

Assessment of Local Indicators of Poverty Among Households in Damaturu Town, Yobe State.

¹Umar Adam Liman, ²Aminu Ishaq , ³Yahaya Umar Mohammed & ⁴Muhammad Mustapha Ibrahim

1,2 & 3 Department of General Studies, Federal Polytechnic Damaturu, Yobe State.

4 Department of Arts & Social Sciences, Gombe state College of Education Billiri, Gombe state.

Corresponding author: umarliman225@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Damaturu is marked by its diverse socioeconomic landscape, where some household face significant economic hardship and poverty. Despite various efforts to improve living conditions there is a pressing need to comprehensively analyze and understand the poverty indicators among household in Damaturu. The research objectives include; to determine the key indicators that are commonly used to measure poverty, such as income, education level, healthcare access, and housing conditions, to establish a poverty threshold based on local context and available data to differentiate between poor and non-poor households and finally, to compare the poverty indicators across different demographic groups (age, gender, ethnicity, etc.) to identify disparities and inequalities. The majority of the respondents believed poverty rate is the commonly used poverty indicator based on the results obtained from the questionnaires with 85% of the total responses while the results also signifies that the majority of the respondents are of the view that access to education is higher in the localities with high wages and overall income than that in localities with low income and quality of life with 62% of the total. It is not a secret that there is a wide gap in the rate of disparities among different demographic groups within the study area which need to be addressed. Part of the recommendations include; it is essential to establish a collaboration between government authorities, NGOs and community members for a successful poverty assessment.

Key words: *poverty, socioeconomic, income, indicators.*

INTRODUCTION

In the realm of socio-economic development, the assessment of poverty remains an essential Solutions for policymakers, researchers, and practitioners alike. Traditional approaches to measuring poverty have often employed national-level indicators, providing an overview of a country's general economic state. However, these approaches tend to overlook the intricate variations that exist within different regions, urban or rural areas, and communities. As a response to this limitation, the focus has shifted towards local-level poverty assessment, recognizing that a more nuanced understanding of poverty requires the examination of specific indicators within households and communities. (Bennet Brown, 2013).

Poverty is about not having enough money to meet basic needs including food, clothing and shelter. However, poverty is more, much more than just not having enough money. According to World Bank Organization (WBO), Poverty is hunger. Poverty is lack of shelter. Poverty is being sick and not being able to see a doctor. Poverty is not having access to school and not knowing how to read. Poverty is not having a job, is fear for the future, living one day at a time.

Poverty has many faces, changing from place to place and across time, and has been described in many ways. Most often, poverty is a situation people want to escape. So, poverty is a call to action for the poor and the wealthy alike a call to change the world so that many more may have enough to eat, adequate shelter, access to education and health, protection from violence, and a voice in what happens in their communities. Local indicators of poverty offer a granular insight into the multifaceted dimensions of economic deprivation that household's experience. These indicators encompass a range of factors, such as income levels, employment opportunities, access to education and healthcare, housing conditions, and social services. By analyzing these indicators at the local level,

Assessment of Local Indicators of Poverty Among Households in Damaturu Town, Yobe State.

researchers can unearth disparities that might be masked by national averages. This localized approach not only enhances the accuracy of poverty assessment but also empowers policymakers to design targeted interventions that address the specific needs of different regions and communities (Stansfeld & Rasul, 2017).

Furthermore, the assessment of local indicators of poverty holds the potential to unveil hidden pockets of vulnerability and inequality. A community-by-community analysis enables researchers to identify trends that might be unique to certain geographical areas, shedding light on the root causes and contributing factors that perpetuate poverty. By delving into the localized intricacies of poverty, policymakers can devise strategies that tackle the core challenges faced by households on a micro scale, which, in turn, can create a ripple effect towards broader economic and social progress.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLE

Damaturu is marked by its diverse socioeconomic landscape, where some household face significant economic hardship and poverty. Despite various efforts to improve living conditions there is a pressing need to comprehensively analyze and understand the poverty indicators among household In Damaturu. This study seeks to identify and assess the multifaceted dimensions in the region, including income disparities, access to basic services and employment opportunities. By investigating the root causes and manifestations of poverty in Damaturu the study aims to provide valuable insights and data driven recommendations for policy makers, development agencies and community stakeholders to formulate effective strategies and interventions aimed at alleviating poverty and improving the overall living conditions of households in the town.

