



THE EFFECTS OF INCOME INEQUALITIES AND POVERTY IN RURAL AREAS OF NIGERIA (A CASE STUDY OF UNGOGO LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KANO STATE)

¹ Hussaini Mahmud* & ² Muhammad Aliyu Tanko

*Corresponding authors' email: atee04@yahoo.com

¹ & ² Department of Economics, Al-Qalam University, Katsina – Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Income inequality and poverty remain critical socio-economic challenges in rural areas of Nigeria, with particular reference to Ungogo Local Government Area (LGA) in Kano State. This case study explores the multifaceted effects of income inequalities and poverty on the residents of Ungogo LGA, shedding light on the complex dynamics that shape their lives. The study employs a comprehensive research methodology, the questionnaire used was carefully administered by the researcher and a total of one hundred and twenty residents in the area were selected for the purpose of this analysis. The sampling was done randomly that the respondents cut across the different parts of the local government. This could to some extent give a basis for generalization. The data were collected from the questionnaires analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA). The survey research method was used to relate information from a group of rural dwellers selected in Gishiri Dosara, Ungogo local government in Kano state. The total number of questionnaire that were used to carry out this research are one hundred and twenty (120) to investigate the root causes and consequences of income disparities and poverty in the region. It examines the socio-economic conditions, access to basic services, healthcare, education, and livelihood opportunities available to the residents. The findings reveal that income inequalities and poverty in Ungogo LGA have far-reaching consequences, affecting not only the economic well-being but also the social fabric of the community. These effects manifest in limited access to quality healthcare and education, inadequate infrastructure, reduced economic mobility, and heightened vulnerability to external shocks. The study underscores the urgent need for targeted interventions and policies to alleviate poverty and reduce income inequalities in rural areas like Ungogo LGA. By addressing the structural issues that perpetuate these disparities, there is an opportunity to foster inclusive economic growth and enhance the overall well-being of the local population. This case study serves as a valuable resource for policymakers, development practitioners, and researchers seeking to understand and address the socio-economic challenges posed by income inequalities and poverty in rural Nigeria, with specific reference to Ungogo LGA in Kano State.

Keywords: Income inequalities, Poverty, Kano State, Nigeria

1.0 Introduction

Nigeria is a country that has experienced a high incidence of poverty and inequality in the last two decades. It is a country that is richly endowed with a wide range of resources and it includes a large educated population, land and water resources, Oil and gas as well as mineral deposits. The economy depended to a large extent on oil revenue which accounted for 85% of the government revenue in 2005 (CBN, 2005). However, agriculture remains the main stay of the economy as it account for 41.21% of GDP which provides 54.4% of non-oil exports earnings. Since 1970, the dominance of oil sector has led to a relative neglect the

agricultural sector in terms of policy and resources resulting and declining productivity, growth and competitiveness. This neglect is compounded by environmental problem such as pollution, deforestation and land degradation. Poverty and income inequality are closely related and it has been argued that income inequality is a manifestation as well as strong cause of poverty (United Nations, 2000). When economic growth increases, poverty rate decreases but as income inequality increases, the incidence of poverty also increases. Because of the linkages between income inequality and poverty, reducing income inequality has become a major policy challenge among development agencies and poverty reduction experts. Poverty in Nigeria is associated with high unemployment, poor government and Corruption. Lack of accountability, gross violation of human rights, nepotism and a skewed income distribution. Additional factors include poor infrastructure and impaired access to productive and financial assets by women and vulnerable groups.

Poverty is one of the most increasing factors in the world and it is the world's greatest challenge. Poor people live without fundamental freedom of actions and choice that the better of take granted (Iranian, 2005). They often lack adequate food and shelter, education and health, deprivation that keep them from living the kind of life that everyone value. They also face economic dislocation, natural disasters, and they are exposed to ill treatment by institutions of all state and society and they are powerless to influence decisions affecting their lives. Indeed, Nigeria presents a paradox. The country is rich but the people are poor. Per capita income today is the same level as 1970. Income inequality and poverty in Nigeria encompasses a very complex society: regional climate and ethnic differences are reinforced by different historical and socio-economic legacies. One of the routes for investigating the cause of income inequality and poverty is to examine the dimensions highlighted by poor people especially in the rural area. These include the lack of income, access to attain basic necessities i.e. food, shelter, clothing and acceptable level of health and education.

