

The effect of the sectoral composition of economic growth on rural and urban poverty

by
Rui Benfica
Heath Henderson

23 IFAD
RESEARCH
SERIES



The IFAD Research Series has been initiated by the Strategy and Knowledge Department in order to bring together cutting-edge thinking and research on smallholder agriculture, rural development and related themes. As a global organization with an exclusive mandate to promote rural smallholder development, IFAD seeks to present diverse viewpoints from across the development arena in order to stimulate knowledge exchange, innovation, and commitment to investing in rural people.

The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IFAD concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The designations “developed” and “developing” countries are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily express a judgement about the stage reached in the development process by a particular country or area.

This publication or any part thereof may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes without prior permission from IFAD, provided that the publication or extract therefrom reproduced is attributed to IFAD and the title of this publication is stated in any publication and that a copy thereof is sent to IFAD.

Authors:

Rui Benfica, Heath Henderson

© IFAD 2018

All rights reserved

ISBN 978-92-9072-816-0

Printed April 2018



The effect of the sectoral composition of economic growth on rural and urban poverty

by
Rui Benfica
Heath Henderson



23 IFAD
RESEARCH
SERIES

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Shaohua Chen, Rebecca Ray and Sean Severe for providing detailed comments, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) for financial support. We are grateful for questions raised by attendees of the 43rd and 44th annual conference of the Eastern Economic Association, Drake University's "First Friday Brown Bag Seminar", and participants in the African Development Bank/Cornell University workshop on the Structural Transformation of African Agriculture and Rural Spaces (STAARS) Initiative in December 2017.

About the authors

Rui Benfica is Lead Economist, Research and Impact Assessment Division, at IFAD. He undertakes research in areas relevant for IFAD's overarching goal of overcoming poverty and achieving food security. This includes development research outputs, the design and implementation of impact assessments in client countries, and economy-wide modelling analysis to inform IFAD's country strategies. Benfica has extensive policy research and outreach experience in developing regions. Before joining IFAD in 2015, he was an associate professor at Michigan State University. Prior to that, he worked at the World Bank as an economist with the Gender and Development Group, and poverty economist with the Africa region, Mozambique Country Office, where he worked closely with the Ministry of Planning and Development and the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. He holds a PhD in agricultural economics from Michigan State University with a focus on international development, commodity market analysis, and quantitative development policy research. Benfica has published extensively in peer-reviewed journals.

Heath Henderson is an assistant professor of economics in the College of Business and Public Administration at Drake University. Heath holds a PhD in economics and an MA in international politics from American University, United States. Before coming to Drake University, Heath was a research fellow in the Office of Strategic Planning and Development Effectiveness at the Inter-American Development Bank. Heath's research interests include development economics, econometrics, and computational economics. His work has been published in the *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, the *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, and the *Journal of Development Studies*, among others.

Oversight: Paul Winters, Associate Vice-President, ad interim, Strategy and Knowledge Department, and Director, Research and Impact Assessment Division.

Advisory Board: Fabrizio Bresciani, Shirley Chinien, Edward Heinemann, Bruce Murphy, Richard Pelrine, Lauren Phillips, Paolo Silveri and Abdelkarim Sma.

Editorial Management Team: Rui Benfica, Helen Gillman and Anja Lesa.

Table of contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Acknowledgements | 2 |
| Abstract | 4 |
| 1 Introduction | 5 |
| 2 Methodology | 8 |
| 3 Data and descriptive analysis | 13 |
| 4 Results | 16 |
| 4.1 Baseline results | 16 |
| 4.2 Sensitivity analysis | 19 |
| 4.3 Sources of historical poverty reduction across regions | 21 |
| 5 Conclusions and policy implications | 24 |
| References | 26 |
| Appendix: tables and figures | 28 |

Abstract

We examine the relationship between the sectoral composition of economic growth and the rural-urban composition of poverty. To this end, we use a new cross-country panel dataset consisting of 146 rural and urban poverty “spells” for 70 low- and middle-income countries. We find that rural (urban) poverty is highly responsive to agricultural (non-agricultural) productivity growth. The effect of agricultural productivity growth on rural poverty is particularly strong for countries with little dependence on natural resources. We also find that growth in the share of employment in the non-agricultural sector (i.e. structural transformation) reduces rural poverty, most notably for countries at a low initial level of development. These findings are robust to changes in key assumptions, including using alternative poverty lines. Finally, we use our estimates to examine the historical contribution of different sources of economic growth to rural and urban poverty reduction across regions.

1 Introduction

An understanding of the channels through which economic growth reduces poverty is instrumental for promoting inclusive and sustainable economic development. While it is well documented that growth tends to contribute to poverty reduction, the empirical literature suggests that there is considerable heterogeneity in the relationship across space and over time.¹ For example, using data from the 1980s and 1990s, Besley and Burgess (2003) showed that the growth elasticity of poverty reduction varies across different regions, with elasticities ranging from -0.49 (for sub-Saharan Africa) to -1.14 (for Eastern Europe and Central Asia). To cite another example, Datt et al. (2016) examined changes in the growth elasticity of poverty across time using data from pre- and post-reform India. Across a variety of specifications, they found that the responsiveness of poverty to economic growth was significantly greater for the post-reform period.

Explanations for the observed heterogeneity have emphasized differences in “initial conditions” and “patterns of growth.” Initial income inequality has featured prominently in analyses of initial conditions, as higher inequality: (i) may slow the rate of growth (the “induced-growth argument”); and (ii) may reduce subsequent gains to the poor from existing growth (the “growth elasticity argument”) (Ravallion, 1997). While evidence for the induced-growth argument is highly context dependent (Neves and Silva, 2014), a number of studies have found support for the growth elasticity argument (Ravallion and Chen, 2007; Kalwij and Verschoor, 2007; Fosu, 2009). Bourguignon (2003) further showed that the growth elasticity of poverty relates directly to the ratio of the poverty line to mean income. That the responsiveness of poverty to growth increases with per capita income has been corroborated by multiple subsequent empirical studies (Kalwij and Verschoor, 2007; Fosu, 2009; Chistiaensen et al., 2011).²

Regarding patterns of growth, Montalvo and Ravallion (2010) discuss two reasons why the sectoral and/or geographic composition of economic activity affects the growth-poverty relationship: (i) economic growth may occur in sectors or locations that do not benefit poor people; and (ii) the composition of economic activity can affect income inequality, which has implications for the subsequent effect of growth on poverty (see above). There is a large body of empirical research that finds that growth in the agricultural sector is particularly effective at reducing poverty, not only through its direct effect via agricultural incomes, but

1. See Foster and Székely (2008), Ferreira et al. (2010), Ram (2011), or Chambers and Dhongde (2011) for comprehensive reviews of the literature on the growth elasticity of poverty reduction.

2. While the study of initial conditions has focused on initial inequality and the level of development, a number of other factors have been explored. See Datt and Ravallion (1998) on infrastructure and human resources; Ravallion and Datt (2002) on literacy and farm productivity (among other factors); Suryahadi et al. (2009) on human capital; Ferreira et al. (2010) on human development and worker empowerment; and Chistiaensen et al. (2011) on the share of extractive industries in GDP.

also through growth linkages with the rest of the economy (Bezemer and Headey, 2008; de Janvry and Sadoulet, 2010; Dercon, 2009; Chistiaensen et al., 2011). The responsiveness of poverty to agricultural growth, however, has been found to diminish with development (Ravallion and Datt, 2002; Ferreira et al. 2010; Chistiaensen et al. 2011).

