MENTOR | The Journal of Business Studies
Faculty of Commerce and Management, Eastern University, Sri Lanka
JBS

Factors associated with the likelihood of being poor in Sri Lanka

Jeyapraba Suresh

Department of Economics, Faculty of Commerce and Management, Eastern University, Sri Lanka

ABSTRACT

The incidence of consumption poverty in Sri Lanka has steadily declined over the last 30 years, especially after the war ended in 2009. Adopting Sen's (1993) Capability approach, this study investigates the factors associated with consumption poverty in Sri Lanka using nationally representative sample survey data for the year 2016 which is the latest available data in Sri Lanka. The poverty threshold was determined as the poorest consumption quintile and the factors associated with the probability of being in the poorest quintile were investigated using binary logit regression estimation. The research finds that households' demographic characteristics, capability endowments and spatial factors are significantly associated with the likelihood of poverty at the national level. Bigger households with bigger shares of children are shown to be more likely to be poor. Educational attainment of the household head emerges as one of the most important predictors of poverty while working in a skilled occupation significantly reduces the probability of being poor. The findings clearly show that households in the vulnerable regions of Northern, Eastern, Uva, and Sabaragamuwa provinces are most likely to be poor, all other things being equal. The study suggests that enhancing the standard of general and vocational schools in rural areas through more market-driven design of curricula; promoting rural economic diversification; investing in productive infrastructure; and, promoting the optimal allocation of resources between regions, are likely to help the poor earn their way out of poverty.

Keywords: Consumption poverty, poorest quintile, capability, logit regression

*Corresponding Author: pjpraba11@yahoo.com.au

1. Introduction

Consumption poverty declined significantly worldwide from nearly 36 per cent to 10 per cent between 1990 and 2015 (Mahembe and Odhiambo, 2018). While the number of poor has fallen in East Asia and Pacific and South Asia, other parts such as Sub-Saharan Africa, Middle East, and North Africa have seen an increase in the number of poor in the recent past. For instance, the number of Africans living below the international poverty line increased from 416 million in 2015 to 433 million in 2018 (World Bank, 2020). The decline in consumption poverty has shown a similar trajectory in Sri Lanka, with poverty reduction in Sri Lanka posting the lowest rate among the countries of South Asia. Consumption poverty in Sri Lanka reduced significantly over the past two decades from 29 per cent in 1995/96 to 4.1 per cent in 2016 (Department of Census and Statistics, various years). In terms of total numbers, those in poverty declined from around five million in 1995/96 to around 0.8 million in 2016 (Department of Census and Statistics, various years). This reduction was, however, by no means uniform across the country. While 80 per cent of Sri Lanka's population lived in rural areas in 2016, about 85 per cent of all Sri Lanka's poor were the rural poor. Thus, rural poverty and large regional disparities continue to challenge the poverty reduction efforts of Sri Lankan policymakers aiming to reduce all forms of poverty everywhere (Sustainable Development Goal 1), leaving no one behind. While scholars are agreed that poverty manifests in many dimensions, consumption poverty remains an axiomatic component of poverty, and this is the focus of this study. It aims to analyze the consumption poverty and the factors associated with poverty in Sri Lanka. The focus on consumption poverty is to provide a better understanding of the nature of socio-economic conditions associated with poverty in Sri Lanka which can contribute useful insights to the formulation of poverty reduction policies in the country. In fact, the success of poverty reduction efforts will depend on correctly identifying the factors associated with poverty. In this way, this study aims to address critical gaps in knowledge about poverty to support the formulation of policies to help the poorest in the effort to leave no one behind.

2. Literature Review

There is an extensive international literature on the correlates of poverty at the micro and macro levels, with many empirical studies focusing on the relationship between poverty and the characteristics of individuals, households, and communities. This section focuses the review of empirical literature related to the three main groups of characteristics correlated with consumption poverty. They are: (a) demographic characteristics (b) capabilities and (c) spatial characteristics.