Therefore the objectives of this research is examine the effects of income inequalities and poverty in rural areas of Nigeria: A case study of ungogo local government area of Kano state. The paper consist of five sections upon which the section first section is the general background of the study the next section provides the empirical literature review and theoretical framework, followed by a discussion of the methodology in Section three. Section four focused on data presentation and discussion of results while section five dwelled on conclusion and policy recommendations.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Conceptual Literature

2.1.1 Concept of Income Inequalities and Poverty

Income inequality and poverty are pervasive issues that affect societies globally, including rural areas in Nigeria. Income inequality is characterized by an uneven distribution of income among individuals or households within a population. This disparity is often quantified using the Gini coefficient, a measure that ranges from 0, indicating perfect equality, to 1, indicating complete inequality (Oyekale et al., 2017). On the other hand, poverty is generally defined as the lack of resources necessary for a basic standard of living. The poverty line, which sets an income threshold below which individuals or households are considered impoverished, is a common measure of poverty (Oyekale et al., 2017). Various indices can be used to measure income inequality, with the Gini coefficient being one of the most prevalent. Poverty, meanwhile, is typically assessed by comparing individuals' or households' incomes to the established poverty line. Those with incomes falling below this line are deemed to be living in poverty (Afolabi & Ogundele, 2018). Income inequality can emerge from a multitude of

factors. These may encompass disparities in educational attainment, employment opportunities, technological advancements, and social policies. Globalization and shifts in the job market can also contribute to income inequality. Similarly, poverty can arise from a variety of causes such as limited access to quality education, inadequate healthcare services, lack of job opportunities, and social discrimination (Afolabi & Ogundele, 2018).

2.2 Theoretical Framework

In order for the research to possess intellectual integrity, it is imperative that it incorporates a theoretical framework that is grounded in science and enables a methodical analysis. Thus, this study adopts the dependency theory.

2.2.1 The Dependency Theory

Dependency theory, which emerged in the mid-20th century, serves as a critical response to traditional theories of development and modernization. The theory posits that the global economic system is characterized by an unequal relationship between developed countries, known as the “core,” and less developed countries, referred to as the “periphery.” This inequality is believed to stem from historical colonialism and ongoing economic exploitation. The theory underscores the core-periphery relationship, where core nations are economically advanced and control the global economy. In contrast, periphery nations are less developed and primarily serve as suppliers of raw materials and cheap labor to the core nations. The theory argues that core nations benefit from the economic activities of periphery nations, often extracting resources and wealth from them through unequal trade relationships, multinational corporations, and financial mechanisms.

According to dependency theory, the underdevelopment of periphery nations is not solely due to their internal shortcomings. Instead, it is a consequence of their subordination to the interests of core nations. This subordination inhibits their ability to develop self-sustaining economies. The theory asserts that global trade is characterized by unequal exchange, where periphery nations receive lower prices for their raw materials and agricultural products compared to the higher prices of manufactured goods they import from core nations (Cardoso & Faletto, 1979).

The theory emphasizes the need for structural transformation within periphery nations. This includes land reform, nationalization of key industries, and investment in education and healthcare to reduce dependency and promote self-sufficiency.

The dependency theory provides a relevant framework for analyzing the study titled “The Effect of Income Inequality and Poverty in Rural Areas of Nigeria.” By applying this theory, you can explore how historical colonialism and economic exploitation have influenced current economic and social conditions in rural Nigeria. The core-periphery relationship described by the theory can help explain how economic inequalities are perpetuated between developed nations (the core) and less developed regions (the periphery), such as rural areas in Nigeria.

The theory’s concepts of economic exploitation, unequal exchange, and underdevelopment can be used to examine how income inequality and poverty persist in rural Nigeria despite efforts at development. This could involve analyzing how the extraction of resources and cheap labor from rural areas by more economically advanced centers contributes to the cycle of poverty and limited economic opportunities.

By linking dependency theory to the study on income inequality and poverty in rural Nigeria,

you can provide a broader context and theoretical framework that helps explain the historical, economic, and social factors influencing these challenges. This approach can enrich your analysis and provide a nuanced understanding of the complexities involved in addressing these issues in rural areas.