The agriculture versus non-agriculture dimension has been a focus in the patterns of growth literature, but other dimensions have been considered as well. Using data from India, Ravallion and Datt (1996) decomposed mean consumption growth into rural and urban components and found that rural consumption growth was the primary driver of poverty reduction.³ To the contrary, Datt et al. (2016) found that urban growth came to occupy the leading role in the wake of India's reforms of the early 1990s. Suryahadi et al. (2009) took this geographical decomposition a step further by decomposing rural and urban growth by economic sector. Using data from Indonesia, they found that provincial poverty was particularly responsive to growth in the urban and rural services sectors. Finally, in a unique contribution, Loayza and Raddatz (2010) found using cross-country data that the composition of growth in terms of the intensive use of unskilled labour is critical for poverty reduction.⁴

While substantial progress has been made towards understanding the growth-poverty relationship, the literature offers an incomplete characterization of the channels through which growth reduces poverty. To what extent does overall and sectoral growth have a differential effect on rural and urban poverty? Are these growth effects driven by labour productivity growth or employment expansion? Are employment expansion effects due to labour force growth or the movement of labour across sectors (i.e. structural transformation)? How do initial conditions, particularly the differences in economic inequality and the level of development, influence the above channels? We examine these questions using a novel dataset consisting of 146 rural and urban poverty "spells" for 70 low- and middle-income countries spanning from 1992 to 2013. To the best of our knowledge, our dataset represents the most comprehensive source of internationally comparable rural and urban poverty measures compiled to date.

Our primary contribution is the analysis of the relationship between the sectoral composition of growth and the rural-urban composition of poverty. Previous research in this area has focused on single-country studies, largely in an Asian context. Research on China has highlighted the association between agricultural growth and rural poverty reduction (Ravallion and Chen, 2007; Montalvo and Ravallion, 2010), whereas work on India and Indonesia has found that both rural and urban poverty are responsive to growth in the agricultural and services sectors (Ravallion and Datt, 1996; Suryahadi et al. 2009).⁵ In contrast to these studies, we believe we are the first to address these questions using cross-country panel data. Our dataset is also particularly rich in terms of covering a large number of countries over a relatively long period. While cross-country studies have well-known limitations, we are able to provide new insights into the dynamics of rural and urban poverty by examining other contexts (e.g. sub-Saharan Africa) and exploiting cross-country variation in key variables (e.g. income inequality and level of development).

3. See Ravallion and Chen (2007) for a similar result in the context of China. This result is in part a direct implication of the fact that baseline levels of poverty were much higher in rural areas where most people live. Noticeable overall reductions in poverty could only be driven by improvements in consumption in those areas and predominantly driven by agricultural growth.

4. Again, this result is in part a direct effect derived from the fact that most of the poor are exactly the unskilled who are available to work in the growing economy.

5. Recent research suggests, however, that the sectoral composition of growth in India has become less important for poverty reduction after the reforms of the early 1990s (Datt et al. 2016).

In addition to providing complementary insights through the use of cross-country panel data, we seek to deepen the analysis of the relationship between sectoral growth and the rural-urban composition of poverty in three ways. First, we examine the growth-poverty channels by decomposing sectoral growth into components associated with labour productivity growth and employment expansion. Second, we further decompose the employment expansion effects into components associated with labour force growth and structural transformation. Finally, we examine how differences in initial conditions affect the channels through which economic growth reduces rural and urban poverty. Throughout our analysis we do not claim to estimate causal relationships, but rather seek to examine whether robust cross-country empirical regularities can be established.

We report three primary findings. First, the semi-elasticity of rural poverty to agricultural productivity is highly significant and relatively large in magnitude, particularly for countries with little dependence on natural resources. Second, the semi-elasticity of urban poverty to non-agricultural productivity is also large and highly significant. This semi-elasticity is insensitive to initial conditions. Third, structural transformation reduces rural poverty, particularly for countries at a low initial level of development. We find that these results are robust to changes in key assumptions, including using alternative poverty lines, incorporating additional covariates (e.g. changes in the distribution of income), and changing the criteria used to drop extreme observations.

Semi-elasticity estimates alone convey little information about the historical contribution of different sources of economic growth to rural and urban poverty reduction. We thus use our estimates to quantify these contributions across six geographical regions. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to conduct such an exercise on an international level using rural-urban disaggregated poverty rates. We find that agricultural productivity growth has contributed relatively little to rural and urban poverty reduction across all regions. Non-agricultural productivity growth, however, has made substantial contributions in virtually all regions, generally via poverty reductions in urban areas. Additionally, we find that the poverty-reducing effect of structural transformation (employment growth) has primarily been a rural phenomenon and confined to regions with initially lower (higher) levels of development.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines our methodological framework, and section 3 discusses our data and provides descriptive analysis. Section 4 presents baseline results, sensitivity analysis, and examines the sources of historical poverty reduction. Section 5 provides concluding remarks and policy implications.

2 Methodology

This section outlines a strategy for estimating the effect of the sectoral composition of economic growth on rural and urban poverty. Our framework relies heavily on both Ravallion and Datt (1996) and Christiaensen et al. (2011), so the reader is referred to their work for additional discussion.

Let P_{it} denote any decomposable poverty measure and Y_{it} denote gross domestic product (GDP) per capita for country i at time t . We use the so-called naive model as a starting point (Bourguignon, 2003; Klasen and Misselhorn, 2008):

$$\Delta P_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_{it} \Delta \ln Y_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where Δ is the discrete time-difference operator, α_i captures country-specific time trends, β_{it} represents parameters to be estimated, and ε_{it} is the error term. Note that β_{it} is permitted to vary across countries and time (discussed below). Further note that, given the time-differencing of Eq. (1), we implicitly control for time-invariant unobservable characteristics.

In Eq. (1), β_{it} represents the growth semi-elasticity of poverty. Klasen and Misselhorn (2008) argue that there are conceptual and empirical advantages to examining absolute rather than proportionate poverty reduction (i.e. semi-elasticities rather than elasticities). Conceptually, policymakers are likely to be more interested in percentage point changes than in percentage changes. For example, a 10 percentage point change in the poverty rate is clearly substantial, but whether a reduction in the poverty rate by 10 per cent is large depends on the level of headcount poverty. Regarding empirical advantages, the authors argue that semi-elasticities can be estimated more precisely and do not rely heavily on arbitrary assumptions about dealing with data from countries with low poverty rates. In particular, semi-elasticities permit the use of more data, as one does not need to drop “spells where the percentage change ... [is] abnormally large in relative value” (Bourguignon, 2003: 15).⁶

We are interested in how the sectoral composition of economic growth affects poverty. We thus first decompose GDP per capita growth into components associated with growth in the agricultural sector and growth in the non-agricultural sectors. GDP per capita can be written as $Y = Y_a + Y_n$ where Y_a and Y_n represent value added per capita in the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors, respectively. The total differential of GDP per capita can then be written as follows:

$$d \ln Y = \psi_a d \ln Y_a + \psi_n d \ln Y_n \quad (2)$$

6. This occurs when initial poverty rates are low. In the extreme case, when the initial poverty rate is zero, the percentage change in the poverty rate is undefined.

where ψ_a and ψ_n denote the share of the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors in GDP, respectively. Eq. (2) thus states that growth in GDP per capita equals the share-weighted sum of value added per capita growth in each sector.

As discussed in section 1, we are further interested in the extent to which the poverty-reducing effects of sectoral growth are due to labour productivity growth or employment expansion. To this end, value added per capita for sector $j \in \{a, n\}$ can be expressed as $Y_j = \gamma_j \omega_j$, where γ_j and ω_j denote value added per worker and the size of the sector's labour force (in per capita terms), respectively. The total differential of sectoral value added per capita can then be written as $d \ln Y_j = d \ln \gamma_j + d \ln \omega_j$, which we can substitute into Eq. (2), as follows:

$$d \ln Y = \psi_a d \ln \gamma_a + \psi_a d \ln \omega_a + \psi_n d \ln \gamma_n + \psi_n d \ln \omega_n \quad (3)$$

According to Eq. (3), GDP per capita growth can be decomposed into components associated with: (i) agricultural productivity growth; (ii) agricultural labour force expansion; (iii) non-agricultural productivity growth; and (iv) non-agricultural labour force expansion.

To examine the effect of structural transformation on poverty, we must further decompose GDP per capita growth. Noting that $\omega_j = \lambda_j \mu$ where λ_j is the share of employment in sector j and μ is the employment-to-population ratio, we can write the total differential of ω_j as $d \ln \omega_j = d \ln \lambda_j + d \ln \mu$. Substituting this expression into Eq. (3) and rearranging yields the following:

$$d \ln Y = \psi_a d \ln \gamma_a + \psi_n d \ln \gamma_n + \left(\psi_n - \frac{\psi_a \lambda_n}{\lambda_a} \right) d \ln \lambda_n + d \ln \mu \quad (4)$$

The decomposition in Eq. (4) again consists of four components. The first two components are associated with growth in agricultural and non-agricultural value added per worker, respectively. The third component can be interpreted as growth in GDP per capita resulting from structural transformation.⁷ The final component captures the contribution of growth in the employment-to-population ratio.