Poverty and Demographic Characteristics

A vast literature has identified several demographic characteristics that are associated with the probability that an individual or household is poor. They include age, ethnicity, gender, and household size. Most empirical studies have looked at how age of household heads is associated with the probability that a household is poor (Lloyd-Sherlock, 2000; d'Ambrosio et al., 2011; Akarro and Mtweve, 2011; Nguyen et al., 2020). The age variable can act as a proxy for the effect of work experience and has an important influence on participation in income generating activities and other productive work. For example, according to life-cycle theories it can be expected that poverty is relatively high at young ages, decreases during middle age

and then increases again when people are old. Thus, the relationship between age and the probability of being poor often appears “U” shaped (d'Ambrosio et al., 2011). Ethnicity can also correlate with poverty. Generally, the incidence of poverty tends to be higher among ethnic minorities than among major ethnic groups. There are many reasons for this, some studies found that this is due to spatial factors (Van de Walle and Gunewardena, 2001; Baulch et al., 2002; Gang et al., 2008; Gustafsson and Sai, 2009). For example, ethnic minorities are mostly located in marginal areas where lack of technological development, lack of market access and poor health facilities prevail.

Gender as a correlate of poverty has received much attention among scholars and practitioners in recent times (Chetty et al., 2016; Masa et al., 2020). It is widely accepted that women are far more disadvantaged and more likely to be poor in terms of income, employment, education, rights, and are also more likely to be subjected to violence (Malik, 2014). There is a strong correlation between household size and per capita consumption, and it is often concluded that poverty increases with household size (Lanjouw and Ravallion,1995, Widyanti et al., 2010, Khan et al., 2015; Libois and Somville, 2018). Increasing household size is usually indicative of a higher number of dependent household members. The positive relationship between the poverty level and household size or the negative relationship between per capita consumption and household size can be explained by a lower amount of per capita resources and the higher dependency ratio.

Poverty and Capabilities

The literature recognizes many dimensions of capabilities, among them; education, employment and health have been taken here as which are more correlates to poverty. Low educational attainment often associated with poverty because people with less education are less likely to be employed, are less productive and less able to earn sufficient incomes (Mtey and Sulle, 2013). This is explained by human capital theory which sees education as being positively correlated with earnings as education provides skills and knowledge and improves the productivity of individuals (Schultz, 1961; Blaug, 1972; Boeri and Ours, 2008). Educated people are productive population because education increases cognitive skills and expands human capability, which in turn increases economic productivity, earnings and thereby reduces poverty. Using Sri Lankan HIES data for 2016, Jayathilaka et al. (2020) found that if a household member suffers from a chronic decease such as cancer, heart disease or kidney disease, he or she is more likely to be poor in Sri Lanka. Herman (2014) examined the factors determining working poverty in European Union countries and found personal characteristics such as education, gender and age as the most significant factors associated with working poverty. The incidence of working poverty among the poorly educated was 18 per cent while only 4.2 per cent of the more educated were both employed and poor. In Sri Lanka, Gunatilaka (2010) found that education is the significant contributing factor to the earnings gap between the working poor and non-poor in Sri Lanka. Gunatilaka (2014) analyzed the poverty level among different occupational categories and found that managerial and professional employees are less likely to be poor than those in other jobs in Sri Lanka.

Poverty and Spatial Characteristics

Economic performance varies considerably among regions because of several factors including geography, demographics, specialization, productivity, physical and human capital, infrastructure and the capacity to innovate. Myrdal (1957) argues that the process of growth tends to feed on itself through a process of cumulative causation. Lagging regions may benefit from growth in leading regions through “spread” effects. However, these benefits will tend to be offset by the “backwash” effects resulting from the flow of factors of production from poor regions to rich regions.

More recently, Collier (2007) analyzed the situation of the billion people who are facing poverty globally in his book "The Bottom Billion". The study further identifies four traps are the main causes of their poverty. Those are the conflict trap, the natural resource trap, the trap of being landlocked with bad neighbors, and the trap of bad governance. These reasons can be also cause regional disparity. People who are remote from benefits of globalization and trapped without access to global markets are living in economically lagged areas of most of the nations while other areas are able to grow faster given greater access to global market and benefits. Poverty prevalence varies significantly among urban, rural and estates as well as between regions in Sri Lanka has been the subject of empirical confirmation by Gunawardena et al., 2007; de Silva, 2008; de Silva, 2013; Gunatilaka, 2014; de Mel, 2019. Hence, ensuring pro-poor growth and development may help the countries to reduce regional disparities.

3. Methodology

Data related to consumption expenditure, demographic and other related characteristics of individuals and households for this study were drawn from the Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES) of 2016 conducted by the Department of Census and Statistics, Sri Lanka. The Department of Census and Statistics has constructed a poverty line for Sri Lanka based on the cost of basic needs (CBN) method which has been used by many empirical studies previously. However, the official poverty line is based on a consumption bundle which is generally accepted as being out of date, based on a consumption bundle that prevailed in 2002. Therefore, this analysis does not use the national poverty line to define the poor. Instead, this study uses the first quintile of per capita consumption expenditure/poorest quintile as the poverty threshold to define the dependent variable of the probability regression analysis.

The study investigates the covariates of the probability of an individual being poor by estimating the following binary logit model:

$$\Pr(\text{poor} = 1 | \, \mathrm{X}_1, \ldots, \mathrm{X}_\mathrm{n}) = F(\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \cdots + \beta_n X_n)$$

In the equation above, the variable poor indicates whether the individual is in the lowest quintile of the per capita consumption expenditure, Xn are vectors of groups of explanatory variables and βn are the parameters reflecting the impact of change in Xn on the probability of being poor.

In this model, outcome variable defined whether or not the per capita household expenditure falls into the lowest consumption quintile, that is whether the household is among the 20 per cent of the population of

households with the lowest per capita consumption expenditure in the survey year. Since the outcome variable is binary and takes the value one if the household's per capita consumption expenditure places it in the lowest quintile, and zero, it does not. Thus, if the household's per capita consumption expenditure falls into the 2nd, 3rd, 4th or 5th quintile, the household is considered as non-poor.

4. Findings of the study

This section looks at the characteristics associated with the probability that a household finds itself in the poorest consumption quintile over the period of 2016. The estimation results are reported in Table1 did not use sample weights in the calculation of standard errors.

Table 1: Factors associated with the probability of being in the lowest quintile in 2016

Demographic Variables	**Marginal effects**
Characteristics of head of household	
Age	-0.0203*
	(0.0101)
Age squared	0.0003**
	(0.0001)
Sinhalese Christian	-0.4678***
	(0.1389)
Sri Lankan Tamil Hindu	0.2623**
	(0.0883)
Sri Lankan Tamil Christian	0.0127
	(0.1324)
Indian Tamil Hindu	-0.1201
	(0.1427)
Indian Tamil Christian	-0.1386
	(0.2619)
Islamic Moor	-0.1292
	(0.0792)
Female	0.0621
	(0.047)
Composition of the household	
Share of children	0.5552***
	(0.1284)
Share of elderly parents	0.2534
	(0.1641)
Household size	-0.0306
	(0.0674)

Capabilities	
Secondary education	-0.5437***
	(0.0445)
GCE Ordinary Level	-1.1146***
	(0.0892)
GCE Advanced Level or above	-1.6589***
	(0.0956)
Household has working disabled member	-0.1783***
	(0.047)
Log of per capita ownership of land	-0.0234***
	(0.0034)
Home ownership	-0.1038*
	(0.0429)
Number of public employees	-0.5546***
	(0.0816)
Number of private employees	0.1803**
	(0.0618)
Number of employers	-1.3892***
	(0.2111)
Number of own account worker	-0.1350*
	(0.0686)
Number of not working	0.4848***
	(0.0684)
Number of managerial employees	-0.3039*
	(0.1351)
Number of professional employees	-0.4168**
	(0.1282)
Number of technical employees	-0.4940***
	(0.1055)
Number of clerical employees	-0.6954*
	(0.3544)
Number of service sector employees	0.1984**
	(0.0753)
Number of agriculture sector employees	0.4414***
	(0.0567)
Number of production sector employees	0.1093*
	(0.0526)