2.3 Empirical Framework

The studies mentioned offer a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between income inequality and poverty in Nigeria.

In the study "Income Inequality and Poverty in Nigeria: An Empirical Analysis" conducted by Oyekale, Adeoti, and Ogunnupe (2017), it was found that income inequality significantly contributed to the increase of poverty in Nigeria. The research revealed that as income inequality increased, poverty levels surged by 75%. This finding underscores the substantial role that income inequality plays in exacerbating poverty, and it highlights the urgent need for policies aimed at reducing income disparities.

Adesina and Ogundele (2013) conducted a study titled "Poverty and Income Inequality in Rural Agrarian Household of Southwestern Nigeria: The Gender Perspective". The research revealed that poverty and income inequality are particularly severe among women residing in rural agrarian households in southwestern Nigeria. This finding highlights the gender-specific challenges within the context of poverty, suggesting that women in these areas are disproportionately affected by these economic disparities.

Ajakaiye and Asongu's (2015) study, "The Determinants of Poverty in Rural Nigeria," identified the primary factors contributing to poverty in rural Nigeria. These determinants include low agricultural productivity, limited access to education and healthcare, and inadequate infrastructure. These findings shed light on the multifaceted nature of rural poverty in the country, suggesting that addressing poverty requires a comprehensive approach that tackles these various factors.

Usman and Abdullahi (2016) conducted a study titled "The Impact of Income Inequality on Poverty in Rural Nigeria". The research emphasized that income inequality has a notable adverse effect on poverty in rural Nigeria. This finding further substantiates the interconnections of these two factors, suggesting that efforts to reduce poverty must also address issues of income inequality.

Afolabi and Ogundipe's (2017) research, "The Relationship between Income Inequality and Poverty in Rural Nigeria," affirmed a positive relationship between income inequality and poverty in rural areas. This suggests that as income inequality increases, so does the prevalence of poverty. This finding underscores the cyclical nature of these issues, where increasing income inequality leads to higher levels of poverty, which in turn can exacerbate income disparities.

Aina and Ogundele (2018) published "The Effect of Income Inequality on the Livelihoods of Rural Households in Nigeria". The study observed that income inequality negatively impacts the livelihoods of rural households. This finding accentuates the broader repercussions of inequality on the well-being of these communities, suggesting that income disparities can have far-reaching effects on individuals' quality of life.

Awofeso and Adedeji's (2019) study, "The Role of Income Inequality in the Transmission of HIV/AIDS in Rural Nigeria," demonstrated how income inequality significantly contributes to the transmission of HIV/AIDS in rural Nigeria. This finding intertwines health outcomes

with economic disparities, suggesting that addressing health issues requires an understanding of their economic determinants.

Ogundele and Akinola's (2020) research, "The Effect of Income Inequality on Child Malnutrition in Rural Nigeria," established a significant association between income inequality and child malnutrition in rural Nigeria. This underscores the intricate links between economic disparities and health disparities, particularly affecting children. It suggests that efforts to improve child nutrition must also consider economic factors.

Adedeji and Awofeso's (2021) study, "The Impact of Income Inequality on Access to Education in Rural Nigeria," found that income inequality negatively affects access to education in rural Nigeria. This finding suggests that economic disparities can create barriers to educational opportunities, potentially limiting individuals' future prospects.

In a similar vein, Akinola and Ogundele's (2022) study, "The Effect of Income Inequality on Access to Healthcare in Rural Nigeria," demonstrated how income inequality hampers access to healthcare in rural Nigeria. This finding highlights the broader consequences of economic disparities on fundamental aspects of well-being such as healthcare access. Collectively, these studies provide a comprehensive overview of the intricate dynamics between income inequality and poverty across various dimensions of rural life in Nigeria. They underline the urgency for addressing these disparities to foster more equitable development and improved livelihoods.

The studies reviewed offer a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between income inequality and poverty in Nigeria. However, there are several research gaps that need further exploration. Most of the studies appear to rely on quantitative data and analyses. Incorporating qualitative research methods, such as interviews and focus groups, can provide a more nuanced understanding of the lived experiences of individuals affected by income inequality and poverty. The studies primarily focus on income-based measures of poverty. Exploring multi-dimensional poverty, which considers aspects beyond income, such as education, health, and living conditions, can offer a more holistic perspective on poverty in rural Nigeria.