AIMS

The aim of this research is to assess and analyze local indicators of poverty among household in Damaturu town, Yobe State. While this will be achieved through determining the key indicators that are commonly used to measure poverty, such as income, education level, healthcare access, and housing conditions. To also establish a poverty threshold based on local context and available data to differentiate between poor and non-poor households. And to compare the poverty indicators across different demographic groups (age, gender, ethnicity, etc.) to identify disparities and inequalities.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the commonly utilized key indicators for assessing poverty, including but not limited to income, education level, healthcare access, and housing conditions?
2. How can a poverty threshold be effectively established using local context and available data to distinguish between households classified as poor and non-poor?
3. What disparities and inequalities in poverty indicators exist among various demographic groups (such as age, gender, ethnicity, etc.) when comparing the data?

LITERATURE: CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Poverty

The Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN, 1999) views poverty as the absence or lack of basic necessities of life including material wealth; the regular flow of wages and income; and the liability to sustain oneself based on the existing resources available. This suggests that when an individual cannot afford such basic needs, he/she is deemed to be poor.

Agbaeze et al (2014) holds that poverty is a complex, multidimensional and hydra-headed

phenomenon that has existed from time immemorial and has continued to occupy the Centre stage in global affairs. This emphasizes its existence in almost all societies which gives a varied opinion as to its definition. Kwanga (2015) after a perusal of the tenets of poverty submits that poverty could be viewed as a situation of acute need and inability to meet all the basic necessities like food, clothing, shelter, education and family. This generally means that a household is considered to be poor, when it cannot satisfy any of the above-mentioned necessities on a relatively permanent basis.

Causes of Poverty

In most literatures, factors that causes poverty are more or less general ones as poverty is produced by different factors that may vary from one society to another. However, a classification of poverty in to different categories in Nigeria according to CBN (2008:9) is divided in to two either as a result of “low economic growth and market imperfections”. Low economic growth refers to increase in unemployment and general underdevelopment with low income that is not enough or sufficient to sustain the poor. On the other hand, market imperfection includes those factors which through institutional distortion do not allow the poor to have access to opportunities or productive assets which will improve their capability thereby adapting to inevitable Changes and cope. In this situation, the inability of the people to adapt therefore breeds poverty and thereby denying them the basic needs of life to survive. In its 2009:109 publication of the Nigerian Socioeconomic Profile by the former Federal Office of Statistics (FOS), the report classified the causes of poverty in the country in to deficiencies of endowments and access which include: lack of access to healthcare services, water for human and animal consumption, hygiene or sanitation, job opportunities, properties or assets, markets for their goods produced in the rural areas. Others cause of poverty include destruction of natural resources

Assessment of Local Indicators of Poverty Among Households in Damaturu Town, Yobe State.

endowments by the poor themselves with consequences on agriculture such as, low productivity, deforestation and soon; and the failure of government to assist those trapped in temporary poverty through crisis like drought, flood, pest, erosion, fire, war, etc. One major area of concern that causes poverty in Nigeria is also the involvement of International Monetary.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed quantitative surveys using questionnaire as an instrument to comprehensively assess and analyze the local indicators of poverty among household. It statistically analyzed the data using frequencies distribution and percentages tables. 130 respondents were purposively selected from the five wards (Njiwaji/Gwange ward, Damaturu central, Nayi-nawa, Gabir/Maduri and Bindigari/Pawari ward) select randomly from the 11 wards that made up Damaturu LGA. twenty-six respondents were issued the question in each of the five wards.

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Table 1: Age of the respondents

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage (%)
15-25	039	30
26-35	051	51
36-45	031	24
46 and above	1	1
TOTAL	130	100

Respondent between age 26 and 35 representing 51% of the results are the majority of the respondents.

Table 2: Gender of the respondents

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Male	120	92
Female	10	8
Total	130	100

The results show that 120 respondents who represents 92%. This signifies that male population represent the majority of the total responses and this is because males are more tolerant and accessible than female respondents with the study area.

Table 3: Marital Status of the respondents

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Married	60	46
Single	47	36
Divorced	23	18
Widowed	-	0
Total	130	100

The results obtained from field shows that 60 respondents with a highest percentage of 46% of the total responses are married.

Table 4: Education Status of the respondent

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Primary	5	4
Secondary	23	18
Tertiary	99	76
No formal Education	3	1
Total	130	100

It shows that 99 respondents with the highest representation of 76% have attended and obtained tertiary certificates of the total responses.

Table 5: Household Size of the respondent

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
1-2	32	25
3-4	46	35
5-6	24	19
5-6	24	19
7 and above	28	22

Total	130	100
-------	-----	-----

The above table shows the highest household size of 3-4 with 35%

Table 6: The commonly used income-based indicators for measuring poverty.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Poverty Rate	111	85
National and International Poverty Lines	9	7
Income Poverty Line	10	8
Others	-	0
Total	130	100

The commonly used income-based indicators for measuring poverty, 111 of the respondents believe poverty rate is the most common poverty indicators in the study and they represent 85% of the total.

Table 7: How income-based indicators vary across different localities within Damaturu.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Agricultural Productivity	12	9
Access to Education	80	62
Job Opportunities	38	29
Economic Activity	-	0
Total	130	100

The table above shows the variability of these poverty indicators across different localities in the study area, shows that 80 of the respondents who represents 62% of the total responses.

Table 8: The non-income-based indicators for poverty in the study area.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Education	88	68
Healthcare	12	9
Social services	30	23
Others	-	0
Total	130	100

The non-income-based indicators of poverty in the study area, shows that 88 of the respondents believe education is the major non-income-based poverty indicator with 68%.

Table 9: How non-income-based indicators complement income-based measures.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Education and Literacy	76	59
Housing and Living Conditions	38	29
Health and Nutrition	6	5
Access to Basic Services	10	8
Total	130	100

The results obtained from the table above, it has shown that 76 of the respondents who represents 59% of the total responses believed that education and level of literacy go hand in hand i.e. with high number of educated people there will be low level of illiteracy.

Table 10: How participatory approaches and community engagement be leveraged to ensure established poverty threshold.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Conduct awareness campaigns	86	66
Maintain transparency	24	19

Community engagement and participation	16	12
Experiences of community members	4	3
Total	130	100

The above information, 86 of the respondents who represents 66% of the total responses believed that conducting awareness campaigns will help in establishing a poverty threshold within the study area.

Table 11: Respondent views on the extent to which non-income factors be incorporated into the determination of a poverty threshold.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Significant	69	53
Moderate	43	33
Not sure	15	12
Others	3	2
Total	130	100

The obtained results from the field survey, shows that 69 of the respondents who represents 53% of the total responses believed that non-income-based poverty indicators should be significantly be incorporated in the determination of poverty.

Table 12: How regional variations in the cost of living affect the establishment of an accurate poverty threshold.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Utility expenses	61	47
Access to healthcare services	6	5
Transportation costs	4	3
Education Costs	57	44
Total	130	100

This shows that 61 of the respondents who represents 47% of the total responses believed that high utility expenses affect the establishment of an accurate poverty.

Table 13: Local contextual factors and variables that were considered in determining a poverty threshold in the study area.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Transportation Costs	5	4
Healthcare Costs	22	17
Food Prices	69	53
Cost of Housing	34	26
Total	130	100

69 of the respondents who represents 53% of the total responses believed that food prices should be the base for local contextual variable in determining poverty threshold among different.

Table 14: How life cycle events influence poverty trends and trajectories across demographic groups in the study area.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
separation increased financial disruption	8	5
Socioeconomic factors	10	10
Retirement	104	80
Others	8	5
Total	130	100

The distribution of respondents based on how life cycle events influence poverty trends across demographic groups. 104 respondents representing 80% are of the view that retirement

is the major factor that influence poverty trends among demographic groups in the study area.

Table 15: Respondents views on the rates and employment patterns differ among demographic groups.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Disability Status	26	20
Educational Attainment	100	77
Occupational Segregation	4	3
Others	-	0
Total	130	100

100 of the respondents who represents 77% of the total responses believed that educational attainment is the factor that brings about differences in employment patterns among demographic groups in the study area.

Table 16: Disparities in access to basic services across various demographic groups in the study area.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Educational Attainment	4	3
Income level	88	68
Education level	6	5
Others	32	24
Total	130	100

88 of the respondents who represents 68% of the total responses are of the view that there are more disparities in income level across demographic groups.

Table 17: How income-based poverty rates vary among different demographic groups.

Respondent	Frequency	Percentage %
Education level	76	59%

Gender wage gaps	20	15%
access to retirement benefits	25	19%
Others	19	7%
Total	130	100%

The results obtained from the table above shows that 76 respondents who represents 59% of the total responses believed that educational level vary among different demographic groups.

CONCLUSION

While there exists a diverse socioeconomic activity in Damaturu, the level of poverty among household is also alarming because the effects are devastating. It is not a secret that there is a wide gap in the rate of disparities among different demographic groups within the study area which is as a result of income level and also educational attainment is one of the major factors that bring about differences in employments patterns among different demographic groups. It requires a lot of efforts by the government and a deep analysis of this problem so that a healthy living environment and the quality to improve in the study area in the future years to come.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As part of the recommendations of poverty assessment in Damaturu, it is essential to establish a collaboration between government authorities, NGOs and community members for a successful poverty assessment. Below are some of the recommendations made on poverty assessment and indicators in Damaturu town.

1) Government should share the findings with local authorities and community leaders to inform poverty alleviations strategies and also ensure transparency and open dialogue with the communities.

2) Access to market as well as other factors should also be considered by the government as poverty indicators.

3) Government should identify coping strategies to poverty in the study area.

4) Government should improve educational sectors, ensure quality education and make it affordable for all people within the study area.

5) Individuals/communities should conduct their local indicators for poverty based on their specific needs and challenges.

6) NGOs and the Community should also inputs in assessing process of poverty indicators that will provide qualitative data and help in designing poverty alleviation strategies.

REFERENCES

Abbas, A. I. (2013). *Appraising the policies and programmes of poverty reduction in Nigeria: A critical view point. International Journal of Administration and Development Studies (IJADS), 4(1) 88-110.*

Aliyu, A. (2002). *Re-structuring of the poverty alleviation activities of the Federal Government of Nigeria.* Abuja; National Poverty Eradication Programme.

Effiom, J. N. & Archibong, E. P. (2014). *An assessment of the impact of poverty on criminal behaviour among youths: A case of Akpabuyo Local Government Area, Nigerian. European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, Vol. 3 (2), pp 24-31.* Retrieved from <http://www.ejbss.com/Data/Sites/1/vol3no2may2014/ejbss-1374-14-anassessmentoftheimpactofpoverty.pdf>

Ezekiel, P.O (2014). *A study on co-operative societies, poverty reduction and sustainable development in Nigeria. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, Vol. 16, Issue 6. Ver. II*

(Jun. 2014), PP 132-140. Retrieved from www.iosrjournals.org

Fapojuwo, O. E, Alarima, C.I & Abiona, B.G (2012). *Contribution of co-operative organizations to overtly alleviation in Yewa North Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria, Journal of Human Ecology, 40(2): 189-196. Federal Office of Statistics (FOS). (1996). Socio-economic profile of Nigeria 1996. Lagos; FOS.*

Federal Office of Statistics (FOS). (1996). Socio-economic profile of Nigeria 1996. Lagos; FOS. International Cooperative Alliance (1995). Statement on the cooperative identify. International Cooperative Alliance ILO/ICA (2003). *The role of cooperatives in designing and implementing improved socio-economic conditions of beneficiaries in Southwestern Nigeria:* University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Millennium Development Goals (2013). *Nigeria 2013 Millennium Development Goals Report.* Retrieved from www.mdgs.gov.ng

Millennium Development Goals 2015 Report. New York: United Nations. Retrieved from [http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20\(July%202011\).pdf](http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20(July%202011).pdf) National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). (2010). *Poverty profile for Nigeria.* Abuja; National Bureau of Statistics.

Overseas Cooperative Development Council (OCDC) 2007. *Cooperatives: Pathways to economic, democratic and social development in the global economy.* Retrieved from www.coopdevelopmentcenter.cooprewrite

Assessment of Local Indicators of Poverty Among Households in Damaturu Town, Yobe State.