Number of elementary sector employees	0.5027***
	(0.0523)
Earning from paddy only	0.4477***
	(0.1147)
Earning from paddy and other agriculture production only	0.0983
	(0.1693)
Earning from other agriculture production only	0.0686
	(0.0979)
Remittances from abroad	-0.7869***
	(0.0773)
Remittances from Sri Lanka	-0.4069***
	(0.0634)
Received pension	-1.0951***
	(0.1123)
Spatial Variables	
Rural	0.7321***
	(0.0717)
Estate	0.5070***
	(0.142)
Central province	0.8513***
	(0.0785)
Southern province	0.3495***
	(0.0746)
Northern province	0.8515***
	(0.1077)
Eastern province	1.0811***
	(0.0915)
North Western province	0.3554***
	(0.0846)
North Central province	0.4094***
	(0.1003)
Uva province	1.2164***
	(0.0919)
Sabaragamuwa province	0.9855***
	(0.0795)
Number of observations in sample	21756
Pseudo R-squared	0.2209

Source: Estimated with microdata from Department of Census and Statistic' HIES 2009/10, 2012/13, 2016

Note: The omitted categories in the dummy variable analyses are household head is Sinhalese and Buddhist; male head of the household; head of the household has schooling primary or less; household does not have working disable; household does not have own home; earning not only from paddy; earning not only from paddy and other agriculture; earning not only from other agriculture; remittance not received from abroad; remittance not received from Sri Lanka; not received pension; residence in urban; residence in Western province.

Sample weights not used. Standard errors are in parenthesis.

***, ** and * denote statistical significance at one percent, five percent and ten per cent level respectively.

Table 1 sets out the marginal effects of the logistic estimation of the factors associated with the probability of being in the lowest consumption quintile. The marginal effect of each variable presented here is interpreted as the impact of a unit change in the explanatory variable on the probability that a household is in the lowest consumption quintile while all other variables are held constant. Table 1 also shows how the relationships between demographic, Capability-related and spatial characteristics, and the probability of being poor, for the period of 2016.

Among the demographic variables, age of head of household is significantly associated with the probability of the household being in the lowest consumption quintile in 2016. However, the association is negative in the given period. Ethno-religious characteristics are significantly associated with the probability of being poor, all other factors remaining the same. For example, if the household head is a Sinhalese Christian the household is less likely to be poor than if he or she is Sinhalese Buddhist. Islamic Moor household are also less likely to be poor than Sinhalese Buddhist, but the marginal effect is not statistically significant, suggesting that the ethno-religious origin of household head has become less important in predicting the probability of a household being poor in recent times.

In the international empirical literature, female-headed households have been found to be more likely to be in poverty because of women's low levels of education, training, and experience and their low earnings in the labour market (Rahman, 2013; Chant, 2014). This study too find that female-headed households are more likely to be in lowest consumption quintile than male-headed households, but the marginal effect is not statistically significant in the estimation. Since women-headed households were not statistically more likely to be in the lowest consumption quintile in the estimation for 2016, female gender of household head does not appear to be a significant predictor of the probability of being poor in Sri Lanka in recent times. The results suggest that households with higher shares of children are more likely to be living in poverty, as indicated by the significant marginal effects in the estimation.

As far as the capability variables are concerned, education appears to be very strongly associated with the probability of a household being poor. A head of the household who has secondary education, the GCE Ordinary Level or GCE Advanced Level qualification is less likely to be poor than the head of the household with primary education or less. All the marginal effects are statistically significant at the one per cent critical level. For instance, the household whose head is educated at least up to Advanced Level, is 166 percentage points less likely to be poor in 2016 than if he or she had had primary education or less. These results are

consistent with the wider empirical literature on the relationship between education and poverty (Apata et al., 2010; Awan et al., 2011; Gounder, 2013).

In the literature there is a clear link between disability and poverty because of increased expenses, lack of income and lack of opportunities due to social exclusion (Yeo and Moore, 2003; Groce et al., 2011; Rahman, 2013). However, this study finds that households with disabled members of working age are less likely to be in lowest consumption quintile than households that do not have disabled members of working age. This is not surprising as disabled adults in Sri Lanka get a disabled pension as monthly payment above Rs.10,000. As a result, household with disabled members of working age are less likely to be poor than a household with non-disabled working age member, all other things being equal.

Ownership of assets is associated with a lower probability of being poor. Table 1 shows that if the household's log of per capita ownership of land increases, the probability of the household being in lowest consumption quintile declines. Likewise, the marginal effect of the variable showing ownership of house suggests that such households are less likely to be poor than the household that does not live in its own house. Employment is an important determinant of poverty as labour earning is the main source of income for most households. The results in Table 1 suggest that as the number of members of working age who are employed as public sector employees and employers increases, the household is less likely to be in the lowest consumption quintile in surveyed period. The marginal effects are statistically significant. However, the association is stronger for households with a larger number of employers than the household with members who are public employees. The relationship between the probability of being poor and the number of non-working members is statistically significant in 2016. The marginal effect explains that if the number of non-working members increases by one, the probability the household is being poor increases by 48 percentage points.

Household members in high-skilled occupations such as managerial, professional and technical categories make it unlikely that the household will find itself in the poorest quintile. But as the number of household members working in agriculture and as elementary workers increase, the household is more likely to be poor. For example, the marginal effect explains that if the number of agriculture and elementary workers increases by one, the probability that the household is poor increases by 44 and 55 percentage points respectively. Households whose main source of income is from paddy cultivation are more likely to be in the lowest consumption quintile than households that receive income from other sources as well. And this relationship was statistically significant in the estimations for 2016. Having paddy and some other agricultural production as the main source of income is not a statistically significant predictor of the probability of being poor.

Whether households have access to non- labour income is also a significant predictor of the probability of being poor. Households which receive remittances from abroad or Sri Lanka are less likely to be in lowest consumption quintile all other things being equal, than the household that do not receive remittances. However, the marginal effect is larger in the case of foreign remittances. For example, the household that received foreign remittances was 79 percentage points less likely to be in lowest consumption quintile than the household that did not receive foreign remittances, while the household that received remittances from Sri Lanka was only 41 percentage points less likely to be in lowest consumption quintile than the household.

The findings of Lokshin *et al*. (2010), Acosta *et al*. (2008), and Serino and Kim (2011) confirm that households which receive international remittances are less likely to be poor. Earlier studies in Sri Lanka too have found that remittances from international migration reduced the likelihood of households being poor (Gunawardena *et al*., 2007; Ranathunga and Gibson, 2014; Gunatilaka, 2014). Households that receive pensions are also less likely to be poor than those that do not receive pensions. The marginal effects are all statistically significant at the one per cent critical level.

Rural and estate households are more likely to be poor compared to households in urban areas, but the marginal effect is stronger among rural households than estate households. For instance, the estimation of the probability of being poor shows that rural households are approximately 73 percentage points more likely to be poor than urban households, whereas estate households are only 50 percentage points more likely to be poor than urban households. The results attest to the fact that poverty is a rural phenomenon as people who reside in rural areas are more likely to be poor. Households in all non-Western provinces are more likely to be in the poorest quintile than household in Western province in all three survey years. According to the results of the marginal effects in Table 1, a household in Uva and Eastern provinces were more than 100 percentage points more likely to be poor than a household in the Western province. In contrast, the highest prevalence of consumption poverty was reported in Northern province in the latest survey period. Southern province is less likely to be poor next to the Western province.

5. Conclusion

This study looked at the prevalence of consumption poverty and its covariates in Sri Lanka. Its particular focus was the relationship between poverty and characteristics of households such as demographic attributes, Capability-related endowments, and spatial characteristics, which have been identified as the key determinants of poverty in the international empirical literature. The probability analysis also found that these household characteristics were significantly associated with the likelihood of being poor, particularly greater shares of children and elders among household members, low educational attainment, households with more members working in unskilled occupations made it unlikely that the household was poor.

This research provides some key insights into the characteristics of poverty in Sri Lanka. They are likely to be particularly useful for policy makers aiming to reduce the prevalence of poverty, including reducing the prevalence of vulnerable households which are not currently poor but may fall into poverty given external and internal shocks in the future. The findings of this study suggest that improving the general and vocational education systems, increasing productivity, particularly in agriculture, and increasing productive public and private investment, are likely to help the poor earn their way out of poverty. Meanwhile, interventions providing consumption support to the poor should be targeted more carefully to provide more substantial assistance for those in pockets of poverty in the poorest Sri Lankan provinces. Since this study found that the prevalence of poverty significantly varies among regions, regional-level analysis is the future direction of this study.

References

Acosta, P., Calderon, C., Fajnzylber, P., & Lopez, H. (2008), "What is the impact of international remittances on poverty and inequality in Latin America?". World Development, 36(1), pp. 89-114.

Akarro, R. R., & Mtweve, N. A. (2011), "Poverty and its association with child labor in Njombe District in Tanzania: the case of Igima ward. Current Research Journal of Social Sciences". 3(3), pp.199-206.

Apata T. G. , O. M. Apata, O. A. Lgbalajobi and S. M. O. Awoniyi. (2010), "Determinants of rural poverty in Nigeria: Evidence from small holder farmers in South-Western, Nigeria". Journal of Science and Technology Education Research, 1 (4), pp. 85-91.

Awan Masood Sarwar, Nouman Malik,Haroon Sarwar and Muhammad Waqas. (2011), "Impact of Edcuation on Poverty Reduction". International Journal of Academic Research, 3 (1), pp. 660-665.

Baulch Bob, Truong Thi Kim, Dominique Haughton and Jonathan Haughton. (2002), "Ethnic Minorities Development in Vietnam- A Socio Economic Perspective". Washington DC.: World Bank.

Baulch Bob, Truong Thi Kim, Dominique Haughton and Jonathan Haughton. (2002), "Ethnic Minorities Development in Vietnam- A Socio Economic Perspective". Washington DC.: World Bank.

Blaug, M. (1972), "The Correlation between Education and Earnings: What Does It Signify?". Higher Education, 1 (1), pp. 53-76.

Boeri Tito and Ours Jan van. (2008), "The Economics of Imperfect Labor Markets". United Kingdom: Princeton University Press.

Chant, S. (2014), "Exploring the "feminisation of poverty" in relation to women's work and home-based Enterprice in slums of the Global South". International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship, 6 (3), pp. 296 - 316.

Chetty, R., Hendren, N., Lin, F., Majerovitz, J., & Scuderi, B. (2016), "Childhood environment and gender gaps in adulthood". American Economic Review, 106(5), pp. 282-88.

Collier, P. (2007), 'The Bottom billion: Why the Poorest Countries are Failing and What Can be Done About It', Oxford University Press, New York.

d' Ambrosio, C., Deutsch, J., & Silber, J. (2011), "Multidimensional approaches to poverty measurement: an empirical analysis of poverty in Belgium, France, Germany, Italy and Spain, based on the European panel". Applied Economics, 43(8), pp.951-961.

de Mel Sajith., (2019), "Determinants of Poverty in Sri Lanka". International Journal of Creative Research and Studies, 3(11), pp.94-103.

de Silva, I. (2008), "Micro-Level Determinants of poverty reduction in Sri Lanka: a multivariate approach". International Journal of Social Economics, 35 (3), pp.140-158.

De Silva, I. (2013), "Endowments Versus Returns: Counterfactual Quantile Decomposition of Urban–Rural Inequality In Sri Lanka". In Review of Urban & Regional Development Studies: Journal of the Applied Regional Science Conference 25(1), pp. 248-260.

Department of Census and Statistics (2004), "Official poverty line for Sri Lanka". Colombo. Retrieved from http://www.statistics.gov.lk/poverty/OfficialPovertyLineBuletin.pdf.

-(2011), “Household Inome and Expenditure Survey-2009/10, Final Report”. Colombo: Department of Census and Statistics.

-(2015), “Household Inome and Expenditure Survey-2012/13, Final Report”. Colombo: Department of Census and Statistics.

-(2015), “The saptial distribution of poverty in Sri Lanka”. Retrieved from http://www.statistics.gov.lk/ poverty/Spatial Distribution Of Poverty 2012_13.pdf

-(2018), “Household Inome and Expenditure Survey-2016, Final Report”. Colombo: Department of Census and Statistics.

Gang, I. N., Sen, K., & Yun, M. S. (2008), “Poverty in rural India: Caste and tribe”. Review of Income and Wealth, 54(1), pp.50-70.

Gounder, N. (2013), “Correlates of poverty in fiji: An analysis of individual, household and community factors related to poverty”. International Journal of Social Economics, 40 (10), pp.923-938.

Groce Nora , Maria Kett , Raymond Lang & Jean-Francois Trani. (2011), “Disability and Poverty: the need for a more nuanced understanding of implications for development policy and practice”. Third World Quarterly, 32 (8), pp.1493-1513.

Gunatilaka, R. (2010), “Sri Lanka's working poor”. International Labour Organization, Colombo.

Gunatilaka, R. (2014), “Women and Poverty in Sri Lanka”. Centre for Women’s Research (CENWOR).

Gunawardena, D. Meedeniya, A and Shivakumaran, S. (2007), “Absolute and Relative Consumption Poverty in Sri Lanka”. Colombo, Sri Lanka: CEPA

Gustafsson, B., & Sai, D. (2009), “Temporary and persistent poverty among ethnic minorities and the majority in rural China”. *55*, pp.588-606

Jayathilaka, R., Joachim, S., Mallikarachchi, V., Perera, N., & Ranawaka, D. (2020), “Do chronic illnesses and poverty go hand in hand?”. PloS One, 15(10), e0241232.

Khan, R. E. A., Rehman, H., & Haq, M. A. (2015), “Determinants of rural household poverty: the role of household socioeconomic empowerment”. American-Eurasian Journal of Agriculture & Environmental Science, 15(1), pp.93-98.

Lanjouw, P., & Ravallion, M. (1995), “Poverty and household size”. The Economic Journal, 105(433), pp. 1415-1434.

Libois, F., & Somville, V. (2018), “Fertility, household size and poverty in Nepal. World Development”, 103, pp. 311-322.

Lloyd-Sherlock, P. (2000), “Old age and poverty in developing countries: new policy challenges”. World Development, 28(12), pp. 2157-2168.

Lokshin, M., Bontch-Osmolovski, M., & Glinskaya, E. (2010), “Work-related migration and poverty reduction in Nepal”. Review of Development Economics, 14(2), pp. 323-332.

Mahembe, E., & Odhiambo, N. M. (2018), “The dynamics of extreme poverty in developing countries”. Studia Universitatis “Vasile Goldis” Arad–Economics Series, 28(2), pp. 18-35.

Malik, K. (2014), “Human development report 2014: Sustaining human progress: Reducing vulnerabilities and building resilience”. United Nations Development Programme, New York.

Masa, R., Khan, Z., & Chowa, G. (2020), “Youth food insecurity in Ghana and South Africa: Prevalence, socioeconomic correlates, and moderation effect of gender”. Children and Youth Services Review, 116, 105180. Review of Income and Wealth, 55, pp.588-606.

Mtey Kanty P Feksi and Andrew Sulle. (2013), “The role of education in poverty reduction in Tanzania”. Global Advanced Research Journal of Educational Research and Review, 2 (1), pp.006-014.

Myrdal, G. (1957), “Economic Theory and Underdeveloped Regions”. London: University Paperbacks, Methuen.

Nguyen, T. T., Nguyen, T. T., & Grote, U. (2020), “Multiple shocks and households' choice of coping strategies in rural Cambodia”. Ecological Economics, 167, 106442.

Rahman, M. A. (2013), “Household characteristics and poverty: a logistic regression analysis”. The Journal of Developing Areas, 47(1), pp. 303-317.

Ranathunga, S., & Gibson, J. (2014), “Determinants of household poverty in the rural sector in Sri Lanka: 1990-2010”. Economics, 3(3), pp. 43-49.

Schultz, T. W. (1961), “Investment in Human Capital”. The American Economic Review , 51 (1), pp. 1-17.

Sen, A. (1993), “Capabilities and wellbeing”. In M. N. Sen (Ed.), The Quality of Life (pp. 30-53). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Serino, M. N. V., & Kim, D. (2011), “How do international remittances affect poverty in developing countries? A quantile regression analysis”. Journal of Economic Development, 36(4), pp. 17-40.

Van de Walle, D., & Gunewardena, D. (2001), “Sources of ethnic inequality in Viet Nam. Journal of Development Economics”, 65(1), pp. 177-207.

Widyanti, W., Suryahadi, A., Sumarto, S., & Yumna, A. (2009), “The relationship between chronic poverty and household dynamics: evidence from Indonesia”. Chronic Poverty Research Centre Working Paper, (132), pp.1-26.

World Bank. (2020), “ Reversals of Fortune, Poverty, and shared prosperity 2020”, Washington, DC: World Bank.

Yeo Rebecca and Moore Karen. (2003), “ Including Disabled People in Poverty Reduction Work; Nothing About Us, Without Us”. World Development , 31 (3), pp.571–590.