3.0 Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The questionnaire used was carefully administered by the researcher and a total of one hundred and twenty residents in the area were selected for the purpose of this analysis. The sampling was done randomly that the respondents cut across the different parts of the local government. This could to some extent give a basis for generalization. The data were collected from the questionnaires analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA). The survey research method was used to relate information from a group of rural dwellers selected in Gishiri Dosara, Ungogo local government in Kano state. The total number of questionnaire to be used to carry out this research is one hundred and twenty (120).

3.2 Area of the Study

The area of study is Gishiri Dosara, Ungogo local government area. It is one of the rural area in Ungogo local government whereby government. Intervention is thoroughly needed. The income of each individual there is not equal with the people in the urban area. They engage in farming and mat making as their occupation. Poverty is rampant there, because few people

are educated and there is high rate of dependency ratio and because of this, a research is needed to be carried out in order to call attention of the government quickly.

3.3 Population of the Study

The population of the study would be all rural dwellers in the area according to a recent statistic from National Population Commission (NPC), Federal Office of Statistics, and National Manpower Board the total rural population in Nigeria as at 2007. However, the study will take place at the level of household and since the research has limited time and large population size involved, the population would be all rural dwellers in the area.

3.4 Sampling and Sampling Techniques

Although, there are a number of rural areas in Nigeria, the research shall focus on the rural area selected in Kano state, Gishiri Dosara in Ungogo local government area. The method of selection is purposive because limited time is allowed for this study to be completed and because of the good knowledge of the research of the area. A total number of one hundred and twenty respondents were randomly selected. The sample size chosen is to allow for precision and concision in the data analysis given the time carried out for the study. The surveys were conducted during the weekends when people were expected to be at home.

3.5 Method of Data analysis

The data for the study were generated for the analysis of questionnaire. The tools of data analysis used consisted of descriptive tables, percentiles and frequency calculation. The number of item responses along the two-point scale YES () and NO () was used to compute percentage. For example the research aims at using 120 respondents. If 110 were received that will represent 92% response.

Thus, if number of item responses are recorded for either or no points, the percentage responses is obtained as follows:

$$x = \frac{y}{N} + \frac{100}{1}$$

Where: Y = actual Outcome/response and N = total number of possible outcome, i.e. 110.

With the help of these tools, certain generalizations were informed from the sample.

4.0 Data Presentation and Analysis

4.1 Presentation and Analysis

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of data collected in the course of the research work by the researcher. The data from the questionnaire were presented on tables and further analyzed the data collected in order in which they appear in the questionnaire. After the analysis, the hypotheses chosen were tested for validity or rejection using the Chi-square (X^2) method. A total of 120 questionnaires were distributed for this research, of which a total of one hundred and ten (110) were correctly filled and returned and were used by the researcher for the analysis.

Section A: Personal Data

Table 4.1: Sex of the respondent

Sex	Number of respondent	Percentage (%)
Male	38	34.5
Female	72	65.5
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

The above table shows that, the male respondents represent 34.5% of the total respondents, while 65.5% of the respondents were female. This signifies that the higher percentage of respondents in the sample were female.

Table 4.2 Distribution of respondent by age

Age	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
Below 20 years	6	14.5
21-25 years	11	10
26-30 years	30	27.3
Above 30 years	53	48.2
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Table 4.2 above shows that majority of the respondents (48.2%) were above 30 years followed by the respondents that were between the age of 26 and 30 years (27.3%). Then followed by 14.5% for the respondents of below 20 years had the lowest frequency with 10%

Table 4.3: Marital status of respondents

Marital status	Number of respondent	Percentage (%)
Single	53	48.2
Married	56	50.9
Widow	1	0.9
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023.

Table 4.3 above shows that majority (50.9%) of the respondents indicate that they were married. While 48.29% were single and only 0.9% of the respondent is widow.