We can use Eq. (4) to rewrite Eq. (1) as follows (Ravallion and Datt, 1996; Christiaensen et al., 2011):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta P_{it} = & \alpha_i + \beta_{ait} \psi_{ait-1} \Delta \ln \gamma_{ait} + \beta_{nit} \psi_{nit-1} \Delta \ln \gamma_{nit} \\ & + \beta_{sit} \left(\psi_{nit-1} - \frac{\psi_{ait-1} \lambda_{nit-1}}{\lambda_{ait-1}} \right) \Delta \ln \lambda_{nit} + \beta_{eit} \Delta \ln \mu_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where we now have four growth-related parameters. The parameters β_{ait} and β_{nit} capture the effect of (share-weighted) growth in value added per worker in the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors, respectively. The parameter β_{sit} captures the effect of growth in the share of employment in the non-agricultural sector (i.e. structural transformation). Finally, β_{eit} represents the poverty-reducing effect of growth in the employment-to-population

7. The coefficient on $d \ln \lambda_n$ can be written as $(\gamma_n - \gamma_a) \omega_n / Y$, which indicates that structural transformation will lead to improvements in GDP per capita only if the non-agricultural sector witnesses higher labour productivity than the agricultural sector.

ratio. Note that if $\beta_{ait} = \beta_{nit} = \beta_{sit} = \beta_{eit}$ then Eq. (5) collapses to Eq. (1). Therefore, under the null hypothesis that $\beta_{ait} = \beta_{nit} = \beta_{sit} = \beta_{eit}$ it is the overall growth rate that matters for poverty reduction and not the composition of growth.

The country fixed effects in Eq. (5) mitigate concerns about bias arising from country heterogeneity, but the sectoral participation effects (i.e. β_{ait} , β_{nit} , β_{sit} and β_{eit}) themselves may depend on country-specific characteristics, which we denote by X_{it} . More specifically, the magnitude of the sectoral participation effects depends on the position of the poverty line relative to the mean of the income distribution, in addition to the shape of the income distribution (Bourguignon, 2003; Klasen and Misselhorn, 2008). Due in part to enclave effects, sectoral participation may also depend on the share of extractive industries in GDP (Christiaensen et al., 2011). Further, the duration of the poverty spell under consideration may play a critical role, as some effects (e.g. cross-sectoral effects) may take time to manifest. Accordingly, following Christiaensen et al. (2011), we rewrite Eq. (5) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta P_{it} = & \alpha_i + \pi_a X_{it-1} \psi_{ait-1} \Delta \ln y_{ait} + \pi_n X_{it-1} \psi_{nit-1} \Delta \ln y_{nit} \\ & + \pi_s X_{it-1} \left(\psi_{nit-1} - \frac{\psi_{ait-1} \lambda_{nit-1}}{\lambda_{ait-1}} \right) \Delta \ln \lambda_{nit} + \pi_e X_{it-1} \Delta \ln \mu_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where π_a , π_n , π_s and π_e are vectors of parameters and X_{it-1} is a vector of covariates. Included in X_{it-1} is an intercept, the ratio of the poverty line to average daily income, the Gini coefficient of income/consumption, the share of extractive industries in GDP, and the poverty spell length. All variables in X_{it-1} are initial levels of those variables.⁸

We are further interested in how the different components of growth affect not only overall poverty, but also rural and urban poverty. The change in the overall poverty rate can be decomposed into three components: poverty changes in rural areas, poverty changes in urban areas, and changes due to rural-urban migration (Ravallion and Datt, 1996). The overall poverty rate P can be written as $\rho_r P_r + \rho_u P_u$ where ρ_r and P_r are the rural population share and rural poverty rate, respectively, and ρ_u and P_u are the analogous quantities for urban areas. The total differential of the overall poverty rate is then as follows:

$$dP = \rho_r dP_r + \rho_u dP_u + (P_u - P_r) d\rho_u \quad (7)$$

where the first two terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (7) represent the intraregional gains to the poor and the final term represents the independent contribution of rural-urban migration. Note that the coefficient on $d\rho_u$ indicates that urbanization will lead to reductions in overall poverty rates only if poverty is greater in rural areas than in urban areas.

8. That is, the variables in X_{it-1} correspond to the start of each poverty spell as $\Delta P_{it} = P_{it} - P_{it-1}$.

Following Ravallion and Datt (1996), we can then use Eq. (7) as a basis for estimating the following system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{rit-1} \Delta P_{it}^r = & \alpha_i^r + \pi_a^r X_{it-1} \psi_{ait-1} \Delta \ln y_{ait} + \pi_n^r X_{it-1} \psi_{nit-1} \Delta \ln y_{nit} \\ & + \pi_s^r X_{it-1} \left(\psi_{nit-1} - \frac{\psi_{ait-1} \lambda_{nit-1}}{\lambda_{ait-1}} \right) \Delta \ln \lambda_{nit} + \pi_e^r X_{it-1} \Delta \ln \mu_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}^r \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{uit-1} \Delta P_{it}^u = & \alpha_i^u + \pi_a^u X_{it-1} \psi_{ait-1} \Delta \ln y_{ait} + \pi_n^u X_{it-1} \psi_{nit-1} \Delta \ln y_{nit} \\ & + \pi_s^u X_{it-1} \left(\psi_{nit-1} - \frac{\psi_{ait-1} \lambda_{nit-1}}{\lambda_{ait-1}} \right) \Delta \ln \lambda_{nit} + \pi_e^u X_{it-1} \Delta \ln \mu_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}^u \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (P_{uit-1} - P_{rit-1}) \Delta \rho_{uit} = & \alpha_i^m + \pi_a^m X_{it-1} \psi_{ait-1} \Delta \ln y_{ait} + \pi_n^m X_{it-1} \psi_{nit-1} \Delta \ln y_{nit} \\ & + \pi_s^m X_{it-1} \left(\psi_{nit-1} - \frac{\psi_{ait-1} \lambda_{nit-1}}{\lambda_{ait-1}} \right) \Delta \ln \lambda_{nit} + \pi_e^m X_{it-1} \Delta \ln \mu_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}^m \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the superscripts r , u and m denote terms associated with rural areas, urban areas and rural-urban migration, respectively. Eq. (8) thus captures the rural-poverty effect of: (i) growth of value added per worker within and outside the agricultural sector; (ii) changes in the sectoral composition of GDP (i.e. structural transformation); and (iii) changes in the employment-to-population ratio. Eq. (9) is interpreted analogously, but is associated with urban poverty. Finally, Eq. (10) captures the effect of the composition of economic growth on the rural-urban migration component of the poverty decomposition.

Noting that $\pi_k = \pi_k^r + \pi_k^u + \pi_k^m$ for $k \in \{a, n, s, e\}$, it is evident that summing Eqs. (8) to (10) yields Eq. (6). To examine whether the composition of growth matters for poverty reduction in the context of Eqs. (8) to (10), we can conduct an F -test for the hypothesis that $\pi_a^l = \pi_n^l + \pi_s^l + \pi_e^l$ for $l \in \{r, u, m\}$. While for Eq. (1) the semi-elasticities are given by the regression coefficients, additional calculations are needed for other specifications. For regressions using national poverty measures (i.e. Eqs. [5] and [6]), the semi-elasticities can be calculated by partially differentiating with respect to $\Delta \ln y_{ait}$, $\Delta \ln y_{nit}$, $\Delta \ln \lambda_{nit}$ or $\Delta \ln \mu_{it}$. For regressions using decomposed poverty rates (i.e. Eqs. [8] to [10]), the resulting partial derivatives must be divided through by ρ_{rit-1} , ρ_{uit-1} or $P_{uit-1} - P_{rit-1}$, respectively. With the exception of Eq. (1), all semi-elasticities are a function of the data and, as such, are evaluated at variable means.

All regressions are estimated using a fixed effects (FE) estimator with standard errors clustered at the country level. The FE estimator drops any country for which we only observe one poverty spell. In our dataset, this leads to a loss of 28 observations, or 19 per cent of the sample. One way to avoid this issue would be to use a random effects (RE) estimator.

Using a robust form of the Hausman test, we nevertheless reject the null hypothesis that the RE estimator is consistent.⁹ The FE model is thus preferred, but one might argue that the loss of observations biases our estimates. To examine this issue, we estimate Eq. (6) via OLS using the full sample of countries and again after dropping countries with one poverty spell.¹⁰ Comparing coefficients across regressions using a Wald test, we fail to reject the null hypothesis of coefficient equality (p-value = 0.91). Similar results are obtained when using rural and urban poverty changes as the dependent variable, and we thus conclude that any bias is unlikely to be substantial.

9. The robust form of the Hausman test is based on the artificial regression approach described in Wooldridge (2002: 290-291). This statistic is asymptotically equivalent to the standard Hausman test under conditional homoscedasticity, and can be implemented using Stata's `xtoverid` command. We run the test using changes in the overall poverty rate as the dependent variable (i.e. using Eq. [6]), and reject the null hypothesis that the RE estimator is consistent at the 5 per cent level (p-value = 0.02).
10. Note that these regressions omit the country-specific effects. Nevertheless, if the loss of observations biases our results, we would expect the OLS estimates to differ depending on the sample used. The test of coefficient equality is implemented using Stata's `suest` command. Standard errors in both regressions are clustered at the country level.

3 Data and descriptive analysis

Table 1 (see Appendix for tables and figures) provides sources and definitions for all variables used in the analysis. Internationally comparable poverty measures come from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (2016). This information was compiled in collaboration with the PovcalNet team of the World Bank for IFAD's *Rural Development Report 2016*. The variable *overall* is defined as the annual change in a country's poverty headcount ratio. We focus on headcount ratios defined on the basis of an "extreme" poverty line (US\$1.25 per person per day in 2005 purchasing power parity – PPP), but also consider "moderate" poverty lines (US\$2 per person per day in 2005 PPP). The variables *rural* and *urban* are calculated as the annual change in rural and urban poverty rates, respectively, weighted by the corresponding population shares. Rural and urban population share information comes from the World Development Indicators (WDI) database (World Bank, 2017).

The variable *GDP per capita* is defined as the annual growth rate of GDP per person (2011 PPP), where information on GDP per person comes from the WDI database. The variable *agriculture* is calculated as the GDP-share weighted growth of agricultural value added per capita, where GDP share information also comes from the WDI database. As discussed in section 2, *agriculture* can be decomposed into a productivity growth and an employment expansion component, which yields the variables *agricultural productivity* and *agricultural employment*.¹¹ The variables associated with the non-agricultural sector are calculated analogously. Finally, the variable *transformation* is calculated by multiplying the growth rate of the share of non-agricultural employment by the coefficient displayed in Eq. (4), and *employment* is calculated as the annual growth rate of the employment-to-population ratio.

National estimates of the Gini coefficient of income or consumption (i.e. the variable *Gini*) are drawn from the WDI database. There are, however, a few critical countries for which Gini coefficient estimates are not available in the WDI database (e.g. China, India and Indonesia). To avoid losing a substantial number of observations, for these countries we use Gini estimates from the All the Ginis Dataset (Milanovic, 2014). While Gini information is relatively scarce, we find that there is considerable overlap with our poverty measures due to the fact that each is often derived from the same underlying data source.¹² The variables *PI ratio* and *NR rents* use information from the WDI database. While *NR rents* requires no further processing, the variable *PI ratio* is calculated by dividing the poverty line by (daily) GDP per capita estimates from WDI. Finally, the variable *spell* is simply the difference between the initial and final year of a given poverty spell.

11. Suitable sector-specific value added per worker data is not directly available. We thus calculate agricultural value added per worker by multiplying the share of a given sector in GDP by GDP per person employed, and then divide by the share of employment in that sector. Multiplying a sector's share in GDP by GDP per person employed yields sectoral value added per person employed in the economy. Dividing this quantity by the sector's share of overall employment gives value added per worker in that sector. Employment information comes from the International Labour Organization (2017).

12. The Gini coefficient estimates nevertheless have to be approached with caution, as there are concerns about data comparability. For example, some Gini coefficients are calculated with income data while others are calculated with expenditure data. See the documentation from the All the Ginis database for additional information (Milanovic, 2014).

Table 2 provides an overview of data coverage by region. Each observation in our dataset corresponds to periods of change or “spells”, which are derived from comparable household surveys and annualized to accommodate spells of different length. Note that annualization requires the non-trivial assumption that no structural changes took place during the intervening years. Given our focus on spells, we necessarily drop from the analysis any country for which we only have data at one point in time. We further drop: (i) all high-income countries; (ii) any observation with incomplete information; (iii) any spell where the poverty rate is negligible in the initial or final period (i.e. less than one per cent);¹³ and (iv) a few outliers. Regarding outliers, Figure 1 plots the change in the extreme (US\$1.25 per day) poverty rate on GDP per capita growth. It is evident from the figure that Bhutan, Indonesia and Tajikistan are clear vertical outliers and, therefore, are dropped from the econometric analysis.¹⁴ We are left with a total of 146 spells/observations from 70 countries spanning the years 1992-2013. No region is unrepresented in our data. Further note that 42 of the 70 countries have information from more than one spell, and that the overall average spell length is approximately five years.¹⁵

Panel (a) in Figure 2 depicts extreme (US\$1.25 per day) headcount ratio changes by region. Table 2 serves as a key for region abbreviations. For each region, the figure provides overall, rural and urban headcount ratios for two points in time: late 1990s and circa 2010. To calculate regional poverty rates, we take the earliest and most recently observed rate for each country in a given region. The regional poverty rates for each point in time are then calculated as the population-weighted average of the country poverty rates. For the overall poverty rates, population weights are based on total population, but for rural and urban poverty rates we use rural and urban population estimates. Panel (b) in Figure 2 presents a decomposition of the changes in overall regional poverty rates, calculated as a regional analogue to the country-level procedure discussed above.¹⁶

Panel (a) in Figure 2 shows that East Asia and the Pacific (EAP), South Asia (SAS), and sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) had particularly high poverty rates in the late 1990s. As is well known, EAP (and to a lesser extent SAS) has made considerable progress in reducing poverty and Figure 2 demonstrates this clearly. EAP’s reduction in rural poverty has been particularly dramatic, falling from approximately 64 to 11 per cent.¹⁷ To the contrary, poverty rates in SSA have remained relatively high, particularly in rural areas. We estimate that SSA’s rural poverty rate in the most recent period remains at 49 per cent. Panel (b) in Figure 2 shows that, for those regions with the highest initial poverty rates, reductions in overall poverty rates are largely attributable to changes observed in rural areas. For example, we estimate that 72 per cent of the reduction in overall poverty in EAP was due to poverty reduction in rural areas. Conversely, urban areas contributed relatively more to reductions in overall poverty rates in regions with

13. See Kraay (2006) for a similar approach. In section 4, we consider the sensitivity of our results to changes in this criterion.

14. We do not drop all observations associated with these countries, only the spells that are outliers.

15. There is a fair amount of variation in spell lengths.

16. That is, the component due to changes in rural poverty is the change in a given region’s rural poverty rate multiplied by the region’s (initial) rural population share. The urban component is calculated analogously. The rural-urban migration component is the change in the region’s urban population share multiplied by the initial difference in urban and rural headcount ratios.

17. China and Indonesia are major contributors to this statistic, as both are populous countries that witnessed large reductions in rural poverty. China’s rural poverty rate fell from 70 to 11 per cent between 1993 and 2012. Indonesia’s rate fell from 58 to 11 per cent during that same period.

relatively low initial poverty rates (i.e. Europe and Central Asia, ECA; Latin America and the Caribbean, LAC; and Middle East and North Africa, MNA).¹⁸ Finally, note that rural-urban migration has played a relatively small poverty-reducing role in all regions.¹⁹

Panel (a) in Figure 3 presents changes in GDP and sectoral value added per capita by region. The estimates were constructed in a manner similar to those in Figure 2 with the exception that the weighted averages are calculated on the basis of total population for each variable. Panel (b) in Figure 3 presents a sectoral decomposition of regional growth in GDP per capita, which we again calculate as a regional analogue to the country-level procedure previously discussed. Note that the GDP per capita decomposition is a decomposition of the growth rate of GDP per capita, whereas the poverty rate decomposition is a decomposition of the (percentage point) change in the poverty rate.

The considerable growth of EAP countries is evident in panel (a) of Figure 3, as GDP per capita increased by 246 per cent throughout this period.²⁰ EAP also witnessed the fastest growth in agricultural and non-agricultural value added per capita, which we estimate to be 274 and 147 per cent, respectively.²¹ Among the regions with low initial levels of GDP per capita (i.e. EAP, SAS and SSA), SSA witnessed the slowest growth. We find that GDP per capita in SSA grew 44 per cent during this period, a change that is not only relatively small, but also starting from a much lower base than other regions. Looking to panel (b) in Figure 3, we see that non-agricultural productivity growth is the largest contributor to growth in GDP per capita among regions with initially low levels of GDP per capita, whereas employment expansion features prominently in regions with high initial levels of GDP per capita (i.e. ECA, LAC and MNA). The two fastest growing regions (i.e. EAP and SAS) witnessed relatively large contributions from agricultural productivity growth, though agriculture's absolute contribution is modest in all regions. Structural transformation has also played a secondary role in GDP per capita growth, particularly in the relatively stagnant SSA.

As a final data-related consideration, Table 3 presents descriptive statistics for the variables introduced through interaction effects in Eq. (6) (i.e. *Gini*, *PI ratio*, *NR rents* and *spell*). The top panel of Table 3 presents the overall mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum for each variable. Much like Figures 2 and 3, the bottom panel of Table 3 presents initial and final regional averages for the variables *Gini* and *NR rents*. We use population-weighted averages for *Gini* and GDP-weighted averages for *NR rents*. Regarding *Gini*, we see that income is distributed particularly unequally in LAC, as is well known. While LAC witnessed the sharpest reduction in inequality over this time period, EAP saw a substantial increase from 37.63 to 45.80. Finally, regarding *NR rents*, we note that SSA had the highest share of GDP from natural resource rents in the 1990s, but was the only region that saw a reduction in that share by 2010.

18. Recall that the rural and urban components of the decomposition are constructed by multiplying the corresponding population share by the change in the relevant poverty rate. While the regions with higher initial poverty rates did witness relatively large reductions in rural poverty, they also had a higher share of their populations in rural areas. Conversely, those regions with lower initial poverty rates had a higher share of their populations in urban areas. As urbanization accompanies development, it is natural that regions with higher (lower) initial poverty rates have a larger rural (urban) component in the poverty rate decomposition.

19. EAP and MNA are potential exceptions to this statement. In EAP, the migration component is larger than the urban component, while in MNA the migration component is almost as large as the urban component.

20. With an estimated growth rate of GDP per capita at 433 per cent across this period, China is a major contributor to this statistic. Cambodia and Lao People's Democratic Republic also witnessed relatively fast growth (148 and 110 per cent, respectively), but these countries have considerably smaller populations.

21. SAS also witnessed relatively rapid growth. We find that GDP per capita grew 120 per cent, agricultural value added per capita grew 51 per cent, and non-agricultural value added per capita grew 147 per cent.

4 Results

This section comprises three subsections. In the first subsection, we present our baseline estimates of the effect of the sectoral composition of economic growth on rural and urban poverty. The second subsection analyses the sensitivity of our results to changes in key assumptions, including using alternative poverty lines. Finally, the third subsection presents the results from our analysis of the historical contribution of the various sources of growth to rural and urban poverty reduction.

4.1 Baseline results

The growth *elasticity* of poverty reduction can be obtained by estimating Eq. (1), but with the percentage change in the headcount ratio as the dependent variable. We find that the growth elasticity of extreme (US\$1.25 per day) poverty is -0.81, which is statistically insignificant at any conventional level. Results based on the moderate (US\$2 per day) poverty line suggest an elasticity of -0.73, which is significant at the 1 per cent level. These estimates have been called “empirical” (Ravallion and Chen, 1997) or “total” (Chambers and Dhongde, 2011) elasticities, as no attempt is made to control for changes in the distribution of income. While we examine the sensitivity of our results to controlling for distributional changes below, our primary interest is in the poverty-reducing effects of actual – as opposed to hypothetical or distribution-neutral – growth processes (Ravallion and Chen, 1997).

Our elasticity estimates are in line with recent studies. For example, Ram (2011) found a growth elasticity of poverty of -0.84 when using a US\$2 per day poverty line. Nevertheless, as discussed above, Klasen and Misselhorn (2008) argued that there are conceptual and empirical advantages to examining absolute rather than proportionate poverty reduction. We thus focus on growth *semi-elasticities* of poverty. Estimating Eq. (1) with the percentage point change in extreme poverty rates as the dependent variable, we find a semi-elasticity of -0.26, which is statistically significant at the 5 per cent level. This says that a 1 per cent increase in GDP per capita reduces extreme poverty rates by 0.26 percentage points on average. Note that this semi-elasticity estimate is statistically significant, whereas the corresponding elasticity estimate is not, which is consistent with the argument made by Klasen and Misselhorn (2008) that semi-elasticities can be estimated more precisely. Finally, the analogous semi-elasticity based on the moderate poverty line is -0.31, which is significant at the 1 per cent level.

As discussed in sections 1 and 2, we are primarily interested in the channels through which economic growth reduces poverty. To this end, Table 4 presents results associated with various decompositions of GDP per capita growth. In accordance with the poverty decomposition in Eq. (7), each of these growth decompositions is regressed on three alternative dependent

variables: (i) the annual percentage point change in extreme poverty rates (i.e. *overall*); (ii) the change in overall extreme poverty rates due to changes in rural poverty rates (i.e. *rural*); and (iii) the change in overall extreme poverty rates due to changes in urban poverty rates (i.e. *urban*). Each entry in the table presents the relevant semi-elasticity along with its country-clustered standard error.²² Note that the estimates in Table 4 do not yet incorporate the above-discussed interaction effects accounting for differences in initial conditions.

Following Eq. (2), decomposition (1) in Table 4 decomposes GDP per capita growth into components corresponding to growth in the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors. These initial estimates suggest a particularly strong relationship between growth in the non-agricultural sector and reductions in overall extreme poverty. While a 1 per cent increase in non-agricultural value added per capita is associated with a 0.20 percentage point decrease in overall poverty rates on average, a similar increase in agricultural value added per capita is associated with a reduction of overall poverty by 0.05 percentage points. Moreover, the agricultural semi-elasticity is statistically insignificant, whereas the non-agricultural semi-elasticity is significant, albeit only at the 10 per cent level. When looking at the effect of sectoral growth on rural and urban poverty, we find comparable semi-elasticities. Most notably, the semi-elasticity of urban poverty with respect to non-agricultural growth is -0.20 and statistically significant at the 1 per cent level. In no case does the agricultural sector witness a statistically significant effect on poverty reduction.

Based on Eq. (3), decomposition (2) permits us to examine the extent to which the sectoral growth effects are driven by sectoral productivity or employment growth. Each regression now yields four semi-elasticities, consisting of productivity and employment growth semi-elasticities for each sector. Most interestingly, the effect of non-agricultural growth on urban poverty reduction appears to be driven by non-agricultural productivity growth. We find that the semi-elasticity of urban poverty to non-agricultural productivity growth is -0.21, which is statistically significant at any conventional level. Conversely, we find that the effect of non-agricultural growth on rural poverty is largely driven by employment growth. The semi-elasticity of rural poverty to non-agricultural employment growth is statistically significant and relatively large at -0.43. These findings highlight the importance of our rural-urban poverty decomposition, as they suggest that the quality of non agricultural growth may have important implications for the geographic composition of poverty.

Decomposition (3) in Table 4 is based on Eq. (4) and the further decomposition of sectoral employment growth into components associated with structural transformation and growth in the employment-to-population ratio. This decomposition again yields four semi-elasticities for each regression and permits us to examine the extent that the above-discussed employment effects are driven by the reallocation of labour across sectors. With a semi-elasticity of -0.19, we once again see a strong relationship between non-agricultural productivity growth and urban poverty reduction. Perhaps more interestingly, we find that it is structural transformation that appears to be driving the effect of non-agricultural employment growth on rural and (to a lesser extent) urban poverty. Our estimates suggest that a 1 per cent increase in the share of the labour force in the non-agricultural sector is associated with a statistically significant 0.42 (0.10) percentage point reduction in rural (urban) poverty rates. While rural-urban migration provides a potential explanation for this result, the finding is also consistent with the reallocation of rural labour towards more remunerative non farm activities in rural areas.

22. Semi-elasticity calculations are discussed in section 2.

In section 2, we mentioned that the sectoral participation effects – and thus the semi-elasticities – may depend on differences in initial conditions across countries. Further, to the extent that initial conditions affect the process of growth itself, the semi-elasticities presented in Table 4 may be subject to omitted variable bias. Table 5 thus presents results from our full specification, which is based on the full growth decomposition from Eq. (4) and also includes interaction terms to accommodate the effects of differences in initial conditions. The *overall* column presents semi-elasticities calculated from the specification in Eq. (6), whereas the *rural* and *urban* columns present semi-elasticities calculated from the specifications in Eqs. (8) and (9). All semi-elasticities are presented in bold. We further want to understand how the semi-elasticities vary with changes in initial conditions. To this end, below each semi-elasticity we present the marginal effect of each of the covariates on the associated semi-elasticity. Each covariate is normalized to have a mean zero and unit standard deviation.

Looking at the *agricultural productivity* results in Table 5, we find that the semi-elasticity associated with *overall* has increased in magnitude relative to the estimate in Table 4. The semi-elasticity is now -0.14 and is significant at the 1 per cent level. This effect appears to be driven by the effect of agricultural growth on rural poverty reduction. We find that a 1 per cent increase in agricultural productivity is now associated with a 0.23 percentage point decrease in rural extreme poverty rates. This effect is also significant at the 1 per cent level. The change in the magnitude of these semi-elasticities from Table 4 is due to omitted variable bias. The variable *NR rents* is an important consideration here, as it has a positive and statistically significant effect on both the aforementioned semi-elasticities.²³ More specifically, we find that a one standard deviation increase in *NR rents* increases the *overall* (*rural*) semi-elasticity by 0.09 (0.15) (see Table 3 for descriptive statistics on *NR rents*).

Contrary to the *agricultural productivity* results, the *non-agricultural productivity* semi-elasticities in Table 5 have changed little. Indeed, the semi-elasticity associated with *urban* remains -0.19 and significant at the 1 per cent level. While the semi-elasticity of *urban* with respect to *transformation* remains similarly unchanged from Table 4, the *rural-transformation* semi-elasticity is considerably different in Table 5. This semi-elasticity is particularly sensitive to changes in *PI ratio*. We find that a one standard deviation increase in *PI ratio* is associated with a reduction of the rural-transformation semi-elasticity by 0.85 (see Table 3 for descriptive statistics on *PI ratio*). Recall that *PI ratio* is inversely related to the level of economic development and, therefore, we find that the *rural-transformation* semi-elasticity weakens with development. We also find that *spell* exerts a highly significant and positive effect on the *rural-transformation* semi-elasticity. One potential explanation for this finding is general equilibrium effects: the movement of labour into rural non-farm activities, for example, may depress wages with time and limit the poverty-reducing effects of structural transformation.

The results presented in Tables 4 and 5 suggest that the sectoral composition of growth matters for poverty reduction, but we can test this conjecture more formally. As discussed in section 2, this entails an *F*-test of the equality of all vectors of coefficients associated with our growth decomposition. For example, to examine whether the composition of growth matters for rural poverty reduction, we can test $\pi_a^r = \pi_n^r = \pi_s^r = \pi_e^r$ after estimating the specification presented in Eq. (8). This test yields an *F*-statistic of 15.68 (p-value = 0.00), so we reject the null hypothesis at any conventional level of significance. With an *F*-statistic of 4.98 (p-value = 0.00), we also reject the null hypothesis for our urban poverty regression. Finally, we can

23. Of course, the direction of the bias also depends on the relationship between *agricultural productivity* and *NR rents*. We find this relationship to be positive and thus *NR rents* contributes to the upward bias of the *agricultural productivity* semi-elasticities in Table 4.

test whether the composition of growth matters for overall poverty reduction. We similarly reject the null hypothesis for this test at any conventional level of significance (F -statistic = 15.29 and p -value = 0.00).

4.2 Sensitivity analysis

Our baseline results demonstrate three findings. First, the semi-elasticity of rural poverty to agricultural productivity is highly significant and relatively large in magnitude, particularly for countries with little dependence on natural resources. Second, the semi-elasticity of urban poverty to non-agricultural productivity is also large and highly significant. Like all the urban-poverty semi-elasticities, this semi-elasticity is insensitive to initial conditions. Third, structural transformation tends to reduce both urban and rural poverty, though the rural-poverty effect depends on the initial level of development and the spell length under consideration. Tables 6 and 7 present the results from our analysis of the sensitivity of these findings to key assumptions. Table 6 (and Table 7) presents sensitivity analysis results for the rural (urban) poverty regression. For reference, baseline results are provided in column (1) of each table.

We first ask whether our results are sensitive to changes in the poverty line. Column (2) in Tables 6 and 7 presents results from our full specification when using dependent variables calculated on the basis of the moderate (US\$2 per day) poverty line. The semi-elasticity of rural poverty to agricultural productivity (Table 6) remains negative and statistically significant, and the marginal effect of *NR rents* on this semi-elasticity is virtually unchanged. The semi-elasticity of urban poverty to non-agricultural productivity (Table 7) also remains negative and statistically significant. Though the magnitude of some marginal effects has increased slightly (e.g. *Gini* and *PI ratio*), initial conditions continue to play little role in affecting this semi-elasticity. Finally, our structural transformation results generally hold, with the potential exception of the *urban-transformation* semi-elasticity, which is no longer statistically significant.

While not insensitive to changes in the poverty line, two results from our analysis of moderate poverty rates are worth mentioning. First, we find that *PI ratio* has a positive and statistically significant effect on the semi-elasticity of rural poverty to agricultural productivity (Table 6), and the semi-elasticity of rural poverty to non-agricultural productivity. Recall once again that *PI ratio* is inversely related to the level of development and, therefore, these results suggest that the rural poverty-reducing effect of agricultural or non-agricultural productivity growth strengthens as development occurs. One possible explanation for this finding is that as development proceeds a greater number of rural dwellers find themselves situated near the moderate poverty line and thus able to escape poverty with further productivity increases.

The second result pertains to how the effect of structural transformation on moderate poverty is mediated by *Gini* and *NR rents*. The marginal effect of *Gini* is negative and statistically significant in each regression, whereas *NR rents* appears positive and significant in each regression. The effect of these two variables on the *rural-transformation* semi-elasticity is particularly large (Table 6). We find that a one standard deviation increase in *Gini* (*NR rents*) is associated with a 0.46 decrease (0.41 increase) in the *rural-transformation* semi-elasticity (see Table 3 for descriptive statistics). A complete explanation of these findings requires further research, but note that the *Gini* result may simply be due to the fact that inequality creates the capacity for structural transformation to be poverty reducing. Stated differently, equality in the distribution of resources limits opportunities for income gains via the reallocation of labour.

As mentioned in section 4.1, our focus is on estimating “total” semi-elasticities, but one may also be interested in “partial” semi-elasticities, which characterize the poverty-growth relationship while holding distributional changes constant (Chambers and Dhongde, 2011). Our next robustness check thus includes the percentage change in the Gini coefficient as an additional explanatory variable, resulting in a specification Bourguignon (2003) called the “standard model.” The results are presented in column (3) of Tables 6 and 7, where we see that the poverty-inequality semi-elasticity is statistically significant in one case (bottom of Table 7). The other results are, however, essentially identical to the baseline. The one exception to this statement is the *urban-transformation* semi-elasticity (Table 7), which again loses statistical significance. There is thus no meaningful distinction between total and partial semi-elasticities in our data, which is not unexpected given previous findings on the weak relationship between economic growth and changes in inequality (Ravallion and Chen, 1997; Ravallion, 2001; Dollar and Kraay, 2002).

We may also be concerned about the sensitivity of our results to the criterion used to drop extreme observations. While we drop any spell where the poverty rate is less than 1 per cent in the initial or final period, other studies have opted for more conservative thresholds. For example, Kraay (2006) used a 2 per cent criterion. In column (4) of Tables 6 and 7, we thus present results based on this alternative cutoff, which reduces the sample size from 146 to 140. The sign, magnitude and significance of all point estimates are nearly identical to our baseline specification. Note that the *urban-transformation* semi-elasticity (Table 7), which was statistically insignificant in columns (2) and (3), once again witnesses significance at the 5 per cent level.

As a final robustness check, we consider the issue of measurement error. Our poverty measures are derived from household surveys, whereas our growth decomposition relies heavily on national accounts data. Given the well-known discrepancies between economic growth estimates based on national accounts data and those based on household surveys (Ravallion, 2001; Ravallion, 2003; Deaton, 2005), one could argue that our analysis suffers from measurement error issues. To the extent that such measurement errors are correlated with our explanatory variables, we would expect our semi-elasticity estimates to be biased. Following Loayza and Raddatz (2010), we address this issue by including in our regressions an estimate of mean income/consumption growth based on household survey data. The data we use for this were compiled for the World Bank’s PovcalNet tool and made publicly available by Dykstra et al. (2014).

It is important to mention that the data for some countries are not internally consistent in the sense that mean income is calculated in some years and mean consumption in others. To avoid calculating growth rates on the basis of incompatible measures, we keep only one measure for each country.²⁴ This, however, reduces the number of observations considerably, so we linearly interpolate/extrapolate data to nearby years so that we can more reliably compare the results to our baseline.²⁵ The resulting regressions still have fewer observations (139) than our baseline (146), as some countries do not have any mean income/consumption information. Results are presented in column (5) of Tables 6 and 7. The semi-elasticity of poverty to survey mean growth is insignificant in both tables, and all other estimates remain nearly identical to the baseline. Note, however, that the *urban-transformation* semi-elasticity again loses statistical significance.

24. We keep the measure that most frequently coincides with available poverty data.

25. This is done using Stata’s `ipolate` command. In the absence of interpolation/extrapolation, we would have 99 observations.

4.3 Sources of historical poverty reduction across regions

The analysis of semi-elasticities provides information regarding the responsiveness of rural and urban poverty to different sources of economic growth, but conveys little information about the historical contribution of the various sources of growth to poverty reduction. The estimates can nevertheless serve as the basis for an exercise in quantifying the contribution of the various growth components. In particular, each of the components on the right-hand side of our regression models (e.g. see Eq. [6]) embodies a prediction of the poverty rate change due to growth from a given source. We thus use our estimates and data to calculate component-wise contributions for each poverty spell and then average each contribution across time for each country.²⁶ Given estimates of the historical contribution of each growth component for each country, we then summarize the results by region using population-weighted averaging.²⁷

Before presenting the results of the exercise, it is important to make two clarifying points. First, we do not attribute a causal interpretation to our estimates of the contribution of each growth component to poverty reduction. If the poverty-reducing effect of growth in component X occurs via component Y , the nature of the exercise is such that component Y is attributed the poverty reduction. We thus estimate what may be termed as the proximate contribution of each growth component to poverty reduction. Second, given that we are interested in summarizing results at the regional level, one could argue that the parameters of the underlying regressions should be allowed to vary by region. While we are unable to run the regressions separately for each region due to insufficient observations, we did examine the option of including regional dummies in our regressions via the interactions effects. We nevertheless opted for our baseline specification due to the fact that the regional dummies were largely insignificant.

Figure 4 presents results when using the overall poverty rate as the dependent variable (i.e. Eq. [6] serves as the basis for the calculations). Each bar in the figure represents the average annual change in the overall poverty rate due to growth in a given component for a given region. Despite the relatively large and statistically significant semi-elasticity in Table 5, agricultural productivity growth has played a comparatively small role in poverty reduction in all regions, except in SAS.²⁸ This result is unsurprising given the small contribution of agricultural productivity growth to each region's GDP per capita growth (see Figure 3). Non-agricultural productivity growth, however, has made relatively large contributions to poverty reduction in all regions except SSA. Most notably, we estimate that non-agricultural productivity growth in SAS reduced poverty rates by an average of 1.29 percentage points annually. This result is due in part to the large contribution of non-agricultural productivity growth to each region's GDP per capita growth (see Figure 3).

26. The averaging in this step must take into account the differing duration of poverty spells.

27. That is, the contribution of a given source of growth for a given region is calculated as the population-weighted average of that source's contribution for each country in the region. Population data can be incorporated in a variety of ways here (e.g. using initial or final population levels as the basis of the weights). We find that the particular approach used is inconsequential and thus (arbitrarily) choose initial population estimates to calculate the weights.

28. Agricultural productivity growth has made a non-negligible contribution in that region, but its contribution is still small relative to non-agricultural productivity growth.

Structural transformation has played a leading role in EAP and SSA. In EAP, we estimate that structural transformation has reduced poverty rates by an average of 1.04 percentage points annually. While the contribution of structural transformation is much smaller in SSA, it is the only factor that contributed to reductions in overall poverty rates in that region. Regarding growth in the employment-to-population ratio, we find that such growth has been central to poverty reduction in ECA, LAC and MNA. For example, employment growth in MNA is associated with an average annual poverty rate reduction of 0.79 percentage points. While employment growth has also contributed to poverty reduction in EAP and SAS, the magnitude of this effect is relatively small.

Figure 5 presents results from the exercise when using rural and urban poverty rates as the dependent variable (i.e. Eqs. [8] and [9] serve as the basis for the calculations). One key difference here is that population-weighted averaging is based on the population (i.e. rural or urban) that corresponds to the dependent variable. Panel (a) presents rural poverty results and panel (b) presents urban poverty results. Recall that the semi-elasticity of *rural to agricultural productivity* was found to be particularly large and statistically significant (see Table 5). One might thus expect the poverty-reducing effect of agricultural productivity growth to be more clearly evident in panel (a). We nevertheless find that, where it occurred (EAP, ECA and LAC), the contribution of agricultural productivity growth to rural poverty reduction has been relatively modest. We again attribute this result to the fact that the contribution of agricultural productivity growth to each region's GDP per capita growth has been small.

Additionally, recall that we found the semi-elasticity of *urban to non-agricultural productivity* to be relatively large and statistically significant. Contrary to the previous case, the expectation that non-agricultural productivity growth has made relatively large contributions to urban poverty reduction is consistent with our results. In EAP, for example, non-agricultural productivity growth is associated with an average annual reduction of the urban poverty rate by 1.29 percentage points. This is nearly three times the analogous contribution to rural poverty reduction. With the exception of ECA, we generally find that the poverty-reducing effect of non-agricultural productivity growth is concentrated in urban areas. This result is due to the fact that (1) the associated semi-elasticity is relatively large; and (2) the contribution of non-agricultural productivity growth to each region's GDP per capita growth is sizable.

Regarding structural transformation, Figure 5 shows that its large contribution to overall poverty reduction in EAP is driven by a rural poverty effect. More specifically, we find that structural transformation has reduced rural poverty rates in EAP at an average annual rate of 1.69 percentage points. China, with an annual rural poverty rate reduction due to structural transformation at 1.91 percentage points, is a major contributor to this statistic. In SSA, the only other region where structural transformation contributed to poverty reduction, the effect is conversely urban in nature. Finally, Figure 5 shows that the large employment effect witnessed in ECA, LAC and MNA is primarily a rural phenomenon. For example, we find that employment growth in MNA is associated with an average annual reduction of rural poverty rates of 2.37 percentage points. This finding can be attributed to the large *rural-employment* semi-elasticity (see Table 5) and the large contribution of employment growth to GDP per capita growth in these regions.

The results of our attribution exercise can be summarized as follows: First, agricultural productivity growth has contributed relatively little to rural and urban poverty reduction across all regions. Second, non-agricultural productivity growth has made substantial contributions to reducing overall poverty rates in virtually all regions, generally via poverty reductions in urban areas. Third, the poverty-reducing effect of structural transformation has been confined to regions with initially lower levels of GDP per capita (e.g. EAP and SSA) and, at least for EAP, this effect is primarily a rural phenomenon. Lastly, growth in the employment-to-population ratio has contributed to poverty reductions in regions with higher initial levels of GDP per capita (e.g. LAC and MNA). This effect is also driven by rural poverty reduction.

5 Conclusions and policy implications

We examined the effect of the sectoral composition of economic growth on the geographic composition of poverty using a new cross-country panel dataset of internationally comparable rural and urban poverty rates. We reported three primary findings. First, we found that rural poverty is highly responsive to agricultural productivity growth: our best estimate suggests that a 1 per cent increase in agricultural productivity is associated with a statistically significant 0.23 percentage point decrease in rural poverty rates. This semi-elasticity diminishes in absolute magnitude with increased dependence on natural resources. Specifically, a one standard deviation increase in the share of GDP from natural resource rents is estimated to increase the semi-elasticity by 0.15. Second, we found that urban poverty is highly responsive to non-agricultural productivity growth: a 1 per cent increase in non-agricultural productivity is associated with a 0.19 percentage point reduction in urban poverty rates. This effect is insensitive to initial conditions.

Finally, we found that structural transformation reduces rural poverty, particularly for countries at a low level of development. While a 1 per cent increase in the share of employment in the non-agricultural sector reduces the rural poverty headcount ratio by 0.16 percentage points, a one standard deviation increase in the ratio of the extreme poverty line to daily GDP per capita reduces this semi-elasticity by 0.85. Structural transformation also leads to reductions in urban poverty. We found that our results were robust to a number of different specification checks. In particular, we examined the sensitivity of our results to alternative poverty lines, controlling for changes in the distribution of income, modifying the criterion used to drop extreme observations, and accounting for measurement error issues. While we believe our findings constitute a robust set of empirical regularities, we do not claim to have estimated causal relationships.

We additionally reported a number of results regarding the historical contribution of the various growth sources to reductions in rural and urban poverty rates. First, our results suggested that agricultural productivity growth has played a relatively minor role in reducing rural and urban poverty. Second, the poverty-reducing effect of non-agricultural productivity growth has been substantial in nearly all regions, generally via poverty reduction in urban areas. Third, we found that structural transformation has served to reduce poverty in regions with initially lower levels of GDP per capita. Lastly, for those regions with initially higher levels of GDP per capita, growth in the employment-to-population ratio has been critical for poverty reduction, particularly in rural areas.

These results underscore the importance of continued investments in agricultural productivity and diversification to foster inclusive structural and rural transformation, particularly for lesser-developed countries. Agricultural productivity growth has indeed made little past

contribution to rural poverty reduction, but this has been due to relatively weak agricultural productivity growth and not a general lack of responsiveness of rural poverty to such growth. Our results also reinforce the need to sustain non-agricultural productivity growth in urban areas to consolidate poverty reduction achievements. Interestingly, the responsiveness of urban poverty to non-agricultural productivity growth is robust to initial conditions, which suggests that investments in non-agricultural productivity growth can be a viable poverty-reduction strategy in a wide array of contexts.

We believe we are the first to examine the effect of the sectoral composition of economic growth on rural and urban poverty using cross-country panel data. While cross-country data has well-known limitations, we believe that our study provides new insights into the dynamics of rural and urban poverty, particularly by exploiting cross-country variation in key variables to examine the effects of initial conditions. We have further sought to deepen the analysis of the relationship between the sectoral composition of growth and the rural-urban composition of poverty. In particular, we decomposed sectoral growth into components associated with labour productivity growth and employment expansion, and then further decomposed the employment expansion effects into components associated with labour force growth and structural transformation. Our analysis of the relationship between structural transformation and poverty rates in rural and urban areas is particularly novel.

We conclude with directions for further research. Our analysis only considered the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors. Future research may consider further decomposing the non-agricultural sector (e.g. into manufacturing and services) to gain additional insights into the effect of non-agricultural productivity growth on urban poverty reduction. Further, we only examined the effect of the sectoral composition of growth on poverty headcount ratios. Complementary insights could be provided by using alternative poverty measures, including poverty gaps and squared poverty gaps. Finally, we did not attempt to examine the effect of alternative growth paths on rural and urban poverty reduction. In subsequent work we hope to conduct such an exercise, conceivably by estimating the counterfactual rate of poverty reduction under a balanced growth scenario.

References

- Besley, T., and Burgess, R. 2003. Halving Global Poverty. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17(3): 3-22.
- Bezemer, D., and Headey, D. 2008. Agriculture, Development, and Urban Bias. *World Development*, 36(8): 1342-1364.
- Bourguignon, F. 2003. The Growth Elasticity of Poverty Reduction: Explaining Heterogeneity Across Countries and Time Periods. In T. Eicher and S. Turnovsky, eds. *Inequality and Growth: Theory and Policy Implications*. Cambridge, MA, Cambridge University Press.
- Chambers, D., and Dhongde, S. 2011. A Non-parametric Measure of Poverty Elasticity. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 57(4): 683-703.
- Christiaensen, L., Demery, L., and Kuhl, J. 2011. The (Evolving) Role of Agriculture in Poverty Reduction – An Empirical Perspective. *Journal of Development Economics*, 96(2): 239-254.
- Datt, G., and Ravallion, M. 1998. Why Have Some Indian States Done Better Than Others at Reducing Rural Poverty? *Economica*, 65(257): 17-38.
- Datt, G., Ravallion, M., and Murgai, R. 2016. *Growth, Urbanization, and Poverty Reduction in India*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7568.
- de Janvry, A. and Sadoulet, A. 2010. Agricultural Growth and Poverty Reduction: Additional Evidence. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 25(1): 1-20.
- Deaton, A. 2005. Measuring Poverty in a Growing World (Or Measuring Growth in a Poor World). *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 87(1): 1-19.
- Dercon, S. 2009. Rural Poverty: Old Challenges in New Contexts. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 24(1): 1-28.
- Dollar, D., and Kraay, A. 2002. Growth Is Good for the Poor. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 7(3): 195-225.
- Dykstra, S., Dykstra, B., and Sandefur, J. 2014. *We Just Ran Twenty-three Million Queries of the World Bank's Website*. Center for Global Development Working Paper No. 362.
- Ferreira, F., Leite, P., and Ravallion, M. 2010. Poverty Reduction Without Economic Growth? Explaining Brazil's Poverty Dynamics, 1985-2004. *Journal of Development Economics*, 93(1): 20-36.
- Foster, J., and Székely, M. 2008. Is Economic Growth Good for the Poor? Tracking Low Incomes Using General Means. *International Economic Review*, 49(4): 1143-1172.
- Fosu, K. 2009. Inequality and the Impact of Growth on Poverty: Comparative Evidence for Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Development Studies*, 45(5): 726-745.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2016. *Rural Development Report 2016*. Rome, International Fund for Agricultural Development.

International Labour Organization. 2017. *ILOSTAT*. Available at www.ilo.org/ilostat.

Kalwij, A., and Verschoor, A. 2007. Not by Growth Alone: The Role of the Distribution of Income in Regional Diversity in Poverty Reduction. *European Economic Review*, 51(4): 805-829.

Klasen, S., and Misselhorn, M. 2008. *Determinants of the Growth Semi-elasticity of Poverty Reduction*. Ibero America Institute for Economic Research Discussion Paper No. 176.

Kraay, A. 2006. When is Growth Pro-poor? Evidence from a Panel of Countries. *Journal of Development Economics*, 80(1): 198-227.

Loayza, N., and Raddatz, C. 2010. The Composition of Growth Matters for Poverty Alