.9	33.4	24.2	39.1	57.0
North Central	28.0	29.8	36.7	37.2	35.4	33.1
North East	34.4	27.9	35.7	44.3	29.9	27.8
North West	37.3	26.8	39.9	44.4	22.8	28.8

Source: NCS: 1996, 2004

Poverty Trend by State

Poverty incidence increased in nine States from the 1996 figures. This increase was more pronounced in Jigawa State which had a poverty incidence of 71.0 per cent in 1996 and 95 per cent in 2004. Kogi and Kwara States had poverty incidence of 75.5 per cent in 1996. In 2004, poverty incidence was 88.6 per cent in Kogi and 85.6 per cent in Kwara State.

Poverty incidence also increased in Lagos from 53 per cent in 1996 to 63.5 per cent in 2004. In general, poverty increased more in the Northern States than the Southern States.

Poverty Trends by Size of Household

The results of the surveys show that poverty incidence increases with the size of the household. Households with less than five members are likely not to be in poverty. This poverty incidence was less than the national average. A direct correlation exists between the size of the household and poverty for all years.

TABLE 3.12
RELATIVE POVERTY INCIDENCE BY SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD

	Poverty Head Count				
	1980	1985	1992	1996	2004
1	0.2	9.7	2.9	13.1	12.6
2-4	8.8	19.3	19.5	51.5	39.3
5-9	30.0	50.5	45.4	74.8	57.9
10-20	51.0	71.3	66.1	88.5	73.3
20+	80.9	74.9	93.3	93.6	90.7
All Nigeria	27.2	46.3	42.7	65.6	54.4

Source: NCS 1980, 1985, 1992, 1996, 2004

Poverty and Education of Household Head

The incidence of poverty is observed to decrease the higher the education of the head of household, except for the year 1980. The results show clearly that heads of households with no education are most likely to be in poverty. On the other hand, those with secondary and post secondary education are less likely to be in poverty as the incidence of poverty for all the years fell below the national average.

TABLE 3.13
RELATIVE POVERTY INCIDENCE BY EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF
HOUSEHOLD HEADS

	Poverty Headcount				
	1980	1985	1992	1996	2004
No Education	30.2	51.3	46.4	72.6	68.7
Primary	21.3	40.6	43.3	54.4	48.7
Secondary	7.6	27.2	30.3	52.0	44.3
Post Secondary	24.3	24.2	25.8	49.2	26.3
All Nigeria	27.2	46.3	42.7	65.6	54.4

Source: NCS 1980, 1985,1992, 1996, 2004

Poverty and Employment Characteristics

In general, households with heads engaged in agriculture had the highest level of poverty, except in 1980 and 1996. Households with heads that are in the transport and production industry followed in terms of poverty incidence.

TABLE 3.14
RELATIVE POVERTY INCIDENCE BY OCCUPATION
OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS

	Poverty Head Count				
	1980	1985	1992	1996	2004
Professional & Technical	17.3	35.6	35.7	51.8	34.2
Administration	45.0	25.3	22.3	33.5	45.3
Clerical & related	10.0	29.1	34.4	60.1	39.2
Sales Workers	15.0	36.6	33.5	56.7	44.2
Service Industry	21.3	38.0	38.2	71.4	43.0
Agricultural & Forestry	31.5	53.5	47.9	71.0	67.0
Production & Transport	23.2	46.6	40.8	65.8	42.5
Manufacturing & Processing	12.4	31.7	33.2	49.4	44.2
Others	1.5	36.8	42.8	61.2	49.1
Student & Apprentices	15.6	40.5	41.8	52.4	41.6
Total	27.2	46.3	42.7	65.6	54.4

Source: NCS 1980, 1985,1992, 1996, 2004

Other Poverty Indicators, 2004

Other indicators related to the incidence of poverty (frequently termed as P_0) are contribution to poverty (C_0), poverty gap (P_1) and poverty severity (P_2).

P_1 is a measure of the average expenditure of those below the poverty live.

P_2 focuses on the degree of dispersion in the distribution of the individuals lying below a pre-determined poverty line " P_0 " for a given mean " P_1 " for a given mean expenditure. Refer to Appendix Table 6 for the indicators.

Contribution to poverty C_0

The contribution to poverty evaluates the proportion of the poor relative to the total population of the poor. As opposed to the poverty incidence that provides the number of poor in the population, the contribution examines the relative density of the poor across regions. This allows us to identify areas that are disproportionately affected by the poor population.

In this section data is presented on the contribution of the various sub groups to national poverty for the 2004 survey.

TABLE 3.15
CONTRIBUTION BY SECTOR AND ZONE TO NATIONAL POVERTY

Sector	Incidence	Contribution
Urban	43.2	35.0
Rural	63.3	65.0
Zone		
South South	35.1	9.7
South East	26.7	5.9
South West	43.0	15.5
North Central	67.0	17.7
North East	72.2	17.7
North West	71.2	33.6

Table 3.15 presents data on the relative contribution of each sector and zone to national poverty. The contribution of the urban sector to national poverty is 35.0 per cent, while that of the rural sector is 65.1 per cent. This result equally shows that poverty is more predominant in the rural sector. In the 2004 survey, Northwest made the highest contribution of 33.6 per cent to national poverty. This was followed by Northeast 17.7 per cent and Northcentral 17.7 per cent. In this case both Northcentral and Northeast contribute equally, yet have different poverty incidences. This would mean although the poverty incidence is higher in the Northeast, proportionately there are the same number of poor in each zone. Southeast made the least contribution to national poverty.

Contribution by States

Appendix A Table 6 indicates that Lagos State made the highest contribution to National Poverty with 7.6 per cent, followed by Kano State with 6.0 per cent and Katsina State with 4.9 per cent.

Bayelsa made the least contribution to national poverty preceded by FCT, Abuja and Ekiti State.

TABLE 3.16
CONTRIBUTION TO POVERTY BY SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD

Household Size	Contribution
1	0.6
2-4	19.4
5-9	58.9
10 -19	20.5
20+	0.6
Total	100

From Table 3.16, it could be seen that households with five to nine persons had the highest contribution to poverty with 58.9 per cent of the poor with this size of households. The contribution was also higher than that of all other household sizes put together. The next in contribution to national poverty are households with ten to

nineteen persons with 20.5 per cent, followed by households with two to four persons having 19.4 per cent.

The least contributors are one-person households with 0.6 per cent and twenty persons and above with 0.7 per cent.

Contribution by Education Level

TABLE 3.17
CONTRIBUTION BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF
HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

Level of Education	Contribution
No Education	47.6
Elementary	1.2
Primary	3.7
Secondary	30.1
Tertiary	4.3
Others	13.1
Total	100


Households headed by those with no education were the highest contributors to national poverty with 47.6 per cent, followed by those with secondary education with 30.1 per cent. The contribution of those with tertiary education contributed 4.3 per cent to poverty.

Inequality Measures and Lorenz Curve

The best known inequality measure is the Gini Coefficient and is related to the Lorenz Curve. The Lorenz Curve, see Figure 3.5, is based on an ordering of all individuals from the poorest to the least poor and examined the cumulative consumption share as a function of their cumulative population share.

The two curves presented here are (1) an idealized curve or straight line and (2) a concave curve. The straight line represented an ideal distribution where 1 per cent of the population can be attributed to 1 (one) per cent of the welfare measures; 10 (ten) per cent is attributable to 10 per cent, and so forth. In the case of Nigeria, the poorest 10 per cent of the population is attributed 1.6 per cent of the national welfare and the highest 10 per cent account for about 40 per cent of the welfare measures.

FIGURE 3.5
LORENZ CURVE




As already mentioned, a closely-related measure of inequality to the Lorenz curve is the Gini Co-efficient. The coefficient gives a measure of the difference between the idealised curve and the area under the actual Lorenz Curve. The smaller the measure or the closer it is to 0, the more the Lorenz Curve approaches the idealised line; whereas the closer the Gini co-efficient is to 1, the more skewed the curve. The Table below provided a list of the different Gini co-efficients by State and Sector. The State indices are presented in Appendix A Table 6. However, two illustrations are provided in the form of maps (See Maps 3.2).

TABLE 3.18
INEQUALITY MEASURE BY SECTOR AND STATE

Inequality Measure	Gini Co-efficient
National	0.4882
Sector	
Urban	0.5441
Rural	0.5187
Zone	
South South	.5072
South East	.4494
South West	.5538
North Central	.3934
North East	.4590
North West	.3711

MAP 3.2
DISTRIBUTION OF POVERTY INEQUALITY BY STATE



Depth of Poverty-Poverty Gap (P_1) (Appendix A Table 6)

The need to identify the poor for measurement or policy purposes on the basis of a single poverty line threshold implies that all poor people are treated equally regardless of how much their expenditure level is below the poverty line. In Nigeria where the incidence of poverty is high (56.7 per cent), this approach may not be satisfactory because in practice it will not be possible to target all the poor at once. For this reason, it is desirable to add to the measure of poverty incidence a measure of the depth of poverty such as the poverty gap. The measure incorporates the extent to which a poor person's expenditure level falls below the poverty line. This makes it possible to distinguish, for example, between States that have high poverty incidence but shallow poverty gap from those with lower poverty incidence but deeper poverty. The latter region may have to receive higher priority for allocation of resources and poverty interventions.

TABLE 3.17
6 STATES WITH HIGHEST INCIDENCE OF POVERTY

State	Incidence of Poverty	Poverty Gap
	P_o	P_1
Jigawa	92.1	0.4967
Kebbi	90.4	0.4322
Kogi	88.6	0.5713
Bauchi	82.2	0.3573
Yobe	81.1	0.3563
Kwara	79.3	0.4413

From the table, it can be seen that though Kogi State is not the poorest, it has the deepest poverty gap, hence should be given poverty interventions first, followed by Jigawa.

TABLE 3.18
6 STATES WITH LOWEST INCIDENCE OF POVERTY

State	Incidence of Poverty	Poverty Gap
	P_o	P_1
Oyo	23.2	0.0652
Osun	28.8	0.0807
Imo	30.8	0.0954
Bayelsa	32.4	0.1148
Abia	33.2	0.1041
Ogun	35.0	0.1093

In this group the poverty gap for Bayelsa is seen to be deeper than the other states in the group even though poverty incidence is not the highest. The State should be considered first for poverty interventions in the group, followed by Ogun.

3.1.9 Quintile Analysis

One method of evaluating poverty is to tabulate the poverty sensitive indicators by consumption level. The standard way of doing this is to rank household consumption (or per capita consumption) and divide the population in equal increments. For this study, the divisions were based on 20 per cent increments in such a way that the first quintile represents the bottom 20 per cent of the population (the poorest) in terms of consumption and the highest or 5th quintile which represents the highest 20 per cent of the population (non-poor) in terms of consumption. See Chapter 7 for greater detail.

Quintile analysis implies, therefore, an equal distribution of expenditure pattern, starting with the poor in quintile 1 to the non-poor in quintile 5.

TABLE 3.19
QUINTILE DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUAL PER
CAPITA HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE IN NAIRA

Quintile	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Quintile 1	7.811	850	21.310
Quintile 2	13.428	10510	27.122
Quintile 3	19.363	16.000	33.233
Quintile 4	28.335	22.713	44.675
Quintile 5	69.032	34.736	2.205.154

Chapter Four

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Human Development Dimensions of Poverty

The scourge of poverty goes beyond mere measurement of a household's expenditure or welfare. Poverty has many dimensions and may include inadequate access to government utilities and services, environmental issues, poor infrastructure, illiteracy and ignorance, poor health, insecurity, social and political exclusion. General patterns of poverty indicate that there are declines in basic social infrastructure due to the burden of rural-urban migration and rapid population growth.

Poverty has different manifestations in urban and rural areas. In urban areas, the burden of demand for services has effects on school enrolment, access to primary health care and growth of unsanitary urban slums. The result is high level of mortality rates and poor economic productivity of households. In rural areas, poverty manifests itself more in the agricultural sector and food security. Like urban areas, social services are lacking. However, this is more due to inaccessibility and distances. For any meaningful economic growth and poverty reduction, there is the need to enhance and improve access to social services, including health and education. Expanding economic opportunities for the poor boosts social welfare as well as political empowerment.

As mentioned in chapter 3, the use of cross tabulating social indicator variables by quintile is useful for examining trends. The analysis used in this section focuses on quintile distributions. For the purpose of evaluating the distribution, the first two quintiles are considered poor; the third and fourth as moderately poor and the fifth as non-poor.

Health

Health is a key determinant of household welfare. Information was collected on general health conditions, preventive health (vaccinations), post-natal care, fertility, pre-natal care and HIV/AIDS.

The results showed that very few members of households cared to consult any health provider in a two-week period. Only 7.64 per cent made any formal consultation. The responses from those who consulted had some pattern by quintile distribution. The percentage of those consulting increased from the 3.50 per cent in the first quintile to 12.47 per cent in the least poor or the fifth quintile. (See Table 4.1.).

Health care consultation showed a majority of people sought the services of modern medicine. In the first quintile, 25.56 per cent used modern medical services with an increasing trend to 55.96 per cent for the least poor or the fifth quintile. Although not as prevalent, it is important to note that both the non-poor and the poor patronised the traditional healer: 11.64 per cent in the first quintile decreasing to 7.71 per cent in the fifth quintile. (See Table 4.2)

The majority of respondents made their consultation at hospitals or dispensaries. Hospital consultation was 20.90 per cent for the poorest and 49.66 per cent for the least poor in the fifth quintile. Dispensary consultation was 20.57 per cent for the poorest and decreased to 6.21 per cent in the fifth or the least poor. (See Appendix A Table 8.)

TABLE 4.1
HEALTH CARE CONSULTATION BY QUINTILE

	Quintile					Sex		Total
	1	2	3	4	5	Male	Female	
Yes	3.50	5.25	6.98	8.14	12.47	7.3	8.00	7.64
No	96.50	94.75	93.02	91.86	87.53	92.7	92.00	92.36
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 4.2
HEALTH CARE CONSULTATION BY SERVICE PROVIDER
AND BY QUINTILE

	Quintile					Sex		Total
First Consultation	1	2	3	4	5	Male	Female	
Traditional Healer	11.64	10.33	8.61	6.6	7.71	9.35	7.2	8.25
Doctor	25.56	31.79	35.03	43.5	55.96	43.59	44.54	44.08
Dentist	0.2	0.08	0.81	0.62	0.59	0.56	0.53	0.54
Nurse	14.56	15.6	15.92	13.19	11.26	12.78	13.8	13.31
Medical Assistant	20.34	18.99	18.42	15.23	7.51	13.45	13.75	13.6
Midwife	0.87	0.23	0.95	1.37	0.79	0.93	0.85	0.89
Pharmacist	8.42	11.03	12.65	10.35	10.28	10.99	10.34	10.65
Traditional Birth Attendant		0.24	0.45	0.25	0.11	0.1	0.32	0.21
Spiritualist		0.54	0.66	0.39	0.43	0.38	0.5	0.44
Others	18.41	11.17	6.49	8.5	5.37	7.87	8.18	8.03
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Vaccination of Children

The vaccination of children is meant to prevent five childhood diseases, namely: tuberculosis, diphtheria, whooping cough, measles and polio. Nations of the world have made progress in the campaign to eradicate poliomyelitis (polio). These current preventive measures are meant to reduce child and under-five morbidity and mortality.


The results of the survey showed only 63.84 per cent of children had received any form of recommended vaccination against the listed preventable five childhood diseases.

Less than half or 48.85 per cent of children in the poorest households had taken any dose. The trend increased from the first quintile at 48.85 per cent to 79.71 per cent for the children in the least poor households. Most of the vaccination of children took place at a health centre with 48.30 per cent followed by 26.36 per cent in the hospitals. An interesting statistic shows that the campaign to reach people at home may be working with 11.38 per cent. This would be important to monitor in future surveys.

TABLE 4.3
VACCINATION OF CHILDREN BY QUINTILE (PER CENT)

	Quintile					Sex of Child		Total
	1	2	3	4	5	M	F	
Yes	48.85	55.93	64.02	71.97	79.71	63.67	64.02	63.84
No	51.15	44.07	35.98	28.03	20.29	36.33	35.98	36.16
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

FIGURE 4.1
PLACE OF VACCINATION OF CHILDREN



Post-Natal Care

Postnatal period falls between the delivery of the baby and six weeks after. The first 48 hours are critical to the mother and the baby because most maternal and neo-natal deaths occur during this period.

Less than one-fourth, 22.12 per cent, of women who gave birth received post-natal care within 48 hours of childbirth. Post-natal consultation increased from 14.42 per cent in the first quintile to 32.0 per cent in the fifth quintile.

TABLE 4.4
POST-NATAL CONSULTATION BY QUINTILE (PER CENT)

	Quintile					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Yes	14.42	17.48	21.39	26.19	32.02	22.12
No	85.58	82.52	78.61	73.81	69.08	77.88
Total	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Breast-Feeding

Medical experts recommend that children be exclusively breast-fed during the first six months. Almost four-fifths or 79.98 per cent of nursing mothers breast-fed their babies. The distribution across quintiles showed no particular trend. For the poorest mothers, 80.29 per cent breast-fed, while in the fifth quintile it was 79.82 per cent.

TABLE 4.5
BREAST-FEEDING BY QUINTILE (PER CENT)

	Quintile					Sex		
	1	2	3	4	5	M	F	Total
Yes	80.27	80.39	80.47	78.73	79.82	79.81	80.18	79.98
No	19.73	19.41	19.53	21.27	20.18	20.19	19.82	20.02
Total	100.00	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Type of Illness Suffered in the past one Year

Almost nine out of ten (88.34 per cent) reported that they did not suffer any illness or injury in the two weeks prior to being interviewed. (See Table 4.1.6)

TABLE 4.6
GENERAL HEALTH CONDITIONS IN THE PAST TWO WEEKS
BY QUINTILE (%)

Health Condn.	Quintile					SEX		Total
	1	2	3	4	5	M	F	
Neither	92.83	90.24	88.91	88.08	83.46	88.81	87.85	88.34
Illness	6.54	8.94	10.14	11.02	15.06	10.08	11.30	10.68
Injury	0.16	0.34	0.35	0.38	0.73	0.50	0.33	0.42
Both	0.47	0.47	0.59	0.51	0.74	0.61	0.52	0.57
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Of those that suffered illnesses in the last year, most were due to ailments that could easily be prevented or treated with known remedies. They include malaria, diarrhoea and others. Table 4.7 showed, malaria was by far the most common disease reported by the respondents. More than half (50.89 per cent) of Nigerians reported that they suffered from malaria. Other cases of illness ranged from headache at 7.92 per cent to common cold at 7.09 per cent and catarrh at 6.15 per cent.


Malaria was reported across the quintiles with no appreciable trend noted. For the first quintile it was 48.15 per cent and it moved slowly among the quintiles to 54.59 per cent for the least poor.

Other illnesses such as typhoid, common cold, catarrh, headache, diabetes and diarrhoea did not show any significant pattern across quintiles. Figure 4.2 is a graphic representation of the reported illnesses.

TABLE 4.7
TYPE OF ILLNESS SUFFERED IN THE PAST ONE YEAR

	Quintile					Sex		Total
	1	2	3	4	5	Male	Female	
Cholera	1.39	1.68	1.5	2.09	1.1	1.64	1.43	1.54
Malaria	48.15	48.06	50.15	51.39	54.59	51.5	50.26	50.89
Typhoid	2.86	2.84	3.27	4.4	5.23	3.8	3.97	3.89
Hypertension	0.25	0.35	0.55	0.77	1.18	0.63	0.73	0.68
Common Cold	6.94	7.67	7.02	7.26	6.71	6.69	7.5	7.09
Flu	0.52	0.61	0.74	0.53	0.48	0.55	0.59	0.57
Catarrh	6.2	6.91	6.65	6.14	5.22	6.08	6.22	6.15
Cough	6.43	6.23	6.24	5.91	5.16	5.68	6.16	5.92
T.B.	0.11	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.18	0.11	0.1	0.1
Headache	9.15	9.03	8.63	7.53	6.22	7.53	8.32	7.92
Diabetes	0.16	0.06	0.12	0.15	0.2	0.16	0.12	0.14
Diarrhoea	1.47	2.35	2.14	1.63	1.17	1.75	1.67	1.71
None	12.76	10.27	8.47	7.73	6.21	9.26	8.13	8.7
Others	3.6	3.88	4.46	4.4	6.37	4.62	4.79	4.7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

FIGURE 4.2
TYPE OF ILLNESS SUFFERED IN THE PAST ONE YEAR



HIV/AIDS

TABLE 4.8
HIV/AIDS RESPONSES BY QUINTILE (THOSE RESPONDING “YES”)

	QUINTILE					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Heard of HIV/AIDS	90.14	92.12	93.15	93.98	95.8	93.4
Use protection	81.43	82.52	81.02	84.61	86.1	83.5
Know where testing is done	49.89	51.71	54.4	57.45	62.2	56.2
Ever been tested	1.99	2.64	3.63	4.68	8.66	4.89
Is AIDS avoidable	75.22	77.16	78.4	81.95	84.56	80.3
Can healthy looking person have AIDS?	58.13	62.34	65.36	70.47	75.82	67.9
Heard of use of condoms to avoid STDs	71.01	71.18	75.79	81.28	84.91	78.2

Ever Heard of HIV/AIDS

Awareness of HIV/AIDS, according to Table 4.8, was 93.4 per cent. Across the quintile, it was 90.14 per cent among the poorest, rising to 95.80 per cent among the least poor in the fifth quintile.

Protection from HIV/AIDS/STDs

Table 4.8 showed that 83.5 per cent of Nigerians use protection. There was little variation across the quintiles with 81.42 per cent for the poorest and 83.53 per cent for the least poor or the fifth quintile.

Knowledge of HIV/AIDS Test Centres

The respondents were asked whether they knew where they could be tested for HIV/AIDS. Their responses in Table 4.8 showed that only 56.2 per cent had any knowledge of testing centres. However, the knowledge of any testing centre was lower, 49.89 per cent, among the poorest than among the least poor in the fifth quintile with 62.20 per cent.

Ever been tested for HIV/AIDS

Informants were asked whether they had been tested for HIV/AIDS. Only 4.89 per cent confirmed that they had done test for HIV/AIDS. Among the poorest only 1.99 per cent reported they had been tested for HIV/AIDS and 8.66 per cent among the least poor.

Is AIDS/HIV Avoidable?

The respondents were asked if HIV/AIDS was avoidable. Four out of five, 80.26 per cent of the respondents believed that HIV/AIDS was avoidable and 16.21 per cent said they did not know. Table 4.7., most respondents across the quintile believed that HIV/AIDS was avoidable with 75.22 per cent for the poorest and 84.86 per cent for the least poor.

Healthy-Looking Person Can Have HIV/AIDS

The respondents were asked if they thought a healthy looking person may have HIV/AIDS. From Table 4.8, two-thirds or 67.89 per cent of the respondents believed that a healthy-looking persons could have HIV/AIDS. Only 26.43 per cent said they

did not know. Across the quintiles, 58.13 per cent of the poorest said yes and 75.83 per cent of the least poor said 'Yes'.

Heard of Use of Condom for Protection from HIV/AIDS and STDs

The focus here was the knowledge of condom use as a major preventive method from transmitting STDs. More than three quarters or 78.15 per cent believed that the use of condom could prevent STDs. Both the poor and non-poor have knowledge of the use of condoms to avoid transmission, with 71.01 per cent for the poorest and 84.91 per cent for the least poor.

A summary review indicates that the awareness of HIV/AIDS increases through the quintiles.

Source of Information on HIV/AIDS

The major source of information of HIV/AIDS, as seen in Table 4.9 was the radio. The national percentage was 81.65 per cent. TV was only 4.22 per cent. Health workers and places of worship as foci for informing the population accounted for 2.68 per cent and 2.73 per cent respectively. The table also shows that both the non-poor and the poor listen to the radio as a source of information, with 81.70 per cent in the lowest quintile and 83.19 per cent among the least poor or the fifth quintile.

TABLE 4.9
SOURCE OF INFORMATION ON HIV/AIDS BY QUINTILE (PER CENT)

	Quintile					Total
Radio	81.70	80.94	80.27	81.22	83.19	81.65
T.V	3.88	3.04	3.96	4.26	5.19	4.22
Newspaper	0.65	0.87	0.90	0.98	1.27	0.98
Posters	1.33	1.29	1.38	1.05	1.38	1.29
Health workers	2.88	3.13	3.30	2.68	1.95	2.68
Mosques/Churches	2.43	2.99	3.22	3.09	2.15	2.73
Schools	1.17	1.33	1.12	1.27	1.04	1.17
Community meetings	0.90	1.36	1.28	0.92	0.90	1.05
Friends	4.24	4.07	3.74	3.58	2.45	3.47
Work place	0.05	0.16	0.13	0.15	0.20	0.15
Others	0.76	0.82	0.69	0.79	0.28	0.62
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Education and Poverty

Ever Attended School by Quintile

From Table 4.10, the number of Nigerians that ever attended school increased across the quintiles. There was significant difference between the quintiles as can be seen in the increase from 58.28 per cent for the poorest and 80.79 per cent for the least poor.

TABLE 4.10
EVER ATTENDED SCHOOL BY QUINTILE

	Yes	No	Total
1	58.28	41.72	100.00
2	61.17	38.83	100.00
3	66.93	33.07	100.00
4	74.26	25.74	100.00
5	80.79	19.21	100.00
Total	69.48	30.52	100.00

Ability to Read and Write in English by Quintile

Table 4.11 shows that meaningful progress could be made in reducing poverty by improving people's ability to read and write in the English language. In the first quintile about two-fifths, or 40.12 per cent, could read and write in English. In the fifth quintile, about two-thirds of the respondents could read and write in English Language.

TABLE 4.11
ABILITY TO READ AND WRITE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE BY QUINTILE

	Yes	No	Total
1	40.12	59.88	100.00
2	40.17	59.83	100.00
3	46.67	53.33	100.00
4	56.23	43.77	100.00
5	66.06	33.94	100.00
Total	52.10	47.90	100.00

A clear correlation exists in literacy rates and sector (urban/rural). As shown in Table 4.12, the national average of those who could read and write in English was 52.10 per cent. The percentage of the population in the rural areas who could read and write in English was 39.94 per cent. This is far below the national average. Among the urban population, two-thirds, 66.77 per cent, could read and write in English. This further emphasises differences between urban and rural poverty.

TABLE 4.12
ABILITY TO READ AND WRITE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE BY SECTOR

	Yes	No	Total
Urban	66.77	33.23	100.00
Rural	39.94	60.06	100.00
Total	52.10	47.90	100.00

Type of School Attended

Table 4.13 revealed that more than half of the population or 57.61 per cent attended State Government schools. About one-fifth, 18.15 per cent, attended Local Government operated schools, while a significant number (or 14.55 per cent) attended private schools.

Distribution across the quintiles showed that both the poor and non-poor attended State Government schools at the same rate, with 55.32 per cent of the poorest and 55.43 per cent for the least poor. Private school attendance clearly increased from 8.31 per cent for the poorest to 22.66 per cent for the least poor. This could again be another indication of the urban and rural patterns of poverty since most private schools are located in urban areas.

TABLE 4.13
TYPE OF SCHOOL ATTENDED

	QUINTILE					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Federal Govt.	3.41	2.6	3.57	5.4	7.69	5.02
State Government	55.32	60.41	57.2	60.08	55.43	57.61
Local Government	27.25	21.59	24.77	15.61	9.93	18.15
Religious Body	2.74	2.13	1.56	1.63	1.75	1.87
Industrial	0.49	0.64	0.22	0.49	0.11	0.35
Private	8.31	9.81	10.63	14.28	22.66	14.55
Others	2.48	2.82	2.06	2.5	2.43	2.44
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Highest Level of Education Attended

The poor were characterized by low level of education as shown in Table 4.14. The table examines the educational level of the heads of household. The percentage of heads of household with no education diminished through the quintile with 47.9 per cent in the first quintile decreasing to 24.80 in the fifth quintile.

However, the percentage of the heads of household with secondary education rose progressively from 29.48 per cent for the poorest to 47.86 per cent in the fifth quintile. Tertiary level education increased from 1.82 per cent in the first quintile to 9.10 per cent for the least poor.

TABLE 4.14
HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTENDED

	Quintiles					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
No Education	47.92	46.44	39.86	31.17	24.80	36.72
Primary	20.78	20.96	22.86	22.44	18.24	20.02
Secondary	29.48	30.72	35.12	42.15	47.86	38.08
Tertiary	1.82	1.88	2.17	4.24	9.10	4.24
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Housing and Quality of Life

The housing conditions of a household provide good indicators of welfare measurement. The survey sought information on the type of dwelling, occupancy status of the owner, expenditure, water and sanitation and other amenities.

Type of Dwelling

The results of the survey showed that about two-thirds of the population, or 65.86 per cent of households, lived in single-room dwellings. Almost one-quarter or 24.10 per cent of all households occupied whole buildings.

The distribution by quintile showed that 72.41 per cent of the poorest lived in single-room dwellings. By contrast, it is interesting to note that more than half or 56.4 per cent of the least poor lived in single rooms. Apartment occupancy increases across the quintiles with 4.15 per cent in the poorest and 14.88 per cent in the fifth quintile.

Once again, this is an indication of the differences in urban and rural patterns of poverty since most rented dwellings are found in urban areas.

TABLE 4.15
HOUSING BY DWELLING TYPE BY QUINTILE (PER CENT)

	Quintile					
	1	2	3	4	5	
Single Room	72.41	72.88	67.83	63.65	56.40	65.86
Apartment or Flat	4.15	4.00	4.39	8.17	14.88	7.63
Duplex	0.46	0.55	0.57	0.85	1.87	0.92
Whole Building	21.12	20.93	25.73	26.09	25.54	24.10
Others	1.87	1.64	1.49	1.24	1.31	1.48
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Occupancy Status

The occupancy status of the households showed 73.17 per cent of Nigerians owned their accommodation. When this was broken down, heads of households owned 68.05 per cent, spouses of head of household owned 1.9 per cent while joint ownership by heads and spouses accounted for 3.22 per cent. The number of owner-occupiers was highest with 81.3 per cent in the second quintile.

Only 16.0 per cent of the households accounted for rented accommodations at the national level. The percentage of rented accommodation increased from 12.01 per cent in the first quintile to 24.21 per cent in the fifth quintile.

TABLE 4.16
OCCUPANCY STATUS BY QUINTILE (PER CENT)

	QUINTILE					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Owned by Head of Household	75.83	76.64	74.95	63.06	55.14	68.05
Owned by spouse	1.49	1.81	1.95	2.07	2.09	1.90
Owned by Head and Spouse	2.70	2.85	2.54	4.15	3.59	3.22
Household Rents the Dwelling	12.01	11.45	12.18	17.41	24.21	16.06
Pay Nominal Subsidised Rent	2.39	2.45	2.61	4.66	6.44	3.91
Uses Without Paying Rent	5.41	4.74	5.67	8.41	8.27	6.68
Nomadic or Temporary Housing	0.18	0.06	0.11	0.24	0.26	0.18
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Housing Condition: Utilities and Amenities

Electricity Supply

The primary source of lighting for many Nigerian households was kerosene. This accounted for almost half of population or 49.66 per cent. Use of public electricity accounted for 45.39 per cent. However there is a clear dichotomy in usage patterns

with kerosene more prevalent in the poorest households with 60.62 per cent and 32.77 per cent for the fifth quintile. The use of electric power supply was lowest (32.41 per cent) for the lowest quintile and highest (63.35 per cent) for the highest quintile (See Appendix A Table 9).

This survey showed patterns of usage typical of rural and urban settlement with electric power being more readily available in urban areas.

Sources of Fuel for Cooking

More than two thirds, 69.98 per cent, of the households use firewood as their main source of fuel for cooking. More than one-fourth, 26.55 per cent, used kerosene, while only 1.1 per cent used gas. The use of firewood was common to all the five quintiles. It was highest 81.33 per cent for the second quintile and lowest 51.92 per cent for the fifth quintile. It was a reverse pattern for the use of kerosene, where 19.82 per cent was reported in the first quintile and 42.37 per cent for the fifth quintile.

TABLE 4.17
MAIN SOURCES OF FUEL FOR COOKING BY QUINTILE (%)

	Quintile					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Firewood	76.43	81.33	79.27	67.5	51.92	69.98
Charcoal	0.87	0.77	0.59	0.81	1.09	0.84
Kerosene/Oil	19.82	15.78	18.7	30.03	42.37	26.55
Gas	0.35	0.62	0.48	0.46	3.1	1.11
Electricity	0.77	0.23	0.23	0.45	0.84	0.52
Crop Residue or Sawdust	0.14	0.11	0.06	0.05	0.08	0.09
Animal Waste	0.06	0.14	0.06	0.1	0.02	0.07
Other	1.56	1.02	0.61	0.61	0.58	0.84
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Materials for Wall Construction

Less than half or 44.45 per cent of all households use mud to construct the walls of their dwellings. Almost an equal number 45.17 per cent use cements or concrete's to construct their walls. Even though the use of mud and cement were almost equal, the quintile distribution gave the true picture of the levels of usage.

The use of mud was highest with 58.47 per cent for the poorest households and 24.56 per cent for least poor households. The use of cements or concrete rose from 29.96 per cent in the first quintile to 65.89 per cent in the fifth quintile (See Appendix 4.4)

Main Flooring Materials

The primary material used by households for the construction of floors was cement or concrete. It accounted for 61.56 per cent for all Nigerian households. According to the quintile distribution the use of cement or concrete increased from 46.25 per cent in the first quintile to 78.27 per cent in the fifth quintile. (See Appendix A Table 11)

Main Roofing Materials

In the case of roofing materials more than two-thirds or 68.65 per cent of all households lived in houses roofed with corrugated iron sheets. This was followed by 11.07 per cent with mud or mud bricks roofs. The quintile distribution among the

households clearly correlated roofing material with poverty. The use of mud or mud bricks roofs was highest 18.43 per cent among the poorest households and only 4.10 per cent among the fifth quintile. The use of corrugated iron sheets increased from 54.14 per cent in the first quintile to 80.87 per cent in the fifth quintile. (See Appendix A table 12)

Water Supplies and Sanitation

Access to improved water sources not only refers to water quality but proximity. Water supplies are generally classified as safe or unsafe. The households having access to safe drinking water sources are those that use any of the following types of supply: pipe water, untreated pipe, borehole and protected well. Using this definition, over 60.0 per cent of the households have access to safe water. It is interesting to observe that more than half of the households, 55.48 per cent, in the lowest quintile had access to safe drinking water, while more than two-thirds 68.68 per cent had access to safe drinking water among the least poor households.

The increase of pipe-borne water across quintiles is likewise indicative of urban water supply.

TABLE 4.18 :SOURCES OF WATER

	QUINTILE					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Pipe-Borne	14.93	16.11	16.85	23.62	27.78	20.48
Untreated Pipe	3.97	2.98	3.69	2.7	2.9	3.21
Borehole/Hand Pump	18.81	16.87	18.33	17.61	22.34	18.97
Protected Well	18.77	19.06	20.79	18.26	15.67	18.35
Unprotected Well or Rainwater	22.82	22.89	16.12	13.1	9.23	16.17
River, Lake or Pond	15.41	16.37	17.79	16.93	13.9	15.99
Vendor or Water Truck	2.66	3.75	4.46	5.3	5.78	4.52
Others	2.64	1.98	1.95	2.5	2.4	2.3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Type of Refuse Disposal System

Distribution of households by types of refuse disposal system across quintiles indicated that 85.46 per cent of the households in the country disposed of their refuse in unsatisfactory places. This includes places such as within the compound and other unauthorised places.

Sanitation is a big problem as shown by the quintile distribution of the households and has environmental implication. There was no pattern identified across quintiles except a nominal increase in government and private collection in the higher quintiles. The disposal of refuse through unwholesome methods was 80.97 per cent for the poorest households, while the fifth quintile was 76.96 per cent.

**TABLE 4.19
TYPE OF REFUSE DISPOSAL SYSTEM**

	Quintile					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Government Collection	2.5	4.71	4.36	5.56	6.55	4.88
Private Collection	11.56	5.52	4.73	7.52	8.89	7.68
Government Bin	1.34	1.29	1.31	1.35	4.01	1.98
Disposal Within Compound	43.91	43.21	41.53	40.69	39.33	41.53
Unauthorized Heap	37.06	41.6	44.99	41.56	37.63	40.48

Other	3.64	3.67	3.08	3.31	3.58	3.45
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Access to Sanitary Means of Excreta Disposal

Sanitary means of excreta disposal include flush toilets connected to sewage systems or septic tanks, improved pit latrines and traditional pit latrines with cover. More than half or 58.11 per cent of Nigerian households used pit toilets. The number of households that used pail, bush, river/stream, toilet on water or any other types of unconventional methods accounted for 27.17 per cent. Excreta disposal, like the disposal of refuse, is a big problem that needs urgent attention as it has health implications. The quintile distribution did not show any identifiable pattern of distribution.

TABLE 4.20
ACCESS TO SANITARY MEANS OF EXCRETA DISPOSAL

	Quintile					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
None	8.33	6.36	8.23	7.6	5.56	7.13
Toilet on Water	1.49	3.43	3.64	6.68	6.79	4.64
Flush to Sewer	3.53	2.58	3.56	6.14	9.52	5.38
Flush to Septic	6.01	3.39	3.05	6.72	12.07	6.6
Pail or Bucket	3.65	4.76	5.48	4.38	4.25	4.5
Covered Pit Latrine	47.96	50.92	51.34	46.32	41.96	47.32
Uncovered Pit Latrine	11.89	15.15	12.85	10.55	9.56	11.79
VIP Latrine	2.37	1.47	1.35	1.5	1.98	1.73
Other	14.78	11.94	10.51	10.12	8.32	10.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Chapter Five

POVERTY AND AGRICULTURE

Poverty and the Agricultural Sector

Important determinants of living conditions of households and their members will be the economic activities in which they are engaged and the returns they are able to reap there from. For many households in Nigeria, especially in the rural areas, agriculture is the main activity, and previous and current analysis of poverty has shown that poverty is disproportionately concentrated among households whose primary livelihood lie in agricultural activities. Agriculture has been focused as a central element of Poverty reduction strategy. It is, therefore, important to understand the factors responsible for poverty in this sector. Some key issues explored in this analysis include Ownership of Land, Ownership of Livestock and Use of Inputs.

PARTICIPATION IN AGRICULTURE BY SECTOR

FIG. 5.1
PARTICIPATION IN AGRICULTURE BY SECTOR




TABLE 5.1
AGRICULTURAL PARTICIPATION BY ZONE AND GENDER

Zone	Agriculture	Non-Agriculture	Total
South South	20.90	79.10	100
South East	25.96	74.04	100
South West	9.25	90.75	100
North Central	26.41	73.59	100
North East	30.38	69.62	100
North West	22.22	77.78	100
Sex			
Male	27.60	72.40	100
Female	15.34	84.66	100

Participation in agriculture was found to be more predominant in rural areas, with about 86 per cent of households engaged in the sector. On a zonal basis, most of the households participating in the sector were in the Northeast (30 per cent), while the Southwest had the least participation of 9 per cent. The Northern States were more engaged in agriculture than their Southern counterparts. A look at Northern States such as Benue (47 per cent), Jigawa (38 per cent), Borno (35 per cent) and Southern States such as Lagos (0.79 per cent), Osun (7.9 per cent) and Ogun (9.9 per cent) is revealing. (See Appendix A Table 13)

TABLE 5.2
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL BY OCCUPATION (AGRIC. & NON-AGRIC.)

	Occupation		Total
	Agric. Occupation	Non Agric. Occupation	
No Education	54.41	24.04	30.58
Elementary	1.20	2.82	2.47
Primary	6.86	21.64	18.45
Secondary	29.31	40.49	38.08
Tertiary	0.88	5.16	4.24
Others	7.34	5.86	6.18
TOTAL	100.00	100.00	100.00

By gender, the males participated more than the females. The poor were found to participate more in agriculture, which supports the previous findings. About 54 per cent of those that participated in the sector had no education, followed by those with secondary education (29 per cent).

Incidence and Profile of Poverty among Farmers

This section presents the poverty status of operators in the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors. Households were classified according to the main occupational groups and in terms of their location educational level and age groups. These groups were then compared in terms of their poverty status.

FIG 5.2
POVERTY INCIDENCE BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP




TABLE 5.3
RELATIVE POVERTY INCIDENCE BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

Occupational Group	Poverty Classification			Total
	Core Poor	Moderately Poor	Non-Poor	
Agricultural Occupation	25.15	37.45	37.40	100.00
Non-Agricultural Occupation	20.28	33.66	46.06	100.00
Total	21.33	34.48	44.19	100.00

Table 5.3 showed that poor households are more in agricultural occupation (62 per cent) than in non-agricultural occupation (54 per cent). The gap in poverty levels of farm households and non-farming households was at 9 per cent.

TABLE 5.4
AGRICULTURE POPULATION BY SECTOR AND RELATIVE POVERTY INCIDENCE

Sector	Poverty Classification			Total
	Core Poor	Moderately Poor	Non- Poor	
Urban	18.03	38.06	43.91	100.00
Rural	26.27	37.35	36.38	100.00
Total	25.15	37.45	37.40	100.00

Table 5.4 indicated that about 56 per cent of farmers living in the urban areas were poor, while about 63 per cent of those in the rural areas were poor.

TABLE 5.5
AGRICULTURE POPULATION BY ZONE AND RELATIVE INCIDENCE

Zone	Poverty Classification			Total
	Core Poor	Moderately Poor	Non-Poor	
South South	9.65	46.61	43.73	100.00
South East	5.90	31.82	62.28	100.00
South West	7.39	31.78	60.83	100.00
North Central	29.01	33.96	37.03	100.00
North East	34.33	41.78	23.90	100.00
North West	42.54	36.68	20.79	100.00
Total	25.15	37.45	37.40	100.00

The table above shows that there were more poor farmers in the northern zones than in the southern zones. While the south east had the lowest proportion of farmers (37 per cent), the north west had the highest proportion (96 per cent). The moderately poor were evenly distributed among the zones, while the southern zones had the lowest core poor.

TABLE 5.6
AGRICULTURE POPULATION BY SEX AND
RELATIVE INCIDENCE

Sector	Poverty Classification			Total
	Core Poor	Moderately Poor	Non- Poor	
Male	29.21	37.30	33.49	100.00
Female	17.68	37.71	44.61	100.00
Total	25.15	37.45	37.40	100.00

By gender close to 67 per cent of male holders were poor, while about 56 per cent of female holders were poor. The proportion of core poor among the female holders was lower than that among male holders.

TABLE 5.7
AGRICULTURE POPULATION BY EDUCATIONAL GROUP AND
RELATIVE POVERTY INCIDENCE

Education Level	Poverty Classification			Total
	Core Poor	Moderately Poor	Non- Poor	
No Education	29.88	37.21	32.91	100.00
Elementary	29.58	36.57	33.85	100.00
Primary	19.85	38.29	41.86	100.00
Secondary	15.64	37.85	46.50	100.00
Tertiary	12.59	22.46	64.95	100.00
Others	33.83	38.75	27.42	100.00
Total	25.15	37.45	37.40	100.00

Table 5.7 showed that farmers with no education were more likely to be in poverty than the educated farmers, the prevalence of poverty among farmers with no education was 68 per cent, while for farmers with tertiary education it was about 35 per cent. Core poverty decreased with increase in educational level.

TABLE 5.8
AGRICULTURE POPULATION BY AGE GROUP AND
RELATIVE POVERTY INCIDENCE

Age Group	Poverty Classification			Total
	Core Poor	Moderately Poor	Non-Poor	
5 to 9 years	45.60	35.49	18.91	100.00
10 to 14 years	43.79	37.65	18.56	100.00
15 to 19 years	38.24	36.91	25.57	100.00
20 to 24 years	26.38	38.34	35.27	100.00
25 to 29 years	21.93	36.55	41.52	100.00
30 to 34 years	22.46	40.14	37.40	100.00
35 to 39 years	25.54	39.68	34.78	100.00
40 to 44 years	24.53	41.11	34.36	100.00
45 to 49 years	22.29	41.15	36.56	100.00
50 to 54 years	22.43	37.61	39.95	100.00
55 to 59 years	19.32	37.82	42.86	100.00
60 to 64 years	17.74	32.95	49.31	100.00
65 to 69 years	14.03	30.38	55.59	100.00
70 and above	16.27	29.75	53.98	100.00
Total	25.15	37.45	37.40	100.00

By age group, poverty was highest among the young farmers. Farmers between ages 10-14years had about 82percent of them in poverty, while those aged 65 to 69 years had about 45 per cent in poverty. Core poverty was lower for farmers aged 55 and above.

TABLE 5.9
OWNERSHIP OF FARM LAND BY ZONE

Zone	Per Cent that Owned Land
South South	41.48
South East	62.96
South West	16.25
North Central	41.03
North East	69.49
North West	62.18
Total	48.13

TABLE 5.10
OWNERSHIP OF FARMLAND BY SEX AND QUINTILES

Quintile	Male	Female	Total
Q1	21.03	11.08	20.28
Q2	21.85	14.17	21.28
Q3	22.58	14.78	21.99
Q4	18.69	27.23	19.33
Q5	15.85	32.77	17.11
Total	100	100	100

Access to land is a key issue in agriculture. According to the result of NLSS, about 72 per cent of households that own land resided in the rural areas, while only 17.4 per cent resided in the urban areas. On a zonal basis, most households that own land were in the Northeast (69.5 per cent), followed by Southeast with 63 per cent and Northwest with 62 per cent. When disaggregated by sex and quintiles, majority of males in the moderately poor quintile (22 per cent) owned land, followed by those in the poorest quintile (21 per cent). By gender, the non-poor females owned more farmland (33 per cent), while the poorest group of the females owned less land (11 per cent). Conversely, the poorest males owned more land (21 per cent) than the richest.

Ownership of Farm Land with Deed

TABLE 5.11
OWNERSHIP OF FARM LAND WITH DEED BY QUINTILE

Quintile	Ownership with Deed
Q1	15.44
Q2	19.14
Q3	21.93
Q4	21.19
Q5	22.50
Total	100

The table above showed that the percentage of households that owned land with deeds and without deeds is lowest for the poorest quintile (15.44 per cent with deeds). A large percentage of the holders in the lowest quintile owned land but this

analysis showed that most of the land owned by them had no deed of ownership. A larger proportion of holders in the highest quintile had deeds for their lands. Ownership of land with deed increase with increased in quintile.

On a gender basis, 67 per cent of male holders that owned land had deeds, while only 46 per cent of the female holders had deeds for their lands.

Ownership of Livestock by Zone

The type of livestock owned by households varied from zone to zone, but ownership of goats, chicken and pigs cut across all zones. Draught animals were predominantly in the Northwest (80 per cent) and the Northeast 18 per cent, Rabbits were mainly in the Southeast (55 per cent), while Southwest and Northcentral had more fish. (See Appendix A, Table 15)

TABLE 5.12
OWNERSHIP OF LIVESTOCK BY SECTOR

Type of Livestock	SECTOR		
	URBAN	RURAL	TOTAL
Draught Animals	3.71	96.29	100.00
Cattle	4.96	95.04	100.00
Sheep	12.42	87.58	100.00
Goats	11.93	88.07	100.00
Pigs	12.85	87.15	100.00
Rabbits	18.04	81.96	100.00
Chickens	11.53	88.47	100.00
Other Poultry	12.27	87.73	100.00
Other Livestock	2.98	97.02	100.00
Fish	68.55	31.45	100.00
Crabs	21.22	78.78	100.00
Others	20.51	79.49	100.00
Total	18.98	81.02	100.00

By sector, all livestock, except fish, were predominantly owned by households in the rural areas. By gender, the males owned most of the livestock (91 per cent for males and 9 per cent for females). (See Table 5.12)

TABLE 5.13
OWNERSHIP OF LIVESTOCK BY SEX

Type of Livestock	SEX		TOTAL
	MALE	FEMALE	
Draught Animals	98.41	1.59	100.00
Cattle	99.48	0.52	100.00
Sheep	96.87	3.13	100.00
Goats	91.91	8.09	100.00
Pigs	95.07	4.93	100.00
Chickens	88.97	11.03	100.00
Other Poultry	96.39	3.61	100.00
Other Livestock	93.36	6.64	100.00
Fish	82.70	17.30	100.00
Crabs	69.90	30.10	100.00
Others	84.31	15.69	100.00
Total	91.29	8.71	100.00

Ownership of Livestock by occupational groups showed expectedly, people in agriculture and forestry owning more livestock (78 per cent), while those in

administration/clerical group had only 0.2 per cent of them owning livestock. (See Appendix A Table 16)

Primary Crops Grown in Last 12 Months Preceding Survey

Of the 37 major crops grown by households in Nigeria, cassava was grown mainly in the Southsouth (67.6 per cent), Southeast (50.74 per cent) and Southwest (42.59 per cent), while guineacorn was predominantly grown in the North, with Northwest growing most of it (41.27 per cent), followed by Northeast (33.37 per cent). Cocoa was discovered to be grown mainly in the Southwest, while yam was more prevalent in the Southeast. (See Appendix A Table 17)

The higher quintiles grow more bananas (40.47 per cent), coconut (60.36 per cent), coffee (100 per cent), cocoa (41.15 per cent), oil palm (41.03 per cent), pineapple (49.21 per cent), pawpaw (52.18 per cent) and tomatoes (45.81 per cent), while the lowest quintiles grew more of egg plants (54.32 per cent) and tobacco (53.28 per cent). (See Appendix A Table 18)

When disaggregated by gender, it was found that males grew more guineacorn (22.67 per cent), while the females grew more of cassava (31.77 per cent). The participation of both sexes in the growth of the other crops showed no significant difference. (See Appendix A Table 19)

Use of Agricultural Inputs

The most important purchased agricultural inputs used by holders were hired labour, organic and inorganic fertiliser, local hand tools. By quintiles, the highest quintiles used more purchased seed (38.33 per cent), petrol (40.36 per cent), spare parts (46.71 per cent), hired labour (32.10 per cent), imported hand tools (35.78 per cent) and hiring of equipment (66.13 per cent). The lowest quintile used more of organic fertiliser (26.04 per cent), herbicides (23.17 per cent), irrigation (25.83 per cent), and compensation (23.56 per cent). (See Appendix A Table 22)

Gender disaggregation of use of agricultural inputs showed that of all the inputs, the males used more of organic fertiliser, hired labour and local hand tools. There was no marked difference in the use of agricultural inputs by gender, though it is interesting to note that the females used more inorganic facilities. Generally, there was low level of use of agricultural inputs (See Appendix A 23).

Processing of Food Crops

Processing of food is an important use of agricultural output. Most food processing activities were evenly distributed among the quintiles, with the exception of cassava processing and processed fish, which was done in higher proportion by the highest quintile. The lowest quintile were engaged more in yam flour processing. By gender, the males processed more husk and polished rice, maize flour, fish, yam flour than the females, while the females were more involved than the males in the processing of cassava flour, shelled nuts and gari.

Zonal disaggregation showed Southsouth processing more gari (71.72 per cent), followed by Southeast with 49.52 per cent. Northeast and Northwest processed other types of flour. Processing of other food items was evenly distributed within the zones. By sector, food processing was found to be predominantly done in the rural areas. Gari was processed more than any other produce. (See Appendix A Table 24- 26)

Sources of Raw Materials


The three categories of sources of raw materials were **own produce, purchased and gift**.

TABLE 5.14
SOURCES OF RAW MATERIALS BY SEX

Sources	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
Own Produce	45.61	54.39	100
Purchased	47.74	52.26	100
Gift	22.27	77.73	100
Other Sources	36.60	63.40	100

The males purchased most of the raw materials while most of the raw materials used by the females were gifts. Generally females fared better than the males in the three sources of raw materials.

FIG 5.3
SALE OF PRODUCE BY QUINTILE



Sale of Agricultural Produce

TABLE 5.15
SALE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE BY QUINTILE, SEX AND EDUCATION

Quintile	Sale of Produce
Q1	8.44
Q2	15.11
Q3	19.73
Q4	25.83
Q5	30.87
Total	100
Educational Level	
No Education	45.87
Elementary	1.29
Primary	8.23
Secondary	39.40
Tertiary	0.98
Total	100
Sex	
Male	38.80
Female	61.20
Total	100

Respondents were asked if agricultural produce was sold in the last 2 weeks preceding the survey. The responses revealed that people with no education sold more produce (45.87 per cent), followed by people with secondary education (39.4 per cent).

By quintile distribution, the highest quintile sold more farm produce (30.87 per cent). The sale of farm produce increased with increase in quintile.

Sale of agricultural produce by gender revealed that the females sold more produce than the males. The percentage was 61.20 per cent for females and 38.80 per cent for the males.


Chapter Six

GENDER AND POVERTY

Gender has been discovered to be an important dimension in which to disaggregate poverty. The NLSS data are used to examine the relationship between gender and poverty and to describe the patterns of poverty across gender. Gender refers to the differential roles of women and men, boys and girls, which add a gender dimension to poverty analysis. If men and women, boys and girls had similar responsibilities inside and outside the household, were subject to the same constraints and demonstrate similar living standard, then gender would be an unimportant factor for analysis.

The NLSS analysis of gender and poverty focuses mainly on heads of households and not individual members. It looks at how male-headed and female-headed households experience poverty using a number of indicators.

**FIG 6.1
POVERTY PYRAMID**



Adapted from a pyramid of poverty concept (Baulch 1996)

Note:

PC = Personal Consumption

CPR = Common Property Resources

SPC = State Provided Commodities

Figure 6.1 presents a poverty pyramid in which Personal Consumption (PC) is only one element. Other elements are enjoyment of Common Property Resources (CPR) such as forest, rivers, etc, State Provided Commodities (SPC) such as health care and education, assets such as land and equipment. Besides these tangible dimensions, poverty also includes lack of dignity and autonomy and free time.

Nature and Trends of Relative Poverty By Gender, Zone

Incidence of poverty in the previous analysis and the current one is calculated for female- and male-headed households as a measure of gender and poverty. Comparisons were generally made between the incidence of consumption poverty among female-headed households and that among the male-headed households. The result of this comparison has revealed no general association between poverty and female-headship of household.

FIG 6.2
RELATIVE POVERTY OF HEAD BY GENDER




TABLE 6.1.
POVERTY AND GENDER OF HOUSEHOLD HEAD

Year	Male-Headed			Female-Headed		
	Non-Poor	Poor	Total	Non-Poor	Poor	Total
1980	70.8	29.2	100	73.1	26.9	100
1985	52.7	47.3	100	61.4	38.6	100
1992	56.9	43.1	100	60.1	39.9	100
1996	33.6	66.4	100	41.5	58.5	100
2004	41.8	58.2	100	56.5	43.5	100

The table above reveals that male-headed households are more likely to be in poverty than female-headed ones. Previous and current analysis also shows that female-headed households are smaller in size and their educational level generally high. The household size of 50 per cent of female-headed households was 2-4 persons, while the household size of about 46 per cent of male-headed households was 5-9 persons.

Female-headed households constituted only about 16 per cent of the households, and most of them were widows while most of the male-headed households were in monogamous marriages.

The size of the household was found to be a major determinant of the level of poverty. The larger the household, the higher the level of poverty. Households headed by persons without education had a higher chance of being in poverty.

TABLE 6.2.
PER CAPITA EXPENDITURE BY SEX OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, 2004

Expenditure Source	Male-Headed	Female-Headed
Proportion of Expenditure on Food	0.562	0.501
Own Consumption	0.263	0.228
Total Food	0.825	0.729
Non-Food Expenditure	0.094	0.105
Health	0.150	0.151
Rent	0.340	0.420
Total Absolute Expenditure on Food	16,991	18,687
Non-Food		
	17,746	22,521

Almost 50 per cent of total expenditure by both female- and male-headed households was on food. The proportion was 56 per cent for the male-headed and 50 per cent for the female-headed households. In absolute terms, the female-headed household spent more on food and non-food items.

Occupational Groups

TABLE 6.3
OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS BY GENDER, 2004

Occupational Group	Male	Female
Student/Retired/Unemployed/Inactive	32.52	46.16
Professional or technical	5.84	2.79
Administration	0.25	0.07
Clerical	5.15	1.71
Sales and related activities	8.09	14.31
Services and related activities	3.48	11.39
Agriculture and Forestry	36.06	20.09
Production and Transport	2.27	2.98
Manufacturing and Processing	2.05	0.04
Others	4.28	0.44
Total	100	100

Most of the males were engaged in agriculture and forestry (36.06 per cent), while most of the females were in the students, retired unemployed or inactive category (46.16 per cent). About 20 per cent of the females were engaged in agriculture and forestry; females were more than males in sales and related activities (14.3 per cent for females and 8.0 per cent for males). The quintile distributions showed that the poorest of the males were engaged in agriculture and forestry, while the poorest females were students, retired and unemployed.

Engagement in unpaid labour for households, when disaggregated into quintiles by sex, did not exhibit any noticeable difference between the sexes and the poorest and the rich.

TABLE 6.4
OCCUPATIONAL GROUP BY SEX AND QUINTILES

Sex	Occupational Group	Quint 1	Quint 2	Quint 3	Quint 4	Quint 5	Total
Male	Student, Retired, Unemployed or Inactive	31.17	31.26	31.68	35.57	32.22	32.52
	Professional or Technical	3.74	3.35	3.99	6.10	9.37	5.84
	Administration	0.16	0.18	0.34	0.07	0.43	0.25
	Clerical	3.61	3.42	3.88	5.54	7.48	5.15
	Sales and related	4.66	5.61	6.87	8.37	11.93	8.09
	Services and related	2.86	2.86	3.25	3.37	4.39	3.48
	Agricultural and Forestry	47.49	47.36	42.21	32.35	22.32	36.06
	Production and Transport	1.06	1.59	2.10	2.39	3.34	2.27
	Manufacturing and Processing	1.62	1.25	1.99	2.20	2.67	2.05
	Others	3.63	3.12	3.68	4.05	5.85	4.28
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
							0
Sex	Occupational Group	Quint 1	Quint. 2	Quint. 3	Quint. 4	Quint 5	Total
Female	Student, Retired, Unemployed or Inactive	49.71	48.26	47.61	45.45	42.25	46.16
	Professional or Technical	1.13	1.59	1.80	2.43	5.56	2.79
	Administration	0.09		0.09		0.17	0.07
	Clerical	1.03	0.72	0.92	1.89	3.14	1.71
	Sales and related	12.89	11.99	11.66	15.64	17.31	14.31
	Services and related	15.12	15.04	12.69	9.47	7.57	11.39
	Agricultural and Forestry	18.02	19.76	22.36	21.03	19.25	20.09
	Production and Transport	1.77	2.26	2.48	3.52	4.08	2.98
	Manufacturing and processing	0.04			0.03	0.11	0.04
	Others	0.22	0.38	0.39	0.54	0.57	0.44
	Total	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	100.0	100.0
							0

Education

Literacy

Literacy, the ability to read and write in English or any Nigerian language or both was analysed for person's aged 5 years and older.

TABLE 6.5
ABILITY TO READ AND WRITE IN ENGLISH OR ANY NIGERIAN
LANGUAGE BY SEX

Literacy	Male	Female	Total
Literacy in English Language	59.80	44.57	52.10
Literacy in Nigerian Language	35.30	48.24	41.85
Literacy in English & Nigerian Languages	87.96	86.76	87.35

Ability to read and write in English was higher for the males (59.80 per cent) than for the females (44.57 per cent). Conversely, the females fared better in ability to read and write in Nigerian language. There was no large difference in the ability of both sexes to read and write in English and any Nigerian language.

TABLE 6.6
LITERACY IN ENGLISH, NIGERIAN LANGUAGE AND
BOTH LANGUAGES BY QUINTILE AND SEX

Quintile	Sex	Literacy in English	Literacy in Nigerian Language	Literacy in Both
Q1	M	56.62	47.21	50.61
	F	43.38	52.79	49.39
Q2	M	56.17	47.03	50.31
	F	43.83	52.97	49.69
Q3	M	56.09	46.63	50.46
	F	43.91	53.37	49.54
Q4	M	53.50	45.65	49.69
	F	46.50	54.35	50.31
Q5	M	56.57	43.74	51.78
	F	43.43	56.26	48.22

There was no noticeable difference in literacy in English, Nigerian Language and both languages between the poor, moderately poor and the rich. Average literacy level in English for the males was above 50 per cent for all quintiles, while it was above 40 per cent for the females.

School Attendance

FIG 6.3
SCHOOL ATTENDANCE BY SEX AND QUINTILE




TABLE 6.7
SCHOOL ATTENDANCE BY SEX AND QUINTILE

Quintile	Male	Female	Total
Q1	55.09	44.91	100.00
Q2	54.59	45.41	100.00
Q3	54.34	45.66	100.00
Q4	52.84	47.16	100.00
Q5	54.88	45.12	100.00
Total	54.30	45.70	100.00

The total average school attendance level was above 54 per cent for males and 45.7 per cent for females without any notable difference by quintiles for both sexes.

HIV/AIDS and Reproductive Health

TABLE 6.8
HIV/AIDS INDICATORS

Indicators	Male	Female	Total
Use of Protection	84.82	82.28	83.53
Heard of HIV/AIDS	94.77	92.11	98.43
Know Test Centres	58.78	53.58	56.19
Ever Been Tested of HIV AIDS	4.74	5.05	4.89
Is AIDS Avoidable?	81.57	78.94	80.26
Heard of Use of Condom to Avoid STDs	80.93	75.35	78.15
Ever Used Condom	22.81	15.77	19.42

Gender disaggregated Information on HIV/AIDS presented above showed that both sexes were at par in all indicators. The areas of concern were: being tested for HIV/AIDS and use of condom for protection. The percentage of males that had been tested was 4.7 per cent and about 5 per cent for females. For use of condom for protection, the males had 22.8 per cent, while the females had 15.8 per cent. There was no significant difference between the poorest and the rich in use of condom.

TABLE 6.9
REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH INDICATORS

Indicators	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Total
Ever been Pregnant	67.60	71.16	68.71	62.59	57.66	64.80
Received Pre-natal Care	32.13	34.66	43.91	56.61	66.55	48.03
Use Contraceptives	6.23	6.53	8.22	9.04	13.36	9.06

Reproductive Health (Women Aged 15-49 years)

Pre-natal care presented by Quintiles showed that the first Quintile received less care. Pre-natal care increased with the quintiles. First quintile had 32.1 per cent, 2nd quintile 34.7 per cent, Q3 43.9 per cent, Q4 56.6 per cent and Q5 66.6 per cent. Use of contraceptives did not exhibit significant difference by consumption quintiles. There was low rate of use of contraceptives by both the poor and the rich.

Age at first birth increased with increase in quintiles. The poorest (Q1) got pregnant earlier (about 19 years) than the rich (Q5) (21 years). There was no significant difference between the poor and the rich in preference for either male or female child.

TABLE 6.10
PRIMARY METHOD OF CONTRACEPTIVE BY QUINTILE

	QUINTILE					Total
	Quintile 1	Quintile 2	Quintile 3	Quintile 4	Quintile 5	Total
Pill	17.93	14.43	18.91	14.56	22.36	18.55
Condom	41.17	38.52	33.42	37.27	36.86	37.09
Injection	12.83	10.27	9.40	10.47	12.77	11.40
IUD	2.79	0.37	3.16	2.67	3.38	2.75
Traditional Method	5.55	5.58	5.82	5.34	4.11	5.02
Abstinence	10.64	12.71	17.38	15.36	8.28	12.20
Withdrawal	3.29	9.29	4.74	8.92	5.79	6.44
Rhythm	0.38		1.67	0.71	0.78	0.77
Others	7.02	8.16	5.25	5.12	4.47	4.36
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Contraceptive prevalence was generally low for all methods, except use of condom. Condom was mostly used by the poorest (41 per cent) against 37 per cent reported for the rich.

TABLE 6.11
PREFERRED SEX FOR NEXT CHILD

Method	Quintile 1	Quintile 2	Quintile 3	Quintile 4	Quintile 5	Total
Male	22.09	22.72	23.72	23.85	26.91	23.98
Female	23.37	22.59	21.26	22.35	22.21	22.23
Either	54.55	54.69	55.03	53.80	50.88	53.89
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Time Use

From section 5 of the NLSS questionnaire, a time allocation was constructed for each household member aged 5 years and above. The profile consisted of the number of hours spent in the 7 days prior to the interview on house-keeping activities.

TABLE 6.12
TIME USE ON HOUSEHOLD ACTIVITIES BY SEX

Activity	Time Use		Total
	Male	Female	
Recreation	8.24	8.31	8.27
Fetching wood	5.64	5.36	5.48
Fetching water	4.65	4.78	4.72
Ironing	3.44	3.36	3.41
Child Care	9.87	17.23	15.51
Washing Vehicle	4.28	5.99	4.81
Sweeping	3.70	4.67	4.37
Disposing garbage	3.41	3.39	3.40
Cooking	6.62	10.11	9.44
Going to Market	6.67	6.20	6.41
Running errands	4.89	4.53	4.71
Washing dishes	3.81	4.55	4.53
Other household work	4.59	5.62	5.22
Care of the elderly	8.15	9.78	9.13
Total	77.96	93.87	89.27

From the above table a number of observations could be made. Generally, females spent more time than males on house-keeping activities generally. Most of the time was spent on child care (17.23 hours), cooking (10.11 hrs) and care of the elderly (9.78 hrs). Conversely, the males spent more time than the females (though marginally) on fetching wood, ironing and going to market. On the average, the females spent about 15 hours a day on household activities, while the males spent about 11 hours a day. This shows unequal burden on women's and men's labour time in household activities.

Chapter Seven

EXPENDITURE AND ASSETS

Expenditure

One of the primary objectives of the NLSS was to try to capture the household balance sheet. Determination of expenditure and estimates of net worth is fundamental in identifying the consumption patterns of the poor. This chapter dealt specifically with the evaluation of expenditure and assets.

Terminology and Methodology

Clarification on the terminology used is important. The *expenditure aggregate* computes all individual member household expenditure into their primary headings for the household.⁵ Although it is common to speak of an “expenditure” aggregate the measure includes some non-monetary measure such as consumption of own produce; use value on owned assets and imputed owner occupied rents. For this reason the expenditure aggregate is actually a *welfare aggregate* and is more representative of the level of welfare a household enjoys versus actual monetary expenditures.

Furthermore, some of the items included in the welfare aggregate are subject to debate. Expenditure such as taxes and transfers are omitted since there is general agreement these do not increase the welfare of an individual in the household. Other measures are subject to debate. For the purposes of this Poverty Profile, most household expenditures on health and education were included.⁶ Table 7.2 outlines the primary components of the welfare aggregate.

The household aggregate is commonly expressed in terms of per capita expenditure, or the total household expenditure divided by the household size. The table below highlights the average per capita household expenditure in Nigeria in terms of food and non-food by quintile.

TABLE 7.1
EXPENDITURE BY QUINTILE

QUINTILE	Per Capita Food Expenditure	Per Capita Non-Food Expenditure	Total Per Capita Expenditure
1	3,706	3,520	7,226
2	7,796	5,467	13,263
3	11,663	7,572	19,234
4	16,381	11,880	28,261
5	29,408	39,543	68,952
Total	17,094	18,506	35,600

It could be seen from Table 7.1, the fifth quintile spent per capita proportionally more on non-food items than on food.

⁵ For the purposes of this Poverty Profile, the World Bank provided an expenditure aggregate with the primary expenditure headings for the household.

⁶ For further detail on computing the expenditure aggregate, the reader is referred to: *Guidelines for Constructing Consumption Aggregates for Welfare Analysis*, Agnus Deaton and Salman Zaidi, LSMS Working Paper 135, May 2002.

The expenditures cited in this section have been deflated to account for differences in prices across the States and sector

TABLE 7.2
WELFARE AGGREGATE: PRIMARY HEADINGS

Heading	Description
Food	Food Purchases Imputed own consumption
Education	School fees School books Uniforms Extra curricular activities Room and board Transportation Other school related expenditure
Health	Consultations Medication Hospitalisation Transportation Other health care expenditure
Frequent Non-Food	Tobacco & Alcohol Utilities such as: water, electricity, etc. Clothing Household maintenance Transportation Communication Recreation Imputed self-produced non-food Insurance Rent (actual or imputed) Others
Infrequent Non-Food	Expenditure on small appliances Use value on assets Other infrequent non-food
Excluded	Ceremonial expenditure Taxes Transfers

Per Capita Expenditure on Food and Non-Food by Sector

The results as demonstrated in Table 7.3 showed rural per capita expenditure on food was at N18,483, while that of non-food per capital expenditure was N22,521. Urban per capital food expenditure was N16,831 and per capita non-food expenditure N17,746. This difference in figure was as a result of more sample in the rural than the urban sectors.

TABLE 7.3
HOUSEHOLD PER CAPITAL EXPENDITURE ON FOOD
AND NON-FOOD BY SECTOR

	Per Capita Food Expenditure	Per Capita Non-Food Expenditure	Total Per Capita Expenditure
Urban	17,824	25,101	42,925
Rural	16,491	13,058	41,004
Total	17,094	18,506	35,600

As expected and indicative of urban and rural consumption patterns, the tables show that urban areas spend proportionally more on non-food than food (58percent against 32 percent)in the rural areas).

Capital Expenditure on Food and Non-Food by Zone

Table 7.4 showed some salient features that must be understood in the light of the previous evaluation of expenditure by sector. The southeast had mean total per capita expenditure of N45,216 that was well above the national average. A breakdown into food and non-food provides a different picture. Once again, the southwest showed predominantly urban patterns of consumption.

TABLE 7.4
HOUSEHOLD PER CAPITAL EXPENDITURE ON FOOD
AND NON-FOOD BY ZONE

Zone	Per Capita Food Expenditure	Per Capita Non- Food Expenditure	Total Per Capita Expenditure
South South	17,287	19,199	36,486
South East	22,314	22,902	45,216
South West	16,533	26,696	43,229
North Central	14,740	15,067	29,806
North East	15,364	12,171	27,535
North West	16,907	11,176	28,083
Total	17,094	18,506	35,600

Mean Per Capita Expenditure by Characteristics of the Head of Household

Table 7.5 presented the various characteristics of the head of household and evaluated the per capita household expenditure. As can be seen, female-headed households have 18.5percent higher per capita expenditure than male-headed households. However, women-headed households tend to be smaller in size and, therefore, have more resources on a per capita basis. Likewise, per capita expenditure increases the smaller the household size. As households increase, their resources become more and more stretched and per capita expenditures decrease. Figure 7.1 below clearly illustrated the dramatic decrease in per capita expenditure with increases in household size.

FIGURE 7.1
HOUSEHOLD PER CAPITA EXPENDITURE
BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE





TABLE 7.5
PER CAPITA ANNUAL EXPENDITURE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE
HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

	Per Capita Food Expend.	Per Capita Non-Food Expend.	Total Per Capita Expend.	Mean Household Size
Sex				
Male	16,831	17,746	34,576	5.13
Female	18,483	22,521	41,004	3.05
Size of Household				
1 person	27,293	42,887	70,180	1.00
2-4 persons	18,888	17,987	36,876	3.14
5-9 persons	13,156	12,472	25,628	6.33
10-19 persons	11,015	11,891	22,905	11.91
20 persons & above	9,922	5,443	15,365	21.92
Education				
No Education	15,923	13,344	29,262	4.77
Primary	15,602	15,808	31,410	5.03
Secondary	17,983	21,134	39,117	4.59
Tertiary	20,615	37,284	57,900	4.87

Figure 7.2 illustrates a noticeable increase in household per capita expenditure based on the level of education. This was due to decreasing household sizes in households with higher education, although the effect from the decrease in household size is not as evident since these households are closer to the national average than female-headed households.

FIGURE 7.2
HOUSEHOLD PER CAPITA EXPENDITURE BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION



Assets

Ownership of key consumer durable assets was captured in the survey. Household ownership of consumer durable assets is a good indicator for identifying poor households. When asset ownership is examined by quintile, the predominance of ownership in the wealthiest household is clearly evident. The bottom 40 percent of the population own only 10% of the physical assets, while the top 20% of the population owns over 50 percent of the physical assets. (See Table 7.6).

The national aggregate value of these assets also increased sharply with the quintile. (See Appendix A Table 27.) The first two quintiles had only about 5.5 per cent of value, while the fifth quintile non-poor had 65 per cent of the value of the assets. This may imply that not only do the poorest households have less assets but their value is also lower. The non-poor households appear to have more in terms of quantity and quality of assets. In addition, the average age of the asset by quintile showed that the poorer household had older assets (14.2 years old versus 11.27 years).

TABLE 7.6
PER CAPITA ANNUAL EXPENDITURE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE
HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

Asset	Quintiles					Total
	Quintile 1	Quintile 2	Quintile 3	Quintile 4	Quintile 5	
Furniture	2.78	7.29	14.68	24.06	51.19	100.00
Sewing Machine	1.94	8.11	12.84	27.77	49.34	100.00
Stove	2.07	7.37	12.75	24.61	53.20	100.00
Refrigerator or Freezer	0.76	2.58	7.97	22.33	66.36	100.00
Air Conditioner	1.31	1.52	4.06	9.51	83.60	100.00
Fan	1.43	6.14	12.75	23.45	56.22	100.00
Radio Cassette	5.27	10.52	15.91	23.98	44.32	100.00
Gas Cooker	0.52	1.19	1.71	14.53	82.04	100.00
Generator	0.73	0.89	7.44	9.92	81.02	100.00
Video Equipment	0.62	3.31	8.89	21.74	65.44	100.00
Washing Machine		2.96	6.94	26.76	63.35	100.00
Television	1.07	5.32	10.50	24.02	59.09	100.00
Camera		5.93	8.51	24.37	61.20	100.00
Electric Iron	1.24	4.46	9.93	25.02	59.35	100.00
Bicycle	10.43	15.82	20.84	23.55	29.35	100.00
Motorcycle	4.47	8.81	16.03	23.30	47.39	100.00
Car	1.68	2.26	4.72	14.16	77.18	100.00
Total	2.93	7.36	13.13	23.66	52.92	100.00

Chapter Eight

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

DATA PRODUCTION, STORAGE AND ANALYSIS

In scope and coverage, the 2003-2004 NLSS was an enlarged survey compared to the previous NCS surveys. It generated a lot of data and the results are no doubt a great improvement on previous surveys, in quality and content. With the addition of the previous NCS surveys of 1980-1996, a new Poverty Profile for Nigeria, 1980-2004 was produced.

The results showed that poverty incidence in Nigeria is on the decline. Considering the results of the different poverty measures adopted in this survey (absolute, objective or FEI, Dollar per day,, relative and subjective), the results were similar, except for the subjective measure which is rarely used in poverty studies. A number of indicators having strong correlation with poverty have been identified to include level of education of household members, size of households, sector and participation in agriculture.

Considering the volume of data generated in this survey, there is no limit to the results that can be achieved from further research and analysis on several aspects and levels of socio-economic indicators.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The immense technical assistance received from the World Bank, DFID, The British Council and EU over the years has not only enhanced the capability of the NBS in survey management and analysis, but also given a lot of credence to the results of the poverty analysis. Further capacity building and technical assistance to the Bureau would boost the growth and development of the National Statistical System.

POVERTY MONITORING

With the improvement in the dataset achieved in this survey, a strong data base on social and economic indicators had been established. There is, therefore, the need to periodically conduct fresh surveys to update the dataset to make the data relevant in addressing emerging issues on poverty and social development.

OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The following observations were made during the execution of the fieldwork, data analysis and report writing:

At the data analysis stage, the data entry was cumbersome in view of the volume of data collected in the survey. Redesigning the questionnaire applying the experience gained during data collection and processing will be of great advantage and further enhance quality of data from the survey.

Adequate publicity was not provided before and during the survey. This reduced the amount of needed co-operation from respondents during the fieldwork. Jingles and announcements in the print and electronic media would have helped to create public awareness. Several call-backs were made in the course of interviewing respondents, which affected the timely completion of the fieldwork.

Feelers from all the States of the Federation indicated that the field staff complained about insufficient travel allowances. The survey should have budgeted for

contingency fund to shore up the effect of several call-backs. Also, medical allowance should have been included for cases of sickness in the field.

Project bags were not provided to the field staff, which would have enhanced handling and packaging of survey documents.

Providing incentives and material inducements to respondents, (especially the poor ones) would have elicited better co-operation.

Some technical problems were observed in the survey instruments. Some of the worded questions were too ambiguous such that respondents could not provide clear answers to them. Again, several similar questions were repeated in different sections of the questionnaire making it to be copious and time consuming.

On income and expenditure, interviewers concentrated on heads of households without further probe on the income and expenditure of other members of the households. However, erring interviewers had to be corrected by teams of monitoring officers from headquarters.

Questions on sensitive issues like HIV/AIDS status recorded low response rate. Such questions should be reviewed in future surveys.

APPENDIX A
STATISTICAL TABLES

TABLE 1
POVERTY INCIDENCE BY STATE (1996, 2004)

STATE	YEAR	
	1996	2004
Abia	56.2	22.27
Adamawa	65.5	71.73
Akwa Ibom	66.9	34.82
Anambra	51.0	20.11
Bauchi	83.5	86.29
Bayelsa	44.3	19.98
Benue	64.2	55.33
Borno	66.9	53.63
Cross River	66.9	41.61
Delta	56.1	45.35
Ebonyi	51.0	43.33
Edo	56.1	33.09
Ekiti	71.6	42.27
Enugu	51.0	31.12
Gombe	83.5	77.01
Imo	56.2	27.39
Jigawa	71.0	95.07
Kaduna	67.7	50.24
Kano	71.0	61.29
Katsina	77.7	71.06
Kebbi	83.6	89.65
Kogi	75.5	88.55
Kwara	75.5	85.22
Lagos	53.0	63.58
Nassarawa	62.7	61.59
Niger	52.2	63.90
Ogun	69.9	31.73
Ondo	71.6	42.14
Osun	58.7	32.35
Oyo	58.7	24.08
Plateau	62.7	60.37
Rivers	44.3	29.09
Sokoto	83.9	76.81
Taraba	65.5	62.15
Yobe	66.9	83.25
Zamfara	83.9	80.93
FCT	53.0	43.32
All Nigeria	65.6	54.4

TABLE .2 POVERTY INCIDENCE USING 2900 CALORIE LIMIT PLUS A COMPONENT OF NON-FOOD EXPENDITURE OF 8385 NAIRA BY STATE			TABLE 3. DOLLAR PER DAY BASED ON AN ADJUSTED PURCHASING POWER PARITY BY STATE		
State	Poor	Non-Poor	State	Poor	Non-Poor
Abia	32.36	67.64	Abia	28.01	71.99
Adamawa	71.61	28.39	Adamawa	68.91	31.09
Akwa Ibom	50.83	49.17	Akwa Ibom	46.04	53.96
Anambra	32.12	67.88	Anambra	30.36	69.64
Bauchi	77.03	22.97	Bauchi	76.51	23.49
Bayelsa	33.33	66.67	Bayelsa	26.29	73.71
Benue	48.76	51.24	Benue	42.84	57.16
Borno	50.56	49.44	Borno	48.65	51.35
Cross River	55.04	44.96	Cross River	51.64	48.36
Delta	64.52	35.48	Delta	62.28	37.72
Ebonyi	51.88	48.12	Ebonyi	46.06	53.94
Edo	47.02	52.98	Edo	44.31	55.69
Ekiti	39.27	60.73	Ekiti	35.51	64.49
Enugu	36.76	63.24	Enugu	33.89	66.11
Gombe	70.04	29.96	Gombe	66.34	33.66
Imo	28.10	71.90	Imo	26.46	73.54
Jigawa	90.91	9.09	Jigawa	89.54	10.46
Kaduna	40.88	59.12	Kaduna	37.72	62.28
Kano	49.73	50.27	Kano	46.70	53.30
Katsina	62.19	37.81	Katsina	60.42	39.58
Kebbi	89.00	11.00	Kebbi	86.20	13.80
Kogi	89.62	10.38	Kogi	87.46	12.54
Kwara	81.73	18.27	Kwara	79.85	20.15
Lagos	66.96	33.04	Lagos	64.05	35.95
Nassarawa	52.87	47.13	Nassarawa	48.17	51.83
Niger	60.48	39.52	Niger	56.01	43.99
Ogun	30.99	69.01	Ogun	29.84	70.16
Ondo	47.31	52.69	Ondo	41.47	58.53
Osun	24.67	75.33	Osun	22.66	77.34
Oyo	20.95	79.05	Oyo	19.28	80.72
Plateau	54.91	45.09	Plateau	46.78	53.22
Rivers	46.40	53.60	Rivers	43.12	56.88
Sokoto	74.53	25.47	Sokoto	70.54	29.46
Taraba	57.98	42.02	Taraba	54.07	45.93
Yobe	78.22	21.78	Yobe	74.12	25.88
Zamfara	76.40	23.60	Zamfara	73.38	26.62
FCT	51.43	48.57	FCT	46.98	53.02
Total	54.7	45.3	Total	51.55	48.45

TABLE .4
SELF-ASSESSMENT OF POVERTY BY STATE

State	Very Poor	Averagely Poor	Non-Poor
Abia	34.45	46.68	18.87
Adamawa	26.97	47.21	25.82
Akwa Ibom	16.86	49.35	33.79
Anambra	16.19	54.29	29.52
Bauchi	27.01	59.26	13.73
Bayelsa	61.48	33.32	5.20
Benue	26.15	54.69	19.16
Borno	36.86	50.87	12.27
Cross River	21.70	55.24	23.06
Delta	25.13	55.42	19.45
Ebonyi	36.74	49.84	13.42
Edo	34.51	44.64	20.85
Ekiti	35.57	60.65	3.78
Enugu	17.24	59.53	23.23
Gombe	12.25	62.03	25.72
Imo	25.42	53.57	21.01
Jigawa	13.87	47.15	38.97
Kaduna	11.87	59.94	28.19
Kano	18.40	54.58	27.02
Katsina	5.60	67.71	26.69
Kebbi	12.53	62.36	25.12
Kogi	28.63	56.24	15.12
Kwara	32.57	54.75	12.68
Lagos	16.84	51.37	31.78
Nassarawa	19.23	58.51	22.26
Niger	18.10	56.39	25.51
Ogun	18.55	59.69	21.76
Ondo	34.12	47.17	18.71
Osun	20.45	42.26	37.29
Oyo	12.51	49.63	37.86
Plateau	19.42	58.33	22.25
Rivers	14.93	51.87	33.19
Sokoto	17.89	59.64	22.47
Taraba	29.71	52.28	18.01
Yobe	26.29	55.04	18.67
Zamfara	18.52	54.12	27.36
FCT	17.38	57.82	24.80
Total	21.37	54.10	24.54

TABLE .5
PRIMARY REASON FOR POVERTY BY SELF-ASSESSMENT

Primary Reasons For Poverty	%
Agricultural inputs too high	28.54
Lack of capital to expand own business	10.00
Lack of capital to expand agricultural business	7.48
Low agricultural production	7.03
Low salaries	6.81
Lack of credit facilities to expand own business	6.41
Agricultural inputs not available	6.15
Hard economic times	5.46
Commodity prices high	4.45
Agricultural produce prices too low	3.07
Lack of adequate land	2.46
Others	2.36
Lack of employment opportunities	1.98
Low profit from business	1.61
Business not doing well	1.61
Lack of agricultural inputs due to other reasons	1.45
Lack of credit facilities to expand agricultural activities	1.40
No buyers for agricultural produce	0.74
Drought	0.35
Loss of property due to conflict	0.19
Lack of livestock due to death	0.19
Too much competition	0.14
Loss of employment due to conflict	0.11
Loss of limbs due to conflict	0.02
Total	100.00

TABLE .6
POVERTY FIGURES BY SECTOR, ZONE AND STATE

	Percentage of pop.	Incidence of Poverty P0	Poverty Gap P1	Poverty Severity P2	Welfare Gap P1/P0	C0 Contribution	Gini
National	100.00%	54.41%	0.2180	0.1191	0.4006	100.00%	0.4882
Urban	44.10%	43.19%	0.1670	0.0918	0.3868	35.00%	0.5441
Rural	55.90%	63.27%	0.2582	0.1406	0.4080	65.00%	0.5187
South South	14.98%	35.06%	0.1696	0.0903	0.4837	9.66%	0.5072
South East	12.08%	26.74%	0.0996	0.0455	0.3724	5.94%	0.4494
South West	19.55%	43.01%	0.1821	0.1024	0.4234	15.45%	0.5538
North Central	14.37%	66.97%	0.2832	0.1685	0.4229	17.69%	0.3934
North East	13.36%	72.16%	0.2743	0.1434	0.3801	17.71%	0.4590
North West	25.65%	71.17%	0.2567	0.1374	0.3607	33.55%	0.3711
State							
Abia	2.62%	22.27%	0.0904	0.0424	0.4059	1.07%	0.4693
Adamawa	2.36%	71.73%	0.3149	0.1768	0.4390	3.11%	0.4696
Akwa Ibom	2.70%	34.82%	0.1584	0.0843	0.4548	1.73%	0.5003
Anambra	3.14%	20.11%	0.0768	0.0324	0.3820	1.16%	0.4819
Bauchi	3.21%	86.29%	0.3220	0.1676	0.3731	5.09%	0.4782
Bayelsa	1.08%	19.98%	0.0994	0.0557	0.4977	0.40%	0.4757
Benue	3.09%	55.33%	0.1543	0.0691	0.2789	3.14%	0.5450
Borno	2.86%	53.63%	0.1889	0.0891	0.3522	2.81%	0.3947
Cross River	2.14%	41.61%	0.1969	0.1039	0.4731	1.64%	0.5046
Delta	2.91%	45.35%	0.2222	0.1157	0.4899	2.42%	0.4650
Ebonyi	1.25%	43.33%	0.1806	0.0917	0.4169	0.99%	0.4092
Edo	2.44%	33.09%	0.1568	0.0804	0.4739	1.48%	0.4585
Ekiti	1.33%	42.27%	0.1181	0.0479	0.2795	1.03%	0.5074
Enugu	2.29%	31.12%	0.1118	0.0512	0.3591	1.31%	0.4435
Gombe	1.67%	77.01%	0.2936	0.1568	0.3812	2.36%	0.4343
Imo	2.79%	27.39%	0.0871	0.0373	0.3179	1.40%	0.5125
Jigawa	3.22%	95.07%	0.4413	0.2643	0.4641	5.63%	0.4397
Kaduna	4.41%	50.24%	0.1155	0.0516	0.2300	4.08%	0.4226
Kano	6.52%	61.29%	0.1530	0.0778	0.2497	7.34%	0.4318
Katsina	4.21%	71.06%	0.2351	0.1155	0.3308	5.50%	0.4110
Kebbi	2.32%	89.65%	0.3968	0.2135	0.4426	3.82%	0.4104
Kogi	2.41%	88.55%	0.5346	0.3619	0.6037	3.92%	0.5555
Kwara	1.74%	85.22%	0.4236	0.2778	0.4971	2.72%	0.4783
Lagos	6.41%	63.58%	0.3473	0.2200	0.5462	7.49%	0.6429
Nassarawa	1.44%	61.59%	0.1582	0.0734	0.2568	1.63%	0.4665
Niger	2.72%	63.90%	0.2099	0.1006	0.3284	3.19%	0.4619
Ogun	2.62%	31.73%	0.1023	0.0422	0.3224	1.53%	0.5251
Ondo	2.92%	42.14%	0.1539	0.0694	0.3652	2.26%	0.5038
Osun	2.42%	32.35%	0.0757	0.0332	0.2339	1.44%	0.5031
Oyo	3.86%	24.08%	0.0585	0.0244	0.2431	1.71%	0.4315
Plateau	2.27%	60.37%	0.2003	0.1082	0.3317	2.52%	0.4390
Rivers	3.71%	29.09%	0.1498	0.0840	0.5150	1.99%	0.4792
Sokoto	2.71%	76.81%	0.3333	0.1839	0.4339	3.83%	0.3253
Taraba	1.69%	62.15%	0.2112	0.1022	0.3399	1.93%	0.5118
Yobe	1.57%	83.25%	0.3178	0.1723	0.3817	2.40%	0.4503
Zamfara	2.26%	80.93%	0.3264	0.1752	0.4032	3.36%	0.3366
FCT	0.71%	43.32%	0.1787	0.0898	0.4126	0.56%	0.4368

TABLE 7
PLACE OF VACCINATION OF CHILDREN
BY STANDARD OF LIVING QUINTILE

Place of Vaccination	QUINTILE					Sex		Total
	1	2	3	4	5	Male	Female	
Health centre	56.15	43.19	47.96	51.79	45.53	49.01	47.57	48.3
Hospital	16.13	23.57	27.55	25.64	30.68	27.42	25.29	26.36
Private clinic	4.85	11.23	5.06	3.78	4.69	4.92	5.99	5.45
Mobile unit	8.23	7.92	7.67	6.61	6.37	7.72	6.44	7.09
School	2.3	2.66	0.82	1.83	0.66	1.16	1.67	1.41
Home	12.34	11.43	10.94	10.34	12.07	9.76	13.04	11.38
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 8
PLACE OF CONSULTATION BY QUINTILE

Place of first consultation	QUINTILE					Sex		Total
	1	2	3	4	5	Male	Female	
Hospital	20.9	30.16	35.56	38.1	49.66	39.36	40.38	39.88
Dispensary	20.57	17.83	15	12.92	6.21	12.04	11.65	11.84
Pharmacy	4.7	8.82	12.81	9.92	8.1	9.58	8.74	9.15
Clinic	14.83	11.26	12.31	15.79	15.15	14.61	14.02	14.3
Maternity	2.33	1.35	1.96	2.8	2.07	1.48	2.79	2.15
MCH Post	0.12	0.72	0.68	0.45	0.53	0.58	0.47	0.53
Consultant	10.02	8.07	5.61	5.51	5.57	6.28	6.17	6.23
Patient's home	6.33	8.34	7.37	5.79	5.82	6.65	6.23	6.43
Other	20.2	13.46	8.7	8.72	6.89	9.43	9.55	9.49
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 9
MAIN SOURCE OF LIGHTING
BY STANDARD OF LIVING QUINTILE

Main Source of lighting	QUINTILE					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Kerosene	60.62	61.89	56.12	43.92	32.77	49.66
Gas	1.17	1.5	0.76	0.77	0.81	0.98
Main electricity	32.41	32.43	39.61	51.56	63.35	45.39
Electric generator	0.21	0.2	0.26	0.56	0.87	0.45
Battery	0.11	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.04
Candle	0.07	0.23	0.03	0.11	0.07	0.1
Firewood	3.63	2.49	2.41	2.3	1.56	2.41
Others	1.77	1.2	0.79	0.77	0.55	0.97
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 10
MATERIAL USED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF WALL BY STANDARD OF LIVING
BY QUINTILE

	QUINTILE					
Material of outside wall	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Mud	58.47	57.02	51.73	38.61	24.56	44.45
Stone	0.8	0.48	0.91	0.6	0.81	0.72
Burnt bricks	1.94	2.67	2.74	3.06	2.74	2.66
Cement of concrete	29.96	32.48	38.07	50.99	65.89	45.17
Wood or bamboo	0.55	0.7	0.73	0.67	0.36	0.59
Iron sheets	0.56	0.32	0.66	0.63	0.72	0.59
Cardboard	0.01	0.03	0.08	0.09	0.22	0.1
Other	7.71	6.3	5.08	5.36	4.69	5.72
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 11
MAIN FLOORING MATERIAL OF LIVING BY QUINTILE

	QUINTILE					
Main flooring material	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Earth or mud	39.04	36.08	29.62	20.75	11.77	26.19
Wood or tile	1.13	1.41	1.87	1.51	1.4	1.47
Plank	1.4	0.88	1.38	0.99	1.57	1.26
Concrete	46.25	49.59	57.82	68.42	78.27	61.56
Dirt or straw	5.43	5.55	3.64	2.83	1.6	3.62
Other	6.75	6.48	5.67	5.5	5.39	5.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 12
MAIN ROOFING MATERIALS
BY STANDARD OF LIVING QUINTILE

	QUINTILE					
Main roofing material	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Mud or mud bricks	18.43	16.22	12.12	7.72	4.1	11.07
Thatch grass or straw	14.67	13.69	9.87	6.83	4.13	9.35
Wood or bamboo	2.73	1.74	2.88	1.5	1.2	1.95
Corrugated iron sheets	54.14	59.95	67.43	75	80.87	68.65
Cement or concrete	1.3	1.65	1.96	2.29	2.63	2.02
Roofing tiles	1.25	0.6	0.55	0.89	0.89	0.84
Other	7.48	6.16	5.19	5.77	6.18	6.13
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 13
AGRICULTURAL AND NON AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATION BY STATE

	Agric. Occupation.	Non-Agric. Occupation.	Total
Abia	20.28	79.72	100
Adamawa	31.23	68.77	100
Akwa Ibom	21.24	78.76	100
Anambra	24.27	75.73	100
Bauchi	27.76	72.24	100
Bayelsa	28.93	71.07	100
Benue	46.92	53.08	100
Borno	35.53	64.47	100
Cross River	29.97	70.03	100
Delta	20.09	79.91	100
Ebonyi	34.53	65.47	100
Edo	17.3	82.7	100
Ekiti	19.91	80.09	100
Enugu	28.28	71.72	100
Gombe	24.5	75.5	100
Imo	27.59	72.41	100
Jigawa	38.34	61.66	100
Kaduna	13.83	86.17	100
Kano	10.59	89.41	100
Katsina	24.54	75.46	100
Kebbi	31.66	68.34	100
Kogi	16.84	83.16	100
Kwara	8.34	91.66	100
Lagos	0.79	99.21	100
Nassarawa	23.32	76.68	100
Niger	22.93	77.07	100
Ogun	9.94	90.06	100
Ondo	21.67	78.33	100
Osun	7.93	92.07	100
Oyo	10.56	89.44	100
Plateau	31.95	68.05	100
Rivers	15.94	84.06	100
Sokoto	26.7	73.3	100
Taraba	27.64	72.36	100
Yobe	34.15	65.85	100
Zamfara	30.33	69.67	100
FCT	19.27	80.73	100
Total	21.54	78.46	100

TABLE 14
AGE GROUP BY RELATIVE POVERTY INCIDENCE

	Core Poor	Moderately Poor	Non- Poor	Total
5 to 9 years old	45.60	35.49	18.91	100.00
10 to 14 years old	43.79	37.65	18.56	100.00
15 to 19 years old	38.24	36.19	25.57	100.00
20 to 24 years old	26.38	38.34	35.27	100.00
25 to 29 years old	21.93	36.55	41.52	100.00
30 to 34 years old	22.46	40.14	37.40	100.00
35 to 39 years old	25.54	39.68	34.78	100.00
40 to 44 years old	24.53	41.11	34.36	100.00
45 to 49 years old	22.29	41.15	36.56	100.00
50 to 54 years old	22.43	37.61	39.95	100.00
55 to 59 years old	19.32	37.82	42.86	100.00
60 to 64 years old	17.74	32.95	49.31	100.00
65 to 69 years old	14.03	30.38	55.59	100.00
70 and above	16.27	29.75	53.98	100.00
Total	25.15	37.45	37.40	100.00

TABLE 15
OWNERSHIP OF LIVESTOCK BY ZONE

	Zone					
	South South	South East	South West	North Central	North East	North West
Draught animals	1.67	0.29		17.92	80.13	
Cattle	0.04	0.82	0.09	3.22	36.59	59.24
Sheep	1.17	6.86	1.32	5.89	24.87	59.9
Goats	3.68	18.4	4.15	11.88	21.11	40.79
Pigs	0.79	3.49	7.18	46.45	20.34	21.74
Rabbits	8.29	54.56		7.31	3.11	26.73
Chicken	5.43	22.33	5.4	14.96	19.43	32.44
Other Poultry	2.41	8.59	2.33	10.83	29.64	46.2
Other	4.09	19.42	4.02	5.88	24.84	41.75
Livestock						
Fish	9.32	0.47	49.74	38.97	0.98	0.52
Crab	83.57	5.37	7.17		3.9	
Other	20.58	11.7	8.13	10.12	19.87	29.59
Total	4.34	13.47	9.96	15	19.6	37.63

TABLE 16
OWNERSHIP OF LIVESTOCK BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

	Student/Rtd. Unemployed/ Inactive	Pros. or Tech.	Admin.	Clerical	Sales	Ser-vices & related	Agric. & Forestry	Production and Trans-port	Manufact. Processing	Others
Draught Animals	1.23	1.01		0.46	1.56	1.71	92.68	0.11		1.24
Cattle	1.03	1.36	0.2	1.01	1.37	0.58	93.58	0.35	0.11	0.41
Sheep	1.28	2.37	0.09	1.4	3.46	1.72	88.33	0.36	0.24	0.75
Goats	1.84	2.59	0.08	2.25	4.33	1.46	85.41	0.59	0.33	1.12
Pigs	1.68	3.41	0.68	0.96	0.51	1.58	86.71	3.41		1.07
Rabbits	4.14				25.11	12.12	58.62			
Chickens	1.91	2.97	0.05	2.34	3.82	1.84	84.71	0.65	0.46	1.25
Other Poultry	1.09	4.41	0.21	2.38	3.28	3.27	83.32	0.32	0.73	0.99
Other Livestock	4.92	3.88		1.04	0.93	2.42	84.85		1.04	0.93
Fish	8.09	12.12	1.09	8.96	21.95	6.08	25.24	4.78	3.84	7.86
Crabs					7.1		92.9			
Others	2.63	4.98		2.28	5.63		79.86		3	1.62
Total	2.56	3.92	0.23	2.92	6.14	2.24	78.05	1.13	0.83	1.97

TABLE 17

PRIMARY CROPS GROWN BY ZONE

Primary Crop Grown in Last 12 months	Zone					
	South South	South East	South West	North Cent'l	North East	North West
Avocado Pears	0.5	1.01	0.5	0.45	0.64	0.53
Bananas	1.05	1.07	0.47	0.2	0.11	0.15
Beans	0.12	0.09	0.39	3.28	16.39	20.04
Peas	0.05	0.24	0.14	0.12	0.07	0.18
Coconut	0.03	0.39		0.11	0.04	0.03
Coffee	0.02	0.03	0.11		0.02	
Cotton	0.36	0.14	0.08	0.29	0.63	1.98
Cocoa	1.29	0.34	21.59	0.14	0.03	0.11
Cassava	67.62	50.74	42.59	14.68	0.87	0.7
G'nuts/Peanuts	0.54	0.47	0.2	12.44	7.83	7.19
Guineacorn	0.11	0.01	0.3	17.87	33.37	41.27
Millet	0.09	0.05		5.26	15.93	15.2
Colanut	0.09	0.25	1.09	0.17	0.15	0.27
Egg Plants		0.03	0.08	0.05		0.09
Leafy Vegetables	2.01	1.4	0.05	0.14	0.02	0.03
Kenef		0.07		0.07		0.02
Mangoes	0.07	0.86	0.12	0.61	0.1	0.41
Maize	8.51	8.83	10.75	11.68	15.44	6.92
Oil Palm	1.88	7.3	1.13	0.54	0.06	
Okro	0.4	0.83		2.09	0.29	0.21
Other Vegetables	0.93	0.6	0.44	0.23	0.08	0.05
Other Crops	0.15	0.26	0.49	2.31	0.37	0.22
Onions	0.04	0.11	0.16	0.03	0.16	0.27
Oranges	0.13	0.83		0.49	0.21	0.01
Pineapples	0.09	0.12	0.1		0.02	0.02
Plantain	1.54	1.12	0.52	0.02		
Pepper	0.19	0.22	2.63	1.82	0.39	0.5
Pawpaw	0.15	0.15		0.07		
Potatoes	0.24	0.13		0.54	0.15	0.46
Sweet Potatoes	0.13	0.44		0.92	0.28	0.11
Rice	0.56	1.48	0.1	7.93	4.84	2.37
Rubber	0.05	0.04		0.12		
Sugar cane	0.08			0.14	0.07	0.14
Tobacco	0.04	0.05		0.01		0.02
Tomatoes		0.05	1.39	0.35	0.1	0.24
Wood	0.23	0.05	0.29			0.02
Yams	10.72	20.19	14.28	14.81	1.35	0.24

TABLE 18
PRIMARY CROPS GROWN BY QUINTILE

Primary Crop Grown in Last 12 Months	Quint.				
	1	2	3	4	5
Avocado Pears	20.56	12.4	19.4	20.49	27.15
Bananas	3.67	9.26	21.44	25.16	40.47
Beans	24.4	29.1	20.49	15.35	10.67
Peas	7.62	21.62	19.42	18.97	32.37
Coconut	7.9	5.77	10.07	15.91	60.36
Cotton	15.08	22.18	28.34	20.22	14.18
Cocoa	7.03	8.77	21.64	21.41	41.15
Cassava	7.11	12	18.89	24.95	37.05
G'nuts/Peanuts	15.41	21.64	23.61	21.35	17.98
Guineacorn	21.53	24.22	23.9	18.69	11.66
Millet	21.26	25.49	23.93	18.62	10.69
Colanuts	8.64	10.2	29.92	23.14	28.1
Egg Plants	54.32		30.82		14.86
Leafy Vegetables	8.24	6.56	11.67	34.86	38.67
Kenef	6.65	18.43	14.51	16.7	43.71
Mangoes	7.14	15.73	16.92	22.42	37.78
Maize	11.35	15.93	20.13	23.62	28.97
Oil Palm	3.55	9.84	17.74	27.84	41.03
Okro	6.74	11.49	26.91	30.05	24.81
Other Vegetables	2.61	7.65	19.52	25.57	44.65
Other Crops	13.63	16.25	21.93	28.09	20.11
Onions	7.55	4.43	27.15	41.98	18.89
Oranges		13.32	17.2	39.53	29.95
Pineapples	12.25	8.07	7.43	23.03	49.21
Plantain	2.24	4.32	23.96	33.35	36.13
Pepper	10.48	5.37	31.07	19.72	33.36
Pawpaw			24.46	23.36	52.18
Potatoes	14.53	27.19	19.61	22.9	15.76
Sweet Potatoes	10.17	18.17	18.64	28.77	24.25
Rice	7.66	16.36	24.43	28.53	23.01
Rubber		26.9	15.22	57.88	
Sugar cane	8.47	4.49	43.22	14.97	28.85
Tobacco	53.28		17.38	20.12	9.22
Tomatoes	3.64	7.81	18.65	24.08	45.81
Wood		8.12	27.27	37.45	27.16
Yams	9.27	12.52	18.56	25.12	34.54

TABLE 19
PRIMARY CROPS GROWN BY SEX

Primary Crop Grown in Last 12 Months	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
Avocado Pears	0.57	0.85	0.62
Bananas	0.41	0.8	0.48
Beans	10.13	1.83	8.64
Peas	0.13	0.2	0.14
Coconut	0.08	0.25	0.11
Coffee	0.02	0.04	0.02
Cotton	0.86	0.29	0.76
Cocoa	1.94	1.19	1.8
Cassava	18.91	51.77	24.82
G'nuts/Peanuts	5.98	3.21	5.48
Guinea corn	22.67	5.17	19.53
Millet	8.99	1.15	7.58
Colanuts	0.27	0.23	0.26
Egg Plants	0.04	0.07	0.05
Leafy Vegetables	0.34	1.69	0.59
Kenef	0.04		0.03
Mangoes	0.38	0.57	0.42
Maize	10.17	9.19	10
Oil Palm	1.49	3.58	1.87
Okro	0.62	0.9	0.67
Other Vegetables	0.31	0.47	0.34
Other Crops	0.56	0.85	0.61
Onions	0.13	0.2	0.14
Oranges	0.22	0.7	0.3
Pineapples	0.04	0.09	0.05
Plantain	0.4	0.79	0.47
Pepper	0.65	1.23	0.76
Pawpaw	0.06	0.09	0.06
Potatoes	0.33	0.13	0.3
Sweet Potatoes	0.36	0.22	0.33
Rice	3.5	1.5	3.14
Rubber	0.03	0.02	0.03
Sugar cane	0.08	0.09	0.08
Tobacco	0.03		0.02
Tomatoes	0.21	0.42	0.25
Wood	0.06	0.1	0.07
Yams	8.98	10.14	9.19

TABLE 20
PRIMARY CROP GROWN IN LAST 12 MONTHS
BY MEANS OF OBTAINING LAND

Crop	Means of obtaining land				Total
	Rents	Share cropping	Free	Distributed	
Cassava	42.95	30.86	28.88	28.85	31.76
Guineacorn	9.74	9.32	11.20	18.10	14.62
Maize	14.55	2.47	12.16	13.23	13.11
Yam	4.54	2.47	13.76	8.49	8.88
Beans	2.83	14.96	5.46	6.36	5.52
Millet	4.14		5.16	6.09	5.40
Rice	9.35	26.30	4.62	1.28	4.04
Groundnuts or					
Peanuts	1.80	8.65	3.64	2.95	2.95
Other	10.09	4.96	15.12	14.65	13.72
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 21
SEX OF HOLDER BY MEANS OF OBTAINING LAND

Means of Obtaining Land					
Sex	Share				
	Rents	Cropping	Use Free	Distributed	Total
Male	77.55	83.88	75.58	73.59	75.05
Female	22.45	16.12	24.42	26.41	24.95
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 22
USE OF AGRICULTURAL INPUTS BY QUINTILE

	QUINTILE				
	1	2	3	4	5
Inorganic fertilizer	17.87	20.65	20.98	20.29	20.21
Organic fertilizer	26.04	19.73	18.84	18.57	16.81
Insecticides	16.84	18.47	21.91	19.46	23.32
Herbicides	23.17	15.70	22.94	20.36	17.84
Storage of crops	14.54	18.33	20.31	22.42	24.41
Purchased seed	9.24	12.24	16.41	23.79	38.33
Irrigation	25.83	14.42	27.08	16.60	16.06
Bags, containers	14.37	21.03	24.16	23.07	17.37
Petrol	11.38	14.77	14.20	19.29	40.36
Spare parts	16.22	11.43	13.00	12.64	46.71
Hired labour	9.95	14.95	19.68	23.33	32.10
Transport of crops	13.08	17.52	22.63	22.62	24.15
Renting animals	17.00	18.13	29.69	21.33	13.85
Renting equipment	11.11	22.50	26.80	18.24	21.35
Local hand tools	13.77	18.67	20.75	22.48	24.32
Imported hand tools	11.27	9.84	18.66	24.45	35.78
Repairs and maintenance	13.71	20.72	23.26	21.91	20.40
Other crop costs	9.48	17.13	19.72	19.13	34.54
Animal feed	17.94	24.02	22.94	20.56	14.55
Veterinarian services	19.72	25.79	22.66	16.65	15.18
Paid labour for herding	17.67	19.54	19.38	25.66	17.75
Maintenance of pens	13.02	15.18	26.22	22.66	22.91
Transport of feed	19.03	24.25	22.80	18.52	15.40
Commission	16.74	25.48	22.61	21.03	14.15
Compensation	23.56	20.87	16.18	16.19	23.20
Other livestock	9.39	14.26	20.75	24.07	31.53
Hired labor	11.29	16.96	21.89	20.74	29.11
Fuel	14.05	17.38	15.14	12.49	40.94
Hired laborr	9.69	14.83	12.25	18.60	44.62
Spare parts	19.33	17.37	17.91	7.99	37.40
Rent and maintenance	9.80	15.91	16.57	16.27	41.44
Hiring of equipment	5.17	18.07		10.58	66.18
Other inputs	8.77	12.16	15.01	13.00	51.06
Total	15.67	18.69	21.00	21.39	23.26

TABLE 23
USE OF AGRICULTURAL INPUTS BY SEX

	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
Inorganic fertilizer	9.70	16.42	10.23
Organic fertilizer	13.29	6.58	12.76
Insecticides	3.82	2.24	3.69
Herbicides	1.23	0.67	1.19
Storage of crops	1.67	1.13	1.63
Purchased seed	4.31	9.70	4.74
Irrigation	0.22	0.05	0.21
Bags, containers	9.18	4.97	8.84
Petrol	0.37	0.15	0.35
Spare parts	0.26	0.09	0.24
Hired labour	12.47	22.94	13.30
Transport of crops	9.52	7.04	9.32
Renting animals	1.18	0.42	1.12
Renting equipment	0.40		0.37
Local hand tools	13.96	15.78	14.11
Imported hand tools	1.08	0.98	1.07
Repairs and Maintenance	3.26	1.89	3.15
Other crop costs	0.52	0.85	0.54
Animal feed	5.03	2.21	4.81
Veterinarian services	2.50	0.80	2.36
Paid labour for herding	0.53	0.44	0.53
Maintenance of pens	0.32	0.06	0.30
Transport of feed	1.34	0.57	1.28
Commission	1.09	0.48	1.04
Compensation	0.38	0.09	0.35
Other livestock	0.63	1.18	0.68
Hired labour	0.71	1.06	0.74
Fuel	0.16		0.15
Hired labour	0.24	0.14	0.23
Spare parts	0.05	0.08	0.06
Rent and maintenance	0.40	0.64	0.42
Hiring of equipment	0.03	0.09	0.04
Other inputs	0.15	0.24	0.16
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 24
PROCESSING OF FOOD CROPS BY QUINTILE

Type of food Processing	QUINTILE					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Maize flour processing	10.46	13.99	21.75	26.24	27.57	100.00
Flour others processing	17.18	23.31	25.78	18.11	15.62	100.00
Husk and polish rice	10.30	14.52	25.30	26.33	23.55	100.00
Manufacture home Drink	7.37	20.21	31.57	18.32	22.54	100.00
Cassava flour Processing	5.07	9.92	18.37	26.75	39.89	100.00
Shelled nuts	10.34	22.70	25.67	23.77	17.53	100.00
Processed fish	2.29	13.18	8.81	25.00	50.71	100.00
Garri processing	7.84	14.16	20.45	24.32	33.22	100.00
Shear butter processing	11.49	16.16	23.73	23.91	24.72	100.00
Other nut processing	10.72	18.48	25.88	27.26	17.66	100.00
Yam flour processing	18.49	17.44	16.59	22.43	25.05	100.00
Other	45.23	18.62	12.89	12.51	10.76	100.00
Total	24.64	17.06	17.99	19.20	21.11	100.00

TABLE 25
PROCESSING OF FOOD CROPS BY ZONE

Food Processing	Zone						Total
	South South	South East	South West	North Central	North East	North West	
Maize flour Processing	2.08	10.23	2.49	7.48	19.49	14.89	7.91
Flour others Processing	0.67	0.45	0.49	6.16	43.89	35.75	10.64
Husk and polish Rice	0.91	2.88	0.08	4.45	7.71	6.62	3.23
Manufacture home drink	0.23	0.72	0.07	0.20	0.99	0.70	0.37
Cassava flour Processing	4.29	20.60	8.18	8.25	2.75	4.25	8.27
Shelled nuts	0.30	0.72	0.01	2.67	9.45	7.99	2.75
Processed fish	7.17	1.04	0.78	0.30	0.39	0.47	1.35
Garri processing	71.72	49.52	6.77	4.27	0.99	1.65	17.80
Shear butter Processing	2.72	3.28	0.31	0.92	0.70	0.93	1.24
Other nuts Processing	1.06	1.04	0.36	0.70	2.92	3.02	1.20
Yam flour Processing	0.57	1.16	5.97	6.40	3.42	6.00	4.62
Other	8.28	8.34	74.49	58.20	7.30	17.73	40.61
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 26
PROCESSING OF FOOD CROPS BY SECTOR

Food Processing	SECTOR		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Maize flour processing	15.01	84.99	100.00
Flour others processing	12.38	87.62	100.00
Husk and polish rice	15.47	84.53	100.00
Manufacture home drink	13.53	86.47	100.00
Cassava flour processing	15.48	84.52	100.00
Shelled nuts	15.94	84.06	100.00
Processed fish	15.71	84.29	100.00
Garri processing	15.91	84.09	100.00
Shear butter processing	20.58	79.42	100.00
Other nut processing	13.71	86.29	100.00
Yam flour processing	38.87	61.13	100.00
Other	66.86	33.14	100.00
Total	37.19	62.81	100.00

Food Processing	SECTOR		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Maize flour processing	3.19	10.71	7.91
Flour others processing	3.54	14.84	10.64
Husk and polish rice	1.35	4.35	3.23
Manufacture home drink	0.14	0.51	0.37
Cassava flour processing	3.44	11.13	8.27
Shelled nuts	1.18	3.68	2.75
Processed fish	0.57	1.82	1.35
Garri processing	7.61	23.83	17.80
Shear butter processing	0.68	1.56	1.24
Other nut processing	0.44	1.65	1.20
Yam flour processing	4.83	4.50	4.62
Other	73.01	21.42	40.61
	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 26
ASSET DISTRIBUTION BY QUINTILES

Asset	Quintiles					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Furniture	3.00	7.87	14.78	24.19	50.15	100.00
Sewing machine	2.09	7.73	12.62	28.18	49.38	100.00
Stove	2.16	7.41	12.88	24.66	52.90	100.00
Refrigerator/ Freezer	0.81	2.69	8.29	23.02	65.19	100.00
Air Conditioner	1.38	1.60	4.29	9.77	82.97	100.00
Fan	1.48	6.27	12.93	24.18	55.13	100.00
Radio Cassete	5.27	10.71	16.08	24.20	43.73	100.00
Gas cooker	0.54	1.23	1.77	15.00	81.46	100.00
Generator	0.77	0.93	7.28	10.44	80.59	100.00
Video equipment	0.67	3.55	9.32	22.25	64.21	100.00
Washing machine	2.84	3.11	7.31	22.00	64.74	100.00
Television	1.15	5.15	10.92	24.30	58.48	100.00
Camera		5.90	8.47	22.73	62.90	100.00
Electric iron	1.33	4.75	10.27	24.79	58.87	100.00
Bicycle	10.49	15.91	20.91	23.64	29.05	100.00
Motorcycle	4.80	8.74	16.15	23.00	47.31	100.00
Car	1.97	2.65	5.75	15.13	74.50	100.00
House	10.51	15.77	19.59	22.66	31.47	100.00
Land or plot	11.68	16.63	19.46	21.75	30.48	100.00
Shares of stock	1.13	5.96	12.03	30.63	50.25	100.00
Boat		5.47	14.34	37.17	43.02	100.00
Canoes	3.09	10.47	12.13	28.92	45.39	100.00
Outboard motor	13.66	4.56	12.04	21.88	47.87	100.00
Mattress or bed	5.63	11.88	16.68	24.70	41.11	100.00
Total	4.46	9.29	14.60	23.83	47.81	100.00

TABLE 27
NATIONAL AGGREGATE VALUE OF ASSETS BY QUINTILES

Current Declared Value of Aggregate Assets by Quintile	
Quintile 1	1.43%
Quintile 2	4.11%
Quintile 3	12.82%
Quintile 4	17.04%
Quintile 5	64.78%

APPENDIX B

POVERTY MEASURES AND INEQUALITY

Introduction

Four types of poverty measures are recognised in this report. They are Relative Poverty Measure, Absolute Poverty Measure through Food Energy Intake, A Dollar Per Day Measure and Objective Poverty Measure.

Poverty Lines

Four poverty lines are presented here. The first, the relative line, is a measure that was used in the previous poverty study in 1996/97. A second line is the proposed one, which measures consumption based on an objective method. This is the absolute poverty line using the food energy in-take. The third is Dollar per day line using purchasing power parity, while the fourth is subjective on the perception of the households.

RELATIVE POVERTY LINE

There are three key issues in poverty measurement. The first deals with the yardstick to be used in assessing living standards and determining who is poor and who is not. The second focuses on drawing the poverty line that is the cut-off living standard level below which a person is classified as poor. The third deals with depth and the severity of poverty. Poverty lines are the starting point for poverty analysis. They are usually based on income or expenditure data, and separate the poor from the non-poor. Those whose income/expenditure fall below the line are poor; those above it non-poor.

Poverty Indices

It has become customary to use the so-called P. alpha measure in analysing poverty. The measure relates to different dimensions of the incidence of poverty. Po, P1 and P2 are used for head count (incidence), depth and severity of poverty respectively. The three dimensions are based on a single formula, but each index puts different weights on the degree to which a household or individual falls below the poverty line. The mathematical formulation for poverty measurements as derived from Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (1984) is:

$$P\alpha = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\frac{Z - y_i}{Z} \right)^\alpha$$

where z = the poverty line

q = the number of individuals below the poverty line

N = the total number of individuals in the in which individual I lives

α = Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT) index and takes on the values of 0,1 and 2.

The quantity in brackets is the proportionate shortfall of expenditure/income below the poverty line. This quantity is raised to a power α , the aversion to poverty as measured by the index is also increased.

If $\alpha = 0$, then FGT becomes:

$$Po = \frac{1}{n} q = \frac{q}{n}$$

$\frac{q}{n}$ is the proportion of the population that falls below the poverty line. This is called the head count or incidence of poverty.

If $\alpha = 1$ then FGT biomes:

$$P1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\frac{z - Y_i}{Z} \right)^1$$

$$= HI$$

where $H = \frac{q}{n}$ and $I = \sum \left(\frac{Z - Y_i}{Z} \right)^1$

If $\alpha = 2$ then FGT becomes:

$$P2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^q \left(\frac{Z - Y_i}{Z} \right)^2$$

Generally, the indices are interpreted as:

Po = Head count/Incidence: Counts the number of people with expenditure/income below the poverty line.

P1 = Depth of Poverty: The percentage of expenditure/income required to bring each individual below the poverty line up to the poverty line.

P2 = Severity of Poverty: It indicates severity of poverty by giving larger weight to the extremely (core poor). This is done by squaring the gap between their expenditures/income and the poverty line in order to increase its weight in the overall poverty measure.

ABSOLUTE POVERTY MEASURE

The following stages are involved:

Computation of Expenditure

An expenditure was computed from the survey which fulfilled the minimum calorie requirement of a basket representative of the poor (40.0 per cent) at reference price (National Prices in January 2004).

Food Energy In-take Poverty Line

The food energy intake method was used in the poverty profile using the formular

$$P\alpha_j = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{i=1}^{\sum} \left(\frac{Z - y_{ij}}{Z} \right)$$

This method is preferred for evaluating the effectiveness of poverty reduction policy.

A calorie intake of FAO = 2100 cals was applied in the report.

The annual expenditure for Nigeria for the absolute poverty lines were ₦12,103 for FAO 2100 calories

Addition of Non-Food Components

The short-cut method (Mckay) was used to compute the non-food components. The food poverty line was inflated by a factor $(1/1-x)$ where x is the proportion of consumption expenditure dedicated to non-food items for those households whose standard of living measure corresponds to the food poverty line. The table below gave the annual expenditure on non-food components for FAO.

TABLE 1

	FAO
Annual Expenditure Food	12,103
Annual Expenditure Non-Food	4,819
Total	16,922

Household Composition Adjustment

Household composition varies. A household with 5 adults will not consume the same amount of food as a one-adult household. In order to account for this difference in consumption, the standard method used for adjusting the household composition to equivalent adults was applied. The table was recommended by FAO

TABLE 2
TABLE FAO ADULT EQUIVALENT SCALE

	SEX	
	Male	Female
0-1	0.27	0.27
1-3	0.45	0.45
4-6	0.61	0.61
7-9	0.73	0.73
10-12	0.86	0.78
13-15	0.96	0.83
16-19	1.02	0.77
20 and above	1.00	0.73

SUBJECTIVE POVERTY MEASURE

It is normally observed that self-rated lines are high. It also increases with time. Self-rated are not quantitatively useful. The report used this approach too. It is a simple frequent tabulation of Yes or No for individual self-assessment of poverty.

Methodologies for other measures have been described in Chapter three.

QUINTILE ANALYSIS

This is another method of evaluating poverty. The poverty sensitive indicators were tabulated by consumption level. The household consumption on per capita basis was ranked and then divided by the population in equal increments. In the report, the divisions were based on quintiles or 20 per cent increments such that the first quintile represents the bottom 20 per cent of the population in terms of consumption (or the poorest) and the highest of 5th quintile represented the highest 20 per cent of the population in terms of consumption.

INEQUALITY MEASURES AND GINI CO-EFFICIENT

The inequality measure uses Lorenz Curve form where the Gini Co-efficient is estimated. One of the standard methods used to evaluate the level of inequality of consumption is by depicting the relative consumption power of the population ranked from the lowest per capita consumption to the highest. The resulting graph is called the Lorenz Curve. The inequality of welfare graph for Nigeria was constituted at the national level.

In Nigeria, the poorest 10 per cent of the population consumed 2.4 per cent of the national welfare while the highest 10 per cent consumed 33.6 per cent of the same. The Gini Co-efficient is also used for measuring inequality. It gives a measure of the differences between idealised curve and the area under the actual Lorenz Curve. The smaller the measure (or the closer it is to zero) the more the curve approaches the idealised line. The closer the Gini Co-efficient, the more equitable is the distribution of welfare while the higher the coefficient, the least equitable distribution.

CORRECTION FOR SEASONAL/REGIONAL VARIATIONS

Prices of items differ from State to State, region to region, etc. Hence, the need for corrections for variations. In the same vein, there are also seasonal variations for which adjustments were done.

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE DESIGN

Introduction

The Nigeria Living Standard Survey (NLSS) is an extensive exercise detailed in its coverage and scope of topics which serve as good bases for in-depth analysis of living standards in the country and also lends itself to the monitoring, evaluation and analysis of poverty in its various ramifications.

MASTER SAMPLE FRAME

Since 1981, Nigeria developed the National Integrated Survey of Households (NISH) for running household-based surveys in a systematic and integrated manner. The current NISH master sample of 2003/04 was used for this survey. Thus, the sample design was two-stage stratified. The first stage was the cluster of housing units called Enumeration Areas (EAs), while the second stage was the housing units.

SAMPLE SIZE

One hundred and twenty (120) EAs were selected in 12 replicates in each State from the NISH master sample frame in replicates (4-15). However, 60 EAs were selected in the Federal Capital Territory. Five (5) housing units (HUs) were scientifically selected in each of the selected EAs. One replicate consisting of 10 EAs in the State and 5 EAs in the Federal Capital Territory were covered every month. Fifty (50) HUs were covered in each State and 25 HUs in the Federal Capital Territory per month. This implied that the survey had an anticipated national sample size of twenty-one thousand and nine hundred (21,900) HUs for the country for the 12-month survey period. Each State had a sample size of 600 HUs, while the Federal Capital Territory had a sample size of 300. The sample size is robust enough to provide reasonable estimates at national and sub-national (State) levels.

ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

The following statistical notations were used:

- N = the number of EAs in each State
- n_i = Size of replicates r^{th}
- r = number of replicates in a State
- H = number of housing units listed in the i^{th} selected EA.
- X_{hj} = number of housing units selected from i^{th} selected EA.

$$W_{rij} = \text{weight of the replicate} = \left(\frac{H}{h_j} x \frac{N}{n_i} \right)$$

Y_{rij} = total value of variable from the i^{th} HU of i^{th} selected EA.

Replicate Estimate (Monthly Estimate)

$$\hat{y}_r = W_{rij} \sum \sum (y_{ij})$$

Annual State Estimate

$$\hat{Y}_r = \sum_{i=1}^{12} \sum_{j=1}^{10} w_{rij} \sum_{i=j}^n Y_{rij}$$

Sampling Error (Variance) Estimate

The Jackknife indefinite method of variance estimation was used for the survey because the method required replication and clustering.

An estimate of State variance was first obtained. Cluster estimate is $(Z_i) = \sum \sum w_{ij} y_{ij}$

$$\text{Mean Estimate } \bar{z} = \frac{\sum Z_r}{rn}$$

Therefore mean variance is

$$V(\bar{z}) = \frac{S_r^2}{r_n}$$

$$\text{where } S_r^2 = \frac{\sum (Z_r - \bar{z})^2}{(rn - 1)}$$

$$\therefore V(\bar{z}) = \frac{\sum (Z_r - \bar{z})^2}{rn(rn - 1)}$$

APPENDIX D

WEIGHTING PROCESSES AND ESTIMATION

Derivation of Weights for the NLSS

The NLSS, like most household surveys, is based on the NISH frame. The NISH design is a two-stage design with EA's as first stage units and households as second stage units. Ten enumeration areas (EAs) were randomly selected each month and five households were systematically selected from the household listing of each selected EAs. Population level estimates are made by multiplying the data for each household by two factors, one equal to the inverse of the probability of selecting that household from the total list of households in its EA, and one equal to the inverse of the probability of selecting that EA from the list of EAs in its State. The selections can be done by treating every unit as the same and using simple random selection or, if the data is available, a more efficient sample can be selected using some size variable known for every unit of the population thought to be correlated with the variables of interest for measurement. So the weighting factor is at the EA level in each State:

$$\sum (N_h / n_h) \sum (M_{hi} / m_{hi}) \sum X_{hij} P_{hij}$$

where

N_h = the total number of EAs in State h.

n_h = the number of sampled EAs in State h.

M_{hi} = the number of listed households in i^{th} EA of State h.

n_{hi} = the number of sampled households in i^{th} EA of State h.

X_{hij} = the number of persons in the j^{th} household in i^{th} EA of State h.

P_{hij} = the poverty score for the j^{th} household in i^{th} EA of State h.

Therefore, the above will apply to all the individual members in order to give the population. However, the weighting factor will be multiplied by average household size, when there is need to take the household aggregates to the population.

APPENDIX E

PRICE DEFLATORS

Price Deflator

A deflator was computed using Consumer Price Index (CPI) data. Deflator was computed for each State and sector (that is, urban and rural) for both food and non-food. Below is a graph depicting the ranges of the rural food and non-food deflator at the zone level. Zonal aggregation clearly reveals regional patterns of cost-of-living differences. These were applied to the expenditure aggregates.


Variations in prices across region and time required the computation of an index to normalize expenditures to a reference period and geographic point. Prices weighted by population share as a reference based in January of 2004 while a basket of food and non-food representative of the poorest 40% of the population were used. January 2004, was chosen as the base month since it was the beginning of the year and well into the survey period.

In Nigeria, prices of goods and services differ among States of the Federation and between Urban/Rural splits. Prices also differ between socio-economic groups. This can be explained by poor households who buy food items in very small quantities and pay high price per item unlike the non-poor households who buy in large quantities.

The comparison of expenditures across geographical zones and socio-economic groups must take into account these differentials. In actual fact, the prices of some food items are cheaper during the harvesting season than planting season.

Standard of Living Measure


Prices vary across regions and time due to inflation and seasonality of supply. In order to account for these price differentials, a Standard of Living measure was computed to deflate the welfare aggregate and express the monetary measure of welfare to a reference point. In the case of this study, the reference month is January 2004 and the prices used are a national average weighted by the population share attributable to that State. CPI data was the main source of price data. In some cases, where the CPI data was inconsistent or unavailable, the price information was used from the market survey (Schedule 3 Questionnaire) conducted concurrently with the survey. Deflators were computed by State and sector (urban and rural) for the twelve months of the survey for both food and non-food (128 indexes were computed). The graph below illustrates the range of the cost of living index across geographical zones for rural food consumption.




$$C_{r,t}^L = \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,0,0} \left(\frac{p_{i,r,t}}{p_{i,0,0}} \right)$$

The methodology used for computing this index was a Laspeyer index. The price index expresses prices with reference to a fixed point in time and fixes a basket of goods. The index will, therefore, measure spatial and temporal variations of price by fixing the basket and the reference price. The equation below summarises the components of the prices index with $C_{r,t}^L$ = the Laspeyer Price Index; $w_{i,0,0}$ is the budget share of commodity i at the reference region r (0) and time t (0); $p_{i,0,0}$ is the reference price for commodity i at the reference region r (0) and time t (0); $p_{i,r,t}$ is the price for commodity i in a particular region and at a particular time.


Urban: Food Cost of Living by Zone



Zone: Non Food Rural Cost of Living



Zone: Non food Urban Cost of Living



APPENDIX F

CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS

The Household Unit: Two definitions are used for household surveys.

(a) The **de facto** definition applies to household members present when the interview takes place.

(b) The **de jure** definition relies on a concept of normal residence whether or not present at time of interview. The survey used this definition because the survey relates to a 12-monthly period. Since the household composition can change substantially over twelve months, it is necessary to use a definition which describes the average household composition during that period.

Two other criteria are used to classify the household members:

* They are people who usually live and eat together in the dwelling.

* They acknowledge the authority of a simple head of household, regardless of whether the latter is living with the other household members or not.

Expenditure: This refers to all expenditure on goods and services for the use of the household. It also includes all monetary transactions (e.g. donations, savings, Esusu contributions etc)

Poverty Line: This is a measure that divides the poor from non-poor.

Incidence of Poverty (Headcount Ratio) (PO): Is defined as the proportion of the population for whom consumption falls below poverty line, in a given population.

Poverty Gap (PI): This is the depth of poverty or distance between the income of the average poor and the poverty line. It is the extent to which the income of the poor lie below the poverty line.

Severity of Poverty (P2): This is a measure of severity of poverty. It weights the poverty of the poorest individual more heavily than those just slightly below the poverty line.

Health Conditions: The main focus of this part is on the use made of medical facilities during the two-week reference period, the type of consultation, the time taken to go for consultation, the cost of consultation and treatment.

(a) **Fertility:** This is for women 15 to 49 years. The question relates to pregnancy, children ever born, pre-natal health facilities and costs/ expenses incurred in visiting these facilities.

(b) **Post-Natal Care:** This relates to children five years and below. It seeks information of child's health status as influenced by past feeding habits and in particular the duration of breast-feeding.

(c) **Preventive Health:** This part collects information on vaccinations, the effects of vaccination programmes and vaccination services offered through health centres, clinics and hospitals.

Access to Improved Water: Refers to proportion of households with reasonable access to decent and adequate water supplies.

Access to Sanitary Means of Excreta Disposal: Is the percentage of the population with disposal facilities that can effectively prevent human, animal and insect contact with excreta. This disposal facility includes flush toilets connected to swage systems, or septic tanks, improved pit latrines and traditional pit latrines with cover.

Human Development Index: Refers to composite indicators of a country's development, that includes its progress in health and education.

Average Per Capita Consumption: The average amount of consumption accruing to each individual in a household.

Gini Co-efficient/Income Inequality: The Gini Co-efficient is a summary measure of how unevenly incomes are spread in a given population. The co-efficient ranges between 0, represent perfect equality and 1, representing complete income inequality.

GNP Per Capita: Gross National Product (GNP) measures the total domestic and foreign value-added created by residents of a country. GNP per capita is, therefore, the value of GNP for every individual in the country.

Inflation: Increase in the amount of money needed to purchase the same basket of goods and services as time passes by. This increase is generally reflected in a sharp increase in the level and cost of living.

Malnutrition: A worsening of health resulting from the relative or absolute shortage of one or more essential nutrients or calories.

Under – 5 Mortality Rate: The probability of a new born dying before reaching the age of 5 often expressed as a share of 1000 live births.

Wasting: Rapid weight loss from malnutrition. It is also called acute malnutrition.

Contraceptive Prevalence Rate: Is the percentage of women who are practising or whose sexual partners are practising, any form of contraception.

Total Fertility Rate: Is the number of children who would be born to a woman if she were to live to the end of her child-bearing years and bear children in accordance with current age-specific fertility rates.

Gross Domestic Product: Represents the sum of value-added by all producers in the economy.

Gross Domestic Savings: The difference between GDP and total consumption.

Food Production Index: Covers foods that are considered edible and that contain nutrients. The index is calculated using the laspeyres formula.

APPENDIX A
STATISTICAL TABLES

TABLE 1
POVERTY INCIDENCE BY STATE (1996, 2004)

STATE	YEAR	
	1996	2004
Abia	56.2	22.27
Adamawa	65.5	71.73
Akwa Ibom	66.9	34.82
Anambra	51.0	20.11
Bauchi	83.5	86.29
Bayelsa	44.3	19.98
Benue	64.2	55.33
Borno	66.9	53.63
Cross River	66.9	41.61
Delta	56.1	45.35
Ebonyi	51.0	43.33
Edo	56.1	33.09
Ekiti	71.6	42.27
Enugu	51.0	31.12
Gombe	83.5	77.01
Imo	56.2	27.39
Jigawa	71.0	95.07
Kaduna	67.7	50.24
Kano	71.0	61.29
Katsina	77.7	71.06
Kebbi	83.6	89.65
Kogi	75.5	88.55
Kwara	75.5	85.22
Lagos	53.0	63.58
Nassarawa	62.7	61.59
Niger	52.2	63.90
Ogun	69.9	31.73
Ondo	71.6	42.14
Osun	58.7	32.35
Oyo	58.7	24.08
Plateau	62.7	60.37
Rivers	44.3	29.09
Sokoto	83.9	76.81
Taraba	65.5	62.15
Yobe	66.9	83.25
Zamfara	83.9	80.93
FCT	53.0	43.32
All Nigeria	65.6	54.4

TABLE .2 POVERTY INCIDENCE USING 2900 CALORIE LIMIT PLUS A COMPONENT OF NON-FOOD EXPENDITURE OF 8385 NAIRA BY STATE			TABLE 3. DOLLAR PER DAY BASED ON AN ADJUSTED PURCHASING POWER PARITY BY STATE		
State	Poor	Non-Poor	State	Poor	Non-Poor
Abia	32.36	67.64	Abia	28.01	71.99
Adamawa	71.61	28.39	Adamawa	68.91	31.09
Akwa Ibom	50.83	49.17	Akwa Ibom	46.04	53.96
Anambra	32.12	67.88	Anambra	30.36	69.64
Bauchi	77.03	22.97	Bauchi	76.51	23.49
Bayelsa	33.33	66.67	Bayelsa	26.29	73.71
Benue	48.76	51.24	Benue	42.84	57.16
Borno	50.56	49.44	Borno	48.65	51.35
Cross River	55.04	44.96	Cross River	51.64	48.36
Delta	64.52	35.48	Delta	62.28	37.72
Ebonyi	51.88	48.12	Ebonyi	46.06	53.94
Edo	47.02	52.98	Edo	44.31	55.69
Ekiti	39.27	60.73	Ekiti	35.51	64.49
Enugu	36.76	63.24	Enugu	33.89	66.11
Gombe	70.04	29.96	Gombe	66.34	33.66
Imo	28.10	71.90	Imo	26.46	73.54
Jigawa	90.91	9.09	Jigawa	89.54	10.46
Kaduna	40.88	59.12	Kaduna	37.72	62.28
Kano	49.73	50.27	Kano	46.70	53.30
Katsina	62.19	37.81	Katsina	60.42	39.58
Kebbi	89.00	11.00	Kebbi	86.20	13.80
Kogi	89.62	10.38	Kogi	87.46	12.54
Kwara	81.73	18.27	Kwara	79.85	20.15
Lagos	66.96	33.04	Lagos	64.05	35.95
Nassarawa	52.87	47.13	Nassarawa	48.17	51.83
Niger	60.48	39.52	Niger	56.01	43.99
Ogun	30.99	69.01	Ogun	29.84	70.16
Ondo	47.31	52.69	Ondo	41.47	58.53
Osun	24.67	75.33	Osun	22.66	77.34
Oyo	20.95	79.05	Oyo	19.28	80.72
Plateau	54.91	45.09	Plateau	46.78	53.22
Rivers	46.40	53.60	Rivers	43.12	56.88
Sokoto	74.53	25.47	Sokoto	70.54	29.46
Taraba	57.98	42.02	Taraba	54.07	45.93
Yobe	78.22	21.78	Yobe	74.12	25.88
Zamfara	76.40	23.60	Zamfara	73.38	26.62
FCT	51.43	48.57	FCT	46.98	53.02
Total	54.7	45.3	Total	51.55	48.45

TABLE .4
SELF-ASSESSMENT OF POVERTY BY STATE

State	Very Poor	Averagely Poor	Non-Poor
Abia	34.45	46.68	18.87
Adamawa	26.97	47.21	25.82
Akwa Ibom	16.86	49.35	33.79
Anambra	16.19	54.29	29.52
Bauchi	27.01	59.26	13.73
Bayelsa	61.48	33.32	5.20
Benue	26.15	54.69	19.16
Borno	36.86	50.87	12.27
Cross River	21.70	55.24	23.06
Delta	25.13	55.42	19.45
Ebonyi	36.74	49.84	13.42
Edo	34.51	44.64	20.85
Ekiti	35.57	60.65	3.78
Enugu	17.24	59.53	23.23
Gombe	12.25	62.03	25.72
Imo	25.42	53.57	21.01
Jigawa	13.87	47.15	38.97
Kaduna	11.87	59.94	28.19
Kano	18.40	54.58	27.02
Katsina	5.60	67.71	26.69
Kebbi	12.53	62.36	25.12
Kogi	28.63	56.24	15.12
Kwara	32.57	54.75	12.68
Lagos	16.84	51.37	31.78
Nassarawa	19.23	58.51	22.26
Niger	18.10	56.39	25.51
Ogun	18.55	59.69	21.76
Ondo	34.12	47.17	18.71
Osun	20.45	42.26	37.29
Oyo	12.51	49.63	37.86
Plateau	19.42	58.33	22.25
Rivers	14.93	51.87	33.19
Sokoto	17.89	59.64	22.47
Taraba	29.71	52.28	18.01
Yobe	26.29	55.04	18.67
Zamfara	18.52	54.12	27.36
FCT	17.38	57.82	24.80
Total	21.37	54.10	24.54

TABLE .5
PRIMARY REASON FOR POVERTY BY SELF-ASSESSMENT

Primary Reasons For Poverty	%
Agricultural inputs too high	28.54
Lack of capital to expand own business	10.00
Lack of capital to expand agricultural business	7.48
Low agricultural production	7.03
Low salaries	6.81
Lack of credit facilities to expand own business	6.41
Agricultural inputs not available	6.15
Hard economic times	5.46
Commodity prices high	4.45
Agricultural produce prices too low	3.07
Lack of adequate land	2.46
Others	2.36
Lack of employment opportunities	1.98
Low profit from business	1.61
Business not doing well	1.61
Lack of agricultural inputs due to other reasons	1.45
Lack of credit facilities to expand agricultural activities	1.40
No buyers for agricultural produce	0.74
Drought	0.35
Loss of property due to conflict	0.19
Lack of livestock due to death	0.19
Too much competition	0.14
Loss of employment due to conflict	0.11
Loss of limbs due to conflict	0.02
Total	100.00

TABLE .6
POVERTY FIGURES BY SECTOR, ZONE AND STATE

	Percentage of pop.	Incidence of Poverty P0	Poverty Gap P1	Poverty Severity P2	Welfare Gap P1/P0	C0 Contribution	Gini
National	100.00%	54.41%	0.2180	0.1191	0.4006	100.00%	0.4882
Urban	44.10%	43.19%	0.1670	0.0918	0.3868	35.00%	0.5441
Rural	55.90%	63.27%	0.2582	0.1406	0.4080	65.00%	0.5187
South South	14.98%	35.06%	0.1696	0.0903	0.4837	9.66%	0.5072
South East	12.08%	26.74%	0.0996	0.0455	0.3724	5.94%	0.4494
South West	19.55%	43.01%	0.1821	0.1024	0.4234	15.45%	0.5538
North Central	14.37%	66.97%	0.2832	0.1685	0.4229	17.69%	0.3934
North East	13.36%	72.16%	0.2743	0.1434	0.3801	17.71%	0.4590
North West	25.65%	71.17%	0.2567	0.1374	0.3607	33.55%	0.3711
State							
Abia	2.62%	22.27%	0.0904	0.0424	0.4059	1.07%	0.4693
Adamawa	2.36%	71.73%	0.3149	0.1768	0.4390	3.11%	0.4696
Akwa Ibom	2.70%	34.82%	0.1584	0.0843	0.4548	1.73%	0.5003
Anambra	3.14%	20.11%	0.0768	0.0324	0.3820	1.16%	0.4819
Bauchi	3.21%	86.29%	0.3220	0.1676	0.3731	5.09%	0.4782
Bayelsa	1.08%	19.98%	0.0994	0.0557	0.4977	0.40%	0.4757
Benue	3.09%	55.33%	0.1543	0.0691	0.2789	3.14%	0.5450
Borno	2.86%	53.63%	0.1889	0.0891	0.3522	2.81%	0.3947
Cross River	2.14%	41.61%	0.1969	0.1039	0.4731	1.64%	0.5046
Delta	2.91%	45.35%	0.2222	0.1157	0.4899	2.42%	0.4650
Ebonyi	1.25%	43.33%	0.1806	0.0917	0.4169	0.99%	0.4092
Edo	2.44%	33.09%	0.1568	0.0804	0.4739	1.48%	0.4585
Ekiti	1.33%	42.27%	0.1181	0.0479	0.2795	1.03%	0.5074
Enugu	2.29%	31.12%	0.1118	0.0512	0.3591	1.31%	0.4435
Gombe	1.67%	77.01%	0.2936	0.1568	0.3812	2.36%	0.4343
Imo	2.79%	27.39%	0.0871	0.0373	0.3179	1.40%	0.5125
Jigawa	3.22%	95.07%	0.4413	0.2643	0.4641	5.63%	0.4397
Kaduna	4.41%	50.24%	0.1155	0.0516	0.2300	4.08%	0.4226
Kano	6.52%	61.29%	0.1530	0.0778	0.2497	7.34%	0.4318
Katsina	4.21%	71.06%	0.2351	0.1155	0.3308	5.50%	0.4110
Kebbi	2.32%	89.65%	0.3968	0.2135	0.4426	3.82%	0.4104
Kogi	2.41%	88.55%	0.5346	0.3619	0.6037	3.92%	0.5555
Kwara	1.74%	85.22%	0.4236	0.2778	0.4971	2.72%	0.4783
Lagos	6.41%	63.58%	0.3473	0.2200	0.5462	7.49%	0.6429
Nassarawa	1.44%	61.59%	0.1582	0.0734	0.2568	1.63%	0.4665
Niger	2.72%	63.90%	0.2099	0.1006	0.3284	3.19%	0.4619
Ogun	2.62%	31.73%	0.1023	0.0422	0.3224	1.53%	0.5251
Ondo	2.92%	42.14%	0.1539	0.0694	0.3652	2.26%	0.5038
Osun	2.42%	32.35%	0.0757	0.0332	0.2339	1.44%	0.5031
Oyo	3.86%	24.08%	0.0585	0.0244	0.2431	1.71%	0.4315
Plateau	2.27%	60.37%	0.2003	0.1082	0.3317	2.52%	0.4390
Rivers	3.71%	29.09%	0.1498	0.0840	0.5150	1.99%	0.4792
Sokoto	2.71%	76.81%	0.3333	0.1839	0.4339	3.83%	0.3253
Taraba	1.69%	62.15%	0.2112	0.1022	0.3399	1.93%	0.5118
Yobe	1.57%	83.25%	0.3178	0.1723	0.3817	2.40%	0.4503
Zamfara	2.26%	80.93%	0.3264	0.1752	0.4032	3.36%	0.3366
FCT	0.71%	43.32%	0.1787	0.0898	0.4126	0.56%	0.4368

TABLE 7
PLACE OF VACCINATION OF CHILDREN
BY STANDARD OF LIVING QUINTILE

Place of Vaccination	QUINTILE					Sex		Total
	1	2	3	4	5	Male	Female	
Health centre	56.15	43.19	47.96	51.79	45.53	49.01	47.57	48.3
Hospital	16.13	23.57	27.55	25.64	30.68	27.42	25.29	26.36
Private clinic	4.85	11.23	5.06	3.78	4.69	4.92	5.99	5.45
Mobile unit	8.23	7.92	7.67	6.61	6.37	7.72	6.44	7.09
School	2.3	2.66	0.82	1.83	0.66	1.16	1.67	1.41
Home	12.34	11.43	10.94	10.34	12.07	9.76	13.04	11.38
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 8
PLACE OF CONSULTATION BY QUINTILE

Place of first consultation	QUINTILE					Sex		Total
	1	2	3	4	5	Male	Female	
Hospital	20.9	30.16	35.56	38.1	49.66	39.36	40.38	39.88
Dispensary	20.57	17.83	15	12.92	6.21	12.04	11.65	11.84
Pharmacy	4.7	8.82	12.81	9.92	8.1	9.58	8.74	9.15
Clinic	14.83	11.26	12.31	15.79	15.15	14.61	14.02	14.3
Maternity	2.33	1.35	1.96	2.8	2.07	1.48	2.79	2.15
MCH Post	0.12	0.72	0.68	0.45	0.53	0.58	0.47	0.53
Consultant	10.02	8.07	5.61	5.51	5.57	6.28	6.17	6.23
Patient's home	6.33	8.34	7.37	5.79	5.82	6.65	6.23	6.43
Other	20.2	13.46	8.7	8.72	6.89	9.43	9.55	9.49
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 9
MAIN SOURCE OF LIGHTING
BY STANDARD OF LIVING QUINTILE

Main Source of lighting	QUINTILE					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Kerosene	60.62	61.89	56.12	43.92	32.77	49.66
Gas	1.17	1.5	0.76	0.77	0.81	0.98
Main electricity	32.41	32.43	39.61	51.56	63.35	45.39
Electric generator	0.21	0.2	0.26	0.56	0.87	0.45
Battery	0.11	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.04
Candle	0.07	0.23	0.03	0.11	0.07	0.1
Firewood	3.63	2.49	2.41	2.3	1.56	2.41
Others	1.77	1.2	0.79	0.77	0.55	0.97
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 10
MATERIAL USED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF WALL BY STANDARD OF LIVING
BY QUINTILE

	QUINTILE					
Material of outside wall	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Mud	58.47	57.02	51.73	38.61	24.56	44.45
Stone	0.8	0.48	0.91	0.6	0.81	0.72
Burnt bricks	1.94	2.67	2.74	3.06	2.74	2.66
Cement of concrete	29.96	32.48	38.07	50.99	65.89	45.17
Wood or bamboo	0.55	0.7	0.73	0.67	0.36	0.59
Iron sheets	0.56	0.32	0.66	0.63	0.72	0.59
Cardboard	0.01	0.03	0.08	0.09	0.22	0.1
Other	7.71	6.3	5.08	5.36	4.69	5.72
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 11
MAIN FLOORING MATERIAL OF LIVING BY QUINTILE

	QUINTILE					
Main flooring material	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Earth or mud	39.04	36.08	29.62	20.75	11.77	26.19
Wood or tile	1.13	1.41	1.87	1.51	1.4	1.47
Plank	1.4	0.88	1.38	0.99	1.57	1.26
Concrete	46.25	49.59	57.82	68.42	78.27	61.56
Dirt or straw	5.43	5.55	3.64	2.83	1.6	3.62
Other	6.75	6.48	5.67	5.5	5.39	5.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 12
MAIN ROOFING MATERIALS
BY STANDARD OF LIVING QUINTILE

	QUINTILE					
Main roofing material	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Mud or mud bricks	18.43	16.22	12.12	7.72	4.1	11.07
Thatch grass or straw	14.67	13.69	9.87	6.83	4.13	9.35
Wood or bamboo	2.73	1.74	2.88	1.5	1.2	1.95
Corrugated iron sheets	54.14	59.95	67.43	75	80.87	68.65
Cement or concrete	1.3	1.65	1.96	2.29	2.63	2.02
Roofing tiles	1.25	0.6	0.55	0.89	0.89	0.84
Other	7.48	6.16	5.19	5.77	6.18	6.13
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 13
AGRICULTURAL AND NON AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATION BY STATE

	Agric. Occupation.	Non-Agric. Occupation.	Total
Abia	20.28	79.72	100
Adamawa	31.23	68.77	100
Akwa Ibom	21.24	78.76	100
Anambra	24.27	75.73	100
Bauchi	27.76	72.24	100
Bayelsa	28.93	71.07	100
Benue	46.92	53.08	100
Borno	35.53	64.47	100
Cross River	29.97	70.03	100
Delta	20.09	79.91	100
Ebonyi	34.53	65.47	100
Edo	17.3	82.7	100
Ekiti	19.91	80.09	100
Enugu	28.28	71.72	100
Gombe	24.5	75.5	100
Imo	27.59	72.41	100
Jigawa	38.34	61.66	100
Kaduna	13.83	86.17	100
Kano	10.59	89.41	100
Katsina	24.54	75.46	100
Kebbi	31.66	68.34	100
Kogi	16.84	83.16	100
Kwara	8.34	91.66	100
Lagos	0.79	99.21	100
Nassarawa	23.32	76.68	100
Niger	22.93	77.07	100
Ogun	9.94	90.06	100
Ondo	21.67	78.33	100
Osun	7.93	92.07	100
Oyo	10.56	89.44	100
Plateau	31.95	68.05	100
Rivers	15.94	84.06	100
Sokoto	26.7	73.3	100
Taraba	27.64	72.36	100
Yobe	34.15	65.85	100
Zamfara	30.33	69.67	100
FCT	19.27	80.73	100
Total	21.54	78.46	100

TABLE 14
AGE GROUP BY RELATIVE POVERTY INCIDENCE

	Core Poor	Moderately Poor	Non- Poor	Total
5 to 9 years old	45.60	35.49	18.91	100.00
10 to 14 years old	43.79	37.65	18.56	100.00
15 to 19 years old	38.24	36.19	25.57	100.00
20 to 24 years old	26.38	38.34	35.27	100.00
25 to 29 years old	21.93	36.55	41.52	100.00
30 to 34 years old	22.46	40.14	37.40	100.00
35 to 39 years old	25.54	39.68	34.78	100.00
40 to 44 years old	24.53	41.11	34.36	100.00
45 to 49 years old	22.29	41.15	36.56	100.00
50 to 54 years old	22.43	37.61	39.95	100.00
55 to 59 years old	19.32	37.82	42.86	100.00
60 to 64 years old	17.74	32.95	49.31	100.00
65 to 69 years old	14.03	30.38	55.59	100.00
70 and above	16.27	29.75	53.98	100.00
Total	25.15	37.45	37.40	100.00

TABLE 15
OWNERSHIP OF LIVESTOCK BY ZONE

	Zone					
	South South	South East	South West	North Central	North East	North West
Draught animals	1.67	0.29		17.92	80.13	
Cattle	0.04	0.82	0.09	3.22	36.59	59.24
Sheep	1.17	6.86	1.32	5.89	24.87	59.9
Goats	3.68	18.4	4.15	11.88	21.11	40.79
Pigs	0.79	3.49	7.18	46.45	20.34	21.74
Rabbits	8.29	54.56		7.31	3.11	26.73
Chicken	5.43	22.33	5.4	14.96	19.43	32.44
Other Poultry	2.41	8.59	2.33	10.83	29.64	46.2
Other Livestock	4.09	19.42	4.02	5.88	24.84	41.75
Fish	9.32	0.47	49.74	38.97	0.98	0.52
Crab	83.57	5.37	7.17		3.9	
Other	20.58	11.7	8.13	10.12	19.87	29.59
Total	4.34	13.47	9.96	15	19.6	37.63

TABLE 16
OWNERSHIP OF LIVESTOCK BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

	Student/ Unemployed/Inactive	Rtd. Tech.	Admin.	Clerical	Sales	Ser-vices & related	Agric. & Forestry	Production and Trans-port	Manufact. Processing	Others
Draught Animals	1.23	1.01		0.46	1.56	1.71	92.68	0.11		1.24
Cattle	1.03	1.36	0.2	1.01	1.37	0.58	93.58	0.35	0.11	0.41
Sheep	1.28	2.37	0.09	1.4	3.46	1.72	88.33	0.36	0.24	0.75
Goats	1.84	2.59	0.08	2.25	4.33	1.46	85.41	0.59	0.33	1.12
Pigs	1.68	3.41	0.68	0.96	0.51	1.58	86.71	3.41		1.07
Rabbits	4.14				25.11	12.12	58.62			
Chickens	1.91	2.97	0.05	2.34	3.82	1.84	84.71	0.65	0.46	1.25
Other Poultry	1.09	4.41	0.21	2.38	3.28	3.27	83.32	0.32	0.73	0.99
Other Livestock	4.92	3.88		1.04	0.93	2.42	84.85		1.04	0.93
Fish	8.09	12.12	1.09	8.96	21.95	6.08	25.24	4.78	3.84	7.86
Crabs					7.1		92.9			
Others	2.63	4.98		2.28	5.63		79.86		3	1.62
Total	2.56	3.92	0.23	2.92	6.14	2.24	78.05	1.13	0.83	1.97

TABLE 17
PRIMARY CROPS GROWN BY ZONE

Primary Crop Grown in Last 12 months	Zone			North Cent'l	North East	North West
	South South	South East	South West			
Avocado Pears	0.5	1.01	0.5	0.45	0.64	0.53
Bananas	1.05	1.07	0.47	0.2	0.11	0.15
Beans	0.12	0.09	0.39	3.28	16.39	20.04
Peas	0.05	0.24	0.14	0.12	0.07	0.18
Coconut	0.03	0.39		0.11	0.04	0.03
Coffee	0.02	0.03	0.11		0.02	
Cotton	0.36	0.14	0.08	0.29	0.63	1.98
Cocoa	1.29	0.34	21.59	0.14	0.03	0.11
Cassava	67.62	50.74	42.59	14.68	0.87	0.7
G'nuts/Peanuts	0.54	0.47	0.2	12.44	7.83	7.19
Guineacorn	0.11	0.01	0.3	17.87	33.37	41.27
Millet	0.09	0.05		5.26	15.93	15.2
Colanut	0.09	0.25	1.09	0.17	0.15	0.27
Egg Plants		0.03	0.08	0.05		0.09
Leafy Vegetables	2.01	1.4	0.05	0.14	0.02	0.03
Kenef		0.07		0.07		0.02
Mangoes	0.07	0.86	0.12	0.61	0.1	0.41
Maize	8.51	8.83	10.75	11.68	15.44	6.92
Oil Palm	1.88	7.3	1.13	0.54	0.06	
Okro	0.4	0.83		2.09	0.29	0.21
Other Vegetables	0.93	0.6	0.44	0.23	0.08	0.05
Other Crops	0.15	0.26	0.49	2.31	0.37	0.22
Onions	0.04	0.11	0.16	0.03	0.16	0.27
Oranges	0.13	0.83		0.49	0.21	0.01
Pineapples	0.09	0.12	0.1		0.02	0.02
Plantain	1.54	1.12	0.52	0.02		
Pepper	0.19	0.22	2.63	1.82	0.39	0.5
Pawpaw	0.15	0.15		0.07		
Potatoes	0.24	0.13		0.54	0.15	0.46
Sweet Potatoes	0.13	0.44		0.92	0.28	0.11
Rice	0.56	1.48	0.1	7.93	4.84	2.37
Rubber	0.05	0.04		0.12		
Sugar cane	0.08			0.14	0.07	0.14
Tobacco	0.04	0.05		0.01		0.02
Tomatoes		0.05	1.39	0.35	0.1	0.24
Wood	0.23	0.05	0.29			0.02
Yams	10.72	20.19	14.28	14.81	1.35	0.24

TABLE 18
PRIMARY CROPS GROWN BY QUINTILE

Primary Crop Grown in Last 12 Months	Quint.				
	1	2	3	4	5
Avocado Pears	20.56	12.4	19.4	20.49	27.15
Bananas	3.67	9.26	21.44	25.16	40.47
Beans	24.4	29.1	20.49	15.35	10.67
Peas	7.62	21.62	19.42	18.97	32.37
Coconut	7.9	5.77	10.07	15.91	60.36
Cotton	15.08	22.18	28.34	20.22	14.18
Cocoa	7.03	8.77	21.64	21.41	41.15
Cassava	7.11	12	18.89	24.95	37.05
G'nuts/Peanuts	15.41	21.64	23.61	21.35	17.98
Guineacorn	21.53	24.22	23.9	18.69	11.66
Millet	21.26	25.49	23.93	18.62	10.69
Colanuts	8.64	10.2	29.92	23.14	28.1
Egg Plants	54.32		30.82		14.86
Leafy Vegetables	8.24	6.56	11.67	34.86	38.67
Kenef	6.65	18.43	14.51	16.7	43.71
Mangoes	7.14	15.73	16.92	22.42	37.78
Maize	11.35	15.93	20.13	23.62	28.97
Oil Palm	3.55	9.84	17.74	27.84	41.03
Okro	6.74	11.49	26.91	30.05	24.81
Other Vegetables	2.61	7.65	19.52	25.57	44.65
Other Crops	13.63	16.25	21.93	28.09	20.11
Onions	7.55	4.43	27.15	41.98	18.89
Oranges		13.32	17.2	39.53	29.95
Pineapples	12.25	8.07	7.43	23.03	49.21
Plantain	2.24	4.32	23.96	33.35	36.13
Pepper	10.48	5.37	31.07	19.72	33.36
Pawpaw			24.46	23.36	52.18
Potatoes	14.53	27.19	19.61	22.9	15.76
Sweet Potatoes	10.17	18.17	18.64	28.77	24.25
Rice	7.66	16.36	24.43	28.53	23.01
Rubber		26.9	15.22	57.88	
Sugar cane	8.47	4.49	43.22	14.97	28.85
Tobacco	53.28		17.38	20.12	9.22
Tomatoes	3.64	7.81	18.65	24.08	45.81
Wood		8.12	27.27	37.45	27.16
Yams	9.27	12.52	18.56	25.12	34.54

TABLE 19
PRIMARY CROPS GROWN BY SEX

Primary Crop Grown in Last 12 Months	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
Avocado Pears	0.57	0.85	0.62
Bananas	0.41	0.8	0.48
Beans	10.13	1.83	8.64
Peas	0.13	0.2	0.14
Coconut	0.08	0.25	0.11
Coffee	0.02	0.04	0.02
Cotton	0.86	0.29	0.76
Cocoa	1.94	1.19	1.8
Cassava	18.91	51.77	24.82
G'nuts/Peanuts	5.98	3.21	5.48
Guinea corn	22.67	5.17	19.53
Millet	8.99	1.15	7.58
Colanuts	0.27	0.23	0.26
Egg Plants	0.04	0.07	0.05
Leafy Vegetables	0.34	1.69	0.59
Kenef	0.04		0.03
Mangoes	0.38	0.57	0.42
Maize	10.17	9.19	10
Oil Palm	1.49	3.58	1.87
Okro	0.62	0.9	0.67
Other Vegetables	0.31	0.47	0.34
Other Crops	0.56	0.85	0.61
Onions	0.13	0.2	0.14
Oranges	0.22	0.7	0.3
Pineapples	0.04	0.09	0.05
Plantain	0.4	0.79	0.47
Pepper	0.65	1.23	0.76
Pawpaw	0.06	0.09	0.06
Potatoes	0.33	0.13	0.3
Sweet Potatoes	0.36	0.22	0.33
Rice	3.5	1.5	3.14
Rubber	0.03	0.02	0.03
Sugar cane	0.08	0.09	0.08
Tobacco	0.03		0.02
Tomatoes	0.21	0.42	0.25
Wood	0.06	0.1	0.07
Yams	8.98	10.14	9.19

TABLE 20
PRIMARY CROP GROWN IN LAST 12 MONTHS
BY MEANS OF OBTAINING LAND

Crop	Means of obtaining land				Total
	Rents	Share cropping	Free	Distributed	
Cassava	42.95	30.86	28.88	28.85	31.76
Guineacorn	9.74	9.32	11.20	18.10	14.62
Maize	14.55	2.47	12.16	13.23	13.11
Yam	4.54	2.47	13.76	8.49	8.88
Beans	2.83	14.96	5.46	6.36	5.52
Millet	4.14		5.16	6.09	5.40
Rice	9.35	26.30	4.62	1.28	4.04
Groundnuts or					
Peanuts	1.80	8.65	3.64	2.95	2.95
Other	10.09	4.96	15.12	14.65	13.72
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 21
SEX OF HOLDER BY MEANS OF OBTAINING LAND

Means of Obtaining Land					
Sex	Share				
	Rents	Cropping	Use Free	Distributed	Total
Male	77.55	83.88	75.58	73.59	75.05
Female	22.45	16.12	24.42	26.41	24.95
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 22
USE OF AGRICULTURAL INPUTS BY QUINTILE

	QUINTILE				
	1	2	3	4	5
Inorganic fertilizer	17.87	20.65	20.98	20.29	20.21
Organic fertilizer	26.04	19.73	18.84	18.57	16.81
Insecticides	16.84	18.47	21.91	19.46	23.32
Herbicides	23.17	15.70	22.94	20.36	17.84
Storage of crops	14.54	18.33	20.31	22.42	24.41
Purchased seed	9.24	12.24	16.41	23.79	38.33
Irrigation	25.83	14.42	27.08	16.60	16.06
Bags, containers	14.37	21.03	24.16	23.07	17.37
Petrol	11.38	14.77	14.20	19.29	40.36
Spare parts	16.22	11.43	13.00	12.64	46.71
Hired labour	9.95	14.95	19.68	23.33	32.10
Transport of crops	13.08	17.52	22.63	22.62	24.15
Renting animals	17.00	18.13	29.69	21.33	13.85
Renting equipment	11.11	22.50	26.80	18.24	21.35
Local hand tools	13.77	18.67	20.75	22.48	24.32
Imported hand tools	11.27	9.84	18.66	24.45	35.78
Repairs and maintenance	13.71	20.72	23.26	21.91	20.40
Other crop costs	9.48	17.13	19.72	19.13	34.54
Animal feed	17.94	24.02	22.94	20.56	14.55
Veterinarian services	19.72	25.79	22.66	16.65	15.18
Paid labour for herding	17.67	19.54	19.38	25.66	17.75
Maintenance of pens	13.02	15.18	26.22	22.66	22.91
Transport of feed	19.03	24.25	22.80	18.52	15.40
Commission	16.74	25.48	22.61	21.03	14.15
Compensation	23.56	20.87	16.18	16.19	23.20
Other livestock	9.39	14.26	20.75	24.07	31.53
Hired labor	11.29	16.96	21.89	20.74	29.11
Fuel	14.05	17.38	15.14	12.49	40.94
Hired laborr	9.69	14.83	12.25	18.60	44.62
Spare parts	19.33	17.37	17.91	7.99	37.40
Rent and maintenance	9.80	15.91	16.57	16.27	41.44
Hiring of equipment	5.17	18.07		10.58	66.18
Other inputs	8.77	12.16	15.01	13.00	51.06
Total	15.67	18.69	21.00	21.39	23.26

TABLE 23
USE OF AGRICULTURAL INPUTS BY SEX

	Sex		
	Male	Female	Total
Inorganic fertilizer	9.70	16.42	10.23
Organic fertilizer	13.29	6.58	12.76
Insecticides	3.82	2.24	3.69
Herbicides	1.23	0.67	1.19
Storage of crops	1.67	1.13	1.63
Purchased seed	4.31	9.70	4.74
Irrigation	0.22	0.05	0.21
Bags, containers	9.18	4.97	8.84
Petrol	0.37	0.15	0.35
Spare parts	0.26	0.09	0.24
Hired labour	12.47	22.94	13.30
Transport of crops	9.52	7.04	9.32
Renting animals	1.18	0.42	1.12
Renting equipment	0.40		0.37
Local hand tools	13.96	15.78	14.11
Imported hand tools	1.08	0.98	1.07
Repairs and			
Maintenance	3.26	1.89	3.15
Other crop costs	0.52	0.85	0.54
Animal feed	5.03	2.21	4.81
Veterinarian services	2.50	0.80	2.36
Paid labour for herding	0.53	0.44	0.53
Maintenance of pens	0.32	0.06	0.30
Transport of feed	1.34	0.57	1.28
Commission	1.09	0.48	1.04
Compensation	0.38	0.09	0.35
Other livestock	0.63	1.18	0.68
Hired labour	0.71	1.06	0.74
Fuel	0.16		0.15
Hired labour	0.24	0.14	0.23
Spare parts	0.05	0.08	0.06
Rent and maintenance	0.40	0.64	0.42
Hiring of equipment	0.03	0.09	0.04
Other inputs	0.15	0.24	0.16
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 26
PROCESSING OF FOOD CROPS BY SECTOR

Food Processing	SECTOR		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Maize flour processing	15.01	84.99	100.00
Flour others processing	12.38	87.62	100.00
Husk and polish rice	15.47	84.53	100.00
Manufacture home drink	13.53	86.47	100.00
Cassava flour processing	15.48	84.52	100.00
Shelled nuts	15.94	84.06	100.00
Processed fish	15.71	84.29	100.00
Garri processing	15.91	84.09	100.00
Shear butter processing	20.58	79.42	100.00
Other nut processing	13.71	86.29	100.00
Yam flour processing	38.87	61.13	100.00
Other	66.86	33.14	100.00
Total	37.19	62.81	100.00

Food Processing	SECTOR		Total
	Urban	Rural	
Maize flour processing	3.19	10.71	7.91
Flour others processing	3.54	14.84	10.64
Husk and polish rice	1.35	4.35	3.23
Manufacture home drink	0.14	0.51	0.37
Cassava flour processing	3.44	11.13	8.27
Shelled nuts	1.18	3.68	2.75
Processed fish	0.57	1.82	1.35
Garri processing	7.61	23.83	17.80
Shear butter processing	0.68	1.56	1.24
Other nut processing	0.44	1.65	1.20
Yam flour processing	4.83	4.50	4.62
Other	73.01	21.42	40.61
	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE 27

ASSET DISTRIBUTION BY QUINTILES

Asset	Quintiles					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Furniture	3.00	7.87	14.78	24.19	50.15	100.00
Sewing machine	2.09	7.73	12.62	28.18	49.38	100.00
Stove	2.16	7.41	12.88	24.66	52.90	100.00
Refrigerator/ Freezer	0.81	2.69	8.29	23.02	65.19	100.00
Air Conditioner	1.38	1.60	4.29	9.77	82.97	100.00
Fan	1.48	6.27	12.93	24.18	55.13	100.00
Radio Cassete	5.27	10.71	16.08	24.20	43.73	100.00
Gas cooker	0.54	1.23	1.77	15.00	81.46	100.00
Generator	0.77	0.93	7.28	10.44	80.59	100.00
Video equipment	0.67	3.55	9.32	22.25	64.21	100.00
Washing machine	2.84	3.11	7.31	22.00	64.74	100.00
Television	1.15	5.15	10.92	24.30	58.48	100.00
Camera		5.90	8.47	22.73	62.90	100.00
Electric iron	1.33	4.75	10.27	24.79	58.87	100.00
Bicycle	10.49	15.91	20.91	23.64	29.05	100.00
Motorcycle	4.80	8.74	16.15	23.00	47.31	100.00
Car	1.97	2.65	5.75	15.13	74.50	100.00
House	10.51	15.77	19.59	22.66	31.47	100.00
Land or plot	11.68	16.63	19.46	21.75	30.48	100.00
Shares of stock	1.13	5.96	12.03	30.63	50.25	100.00
Boat		5.47	14.34	37.17	43.02	100.00
Canoes	3.09	10.47	12.13	28.92	45.39	100.00
Outboard motor	13.66	4.56	12.04	21.88	47.87	100.00
Mattress or bed	5.63	11.88	16.68	24.70	41.11	100.00
Total	4.46	9.29	14.60	23.83	47.81	100.00

TABLE 28

NATIONAL AGGREGATE VALUE OF ASSETS BY QUINTILES

Current Declared Value of Aggregate Assets by Quintile	
Quintile 1	1.43%
Quintile 2	4.11%
Quintile 3	12.82%
Quintile 4	17.04%
Quintile 5	64.78%