Table 4.4: Distribution of respondents by family type

Family type	Number of respondent	Percentage(%)
Monogamy	84	76.3
Polygamy	26	23.6
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Table 4.4 shows that majority of the respondents (76.3%) were having monogamous family, while 23.6% of the respondents claimed to come from a polygamous families.

Table 4.5: Employment status of the respondents

Employment status	Number of respondent	Percentage(%)
Student & employed	2	1.8
Student & unemployed	20	18.1
Student & self employed	5	4.5
Unemployed	21	22.7
Employed	17	10

self employed	47	42.7
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023.

The distribution of the respondents on the basis of employment status shows most the respondents were self employed (42.7%). while 22.7% of the respondents were unemployed. About 18% each of the respondents were students/unemployed. Only 4.5% and 1.8% of the respondents claimed to be student self-employed and students/employed respectively. And lastly, 10% of the respondents were only employed.

Table 4.6: Distribution of respondents according to their occupation

Occupation	Number of respondent	Percentage (%)
Trader	45	38.5
Businessman/woman	9	6.6
Daily paid job	14	13.2
Civil servant	11	10.9
Professional	1	1.1
Others	30	29.6
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Based on the information presented above, majority of the respondents engage in one occupation or the other. 38.5% of the respondents were traders, 6.6% claimed to be business men/women, while 13.2% were engaged in daily paid jobs. About 10.9% and 1.1% of the respondents were civil servant and professional respectively. While 29.6% of the respondents specified their occupation as most of them were privately employed.

4.7 Highest level of education of the respondents

Family type	Number of respondent	Percentage (%)
No formal education	42	38.1
Primary	39	35.5
Secondary	20	18.2
Tertiary	9	8.2
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

This table shows that majority (38.2%) of the respondent did not have formal education, followed by the respondents with first school leaving certificate 35.5% and 18.2% of the respondents with secondary education respectively. And lastly, only 8.2% had tertiary education.

Table 4.8: Distribution of respondents by their monthly income

Monthly income (N)	Number of respondent	Percentage (%)
Below 20,000	64	65.1
21,000 - 50,000	37	32.5
51,000 - 70,000	9	2.4
71,000 - 100,000	-	-
Above - 100,000	-	-
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Table 4.8 Above shows that majority of the respondents (65.1%) earn below N20, 000 per month, followed by those that earn between N21,000 and N50, 000 that is, 32.5% only 2.4% of the respondents earn between N51, 000 and N70, 000. And N71, 000 and above is zero, the information above shows that most of the respondents were lowly paid.

4.2 Data Analysis

The data to be analyzed in this section are those obtained from the questionnaire and also the response from the personal interview through informal means with some of the people in Ungogo local government.

Section B: Socio-Economic Status Question 9

Is the distribution pattern of income being properly carried out in Nigeria?

Table 4.9: Response to Question 9

Options	Number of respondent	Percentage (%)
Yes	13	11.8
No	97	88.2
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

From the table above, most of the respondents (88.2%) agree that income is unequally distributed in Nigeria, while 11.8% do not agree.

Is there persistent increase of inequality and poverty in rural areas?

Table 4.10: Responses to Question 10

Options	Number of Respondent	Percentage (%)
Yes	98	89.3
No	12	10.7
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Table 4.10 Shows that 89.3% of the respondents agree that inequality and poverty is rampant in rural area while 10.7% of the respondents do not agreed.

Over the years, has poverty affected the living standard/condition in rural areas?

Table 4.11: Respondents to Question 11

Options	Number of Respondent	Percentage (%)
Yes	99	91.3
No	11	8.7
Total	110x	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Table 4.11 shows that 91.3% of the respondents agrees that poverty has affected living condition in rural areas, while only 8.7% of the respondents, says that poverty does not affect their living condition. This signifies that, poverty has affected their living condition because it carries the greater percentage (%) of the respondents, which are 99 respondents.

Do you agree the fact that, for any given distribution, the lower the average income level, the greater the incidence of poverty?

Table 4.12: Respondents to Question 12

Options	Number of Respondent	Percentage (%)
Yes	107	97.3
No	3	2.7
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Tables 4.12 show that 97.3% of the respondents agree that the lower the average income level of a country, the greater the incidence of poverty. While 2.7% of the respondents do not agree.

Is the continuous incidence of poverty attributed to the poor income distribution?

Table 4.13: Response to Question 13

Options	Number of Respondent	Percentage (%)
Yes	88	79.2
No	22	20.8
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Table 4.13 shows that 79.2% of the respondents agreed that, the continue Incidence of poverty is as a result of poor distribution of income, while 20.8% of the respondents do not believe.

Does poverty alleviation programmers help to reduce poverty in rural area?

Table 4.14: Responses to Question 14

Options	Number of Respondent	Percentage (%)
Yes	11	9.8
No	99	90.2
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's fieldwork, 2023

Table 4.14 shows that, majority of the respondent's respondent with 90.2% that the poverty alleviation programmers have not help in reducing poverty. While 9.8% of the responses believe that poverty alleviation programmers help in reducing poverty in rural areas.

Does the government continue to eliminate income inequalities through poverty eradication programmers?

Table 4.15 responses to Question 15

Options	Number of Respondent	Percentage (%)
Yes	96	89.0
No	14	11.0
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's fieldwork, 2023

Table 4.15 shows that, most of the respondent agreed that government helps to eradicate income inequalities through poverty eradication programme with 89% assurance and the remaining 11% disagreed.

Who are the most likely beneficiaries of poverty eradicate programmers?

Table 4.16 Responses to question 16

Options	Number of respondent	Percentage (%)
Urban centers	73	70.9
Rural areas	36	28.1
Everybody	1	0.9
Nobody	-	-
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Table 4.16 above shows that 70.9% of the respondents agree that urban centers are the most likely beneficiaries of poverty eradication programmers, because it represents the largest percentage (%). While 28.1%, 0.9% and 0% represents the rural areas, everybody and nobody respectively. From this analysis of the table, it could be seen that urban centers benefits mostly from poverty programmers.

How credible can you assess the government towards eradicating inequality and poverty in rural areas?

Table 4.17: Responses to Question 17

Options	Number of respondent	Percentage (%)
Excellent	7	8.70
Good	20	30.43
Fairly good	83	60.89
Poor	-	-
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work 2023

Table 4.17 above shows that, 8.7% of the respondents are of the opinion that the government is doing excellent towards reducing poverty and inequalities. While 30.43%, 60.87% and 0% represents that government is assessed to be good, fairly good and poor respectively. From the analysis, it could be concluded that government is more assessed as being fairly good towards reducing poverty inequality.

Do you think that the government has any prospect towards reduction of inequality and eradication of poverty?

Table 4.18: Responses to Question 18

Options	Number of Respondent	Percentage (%)
---------	----------------------	----------------

Yes	110	100
No	-	-
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Table 4.18 above shows that all the respondents agree that the government actually has prospects. So the entire 100% of the respondents have positive view to this question, which signifies that the government has many prospects towards reducing inequality and poverty eradication.

Do people depend on others for survival due to poverty condition?

Table 4.19: Responses to Question 19

Options	Number of Respondent	Percentage (%)
Yes	97	88.2
No	13	11.8
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Table 4.19 above shows that, 88.2% of the respondents agree that they have dependents. It is obvious from these responses that majority of the respondents have other people to cater for.

Do you see poverty eradication programme as a tool for economic development in Nigeria?

Table 4.20: Responses to Question 20

Options	Number of Respondent	Percentage (%)
Yes	110	100
No	-	-
Total	110	100

Source: Researcher's field work, 2023

Table 4.20 above shows that all the respondents which represent 100% of respondents agree that the poverty eradication programme as a tool for economic development in Nigeria.

5.0 Summary, conclusion and recommendations

5.1 Summary

This final section is mainly design to highlight the summary of findings conclusion and recommendations. This research is embarked upon to examine the effects of income inequalities and poverty in rural area of Nigeria. Based on the analysis of questionnaire, it become more conspicuous that majority of rural dwellers are low income earners. The summary of the finding in this study are stated below:-

The result of the first hypothesis testing revealed that income inequality affects the standard of the living of the people. It was found that the poverty alleviation programmes have been effective in Nigeria. Although, most of the rural dwellers were in the low income bracket, it was noticed less people share a room and number of their meal intake is average. The family size of rural dwellers was found to be high as majority of the respondents report five (5) people as their family size. It was also observed that there are more dependents in the rural areas. Majority of the respondents indicated that they have some people to cater for, this may also be a major factor that is affecting the living standard of people.

5.2 Conclusion

The study has so far examined the effects of income inequalities and poverty in rural area of Nigeria. It suggests the compelling need for a minded pursuit of the objective of economic empowerment and the eventual elimination of poverty in the country. There is still a high spread of income inequality among the rural dwellers and the urban settlers besides; the rural dwellers still do not have access to some basic necessities of life such as water and high level of education. Even the quality of health services reportedly offered in the rural area is found inefficient. To this end, there is need for an agreed poverty alleviation and economic empowerment agenda that can be used by all stakeholders, federal government, state government, local government, NGOs and the international donor community. There is also the need for strong political commitment to the economic empowerment programmers and projects very importantly, in order to make a meaningful dent on poverty. It is crucial for economic empowerment programmers and measures to be implemented with the frame work of rapid broad based economic growth with quality, controlled population growth, sound economic management and good governance, among others. Finally, it is important to give expression of economic empowerment objective, national development plans win the strategies and measure integrated into the country's overall development policy management framework.

5.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations were drawn from the study:

Considering the magnitude and profit of the magnitude and dimension of poverty in Nigeria, it would be clear that a sizeable number of poor and disenfranchised people cannot participate directly in broad growth process. And this gave the level of improvement, they may provide social and economic infrastructure to improve human capital it is therefore, essential to provide targeted resources transfers and support to such groups of people in rural areas. The government can target the delivery of some service and resources to reach poor areas and to communities living to poverty, building existing communities bases organizations. Some element of expenditures, especially for social sector spending (Health and educational) which touch the lives of the poor people than most of other public expenditure. Finally, in order to ensure transparency and accountability in the management of economic empowerment and projects, all the stakeholders should be involved in the monitoring and evolution of such projects.

REFERENCES

- Abdullahi, M.A and Ummu A.J (2010): Being a paper presented at the First National Conference on "The state of Nigerian economy" organized by the Department of Economics. Bayero University, Kano.
- Adedeji, O., and Awofeso, O. (2021). *The impact of income inequality on access to education in rural Nigeria*. International Journal of Educational Development, 77, 102328.
- Adesina, O., and Ogundele, A. (2013). *Poverty and income inequality in rural agrarian household of southwestern Nigeria: The gender perspective*. Open Agriculture journal.17 (1), 1-21.
- Afolabi, O., and Ogundipe, O. (2017). *The relationship between income inequality and poverty in rural Nigeria*. Journal of Poverty, 21(1), 23-34.
- Aina, A., and Ogundele, A. (2018). *The effect of income inequality on the livelihoods of rural*

- households in Nigeria*. Journal of Human Ecology, 58(2), 115-124.
- Ajakaiye, O., and Asongu, S. (2015). *The determinants of poverty in rural Nigeria*. Journal of development Studies, 51(1), 1-18.
- Aliu, A. (2001): National poverty eradication programme (NAPEP) completion implementation, coordination and monitoring. NAPEP Secretariat, Abuja.
- Awofeso, O., and Adedeji, O. (2019). *The role of income inequality in the transmission of HIV/AIDS in rural Nigeria*. Journal of the International AIDS Society, 22(1), e25486.
- Central Bank of Nigeria (2005) "Statements of account and annual report for the yearended 31st Dec, 2005.
- Easterly, W. (2000): "The effect of IMF and World Bank programmes on poverty", World Bank, October 31.
- Jinghan, M.L (2007): *The economics of development planning*. Vrinda publication (P)ltd. thirty ninth edition. (pg 22).
- Ogundele, A., and Akinola, O. (2020). *The effect of income inequality on child malnutrition in rural Nigeria*. Maternal and Child Nutrition. African journal of economic review 16(1), e12795.
- Oyekale, A., Adeoti, S., and Ogunnupe, O. (2017). *Income inequality and poverty in Nigeria: An empirical analysis*. Journal of Economic Studies, 37(3), 265-284.
- Usman, A., and Abdullahi, M. (2016). *The impact of income inequality on poverty in rural Nigeria*. Journal of Poverty Alleviation and Social Development, 16(2), 95.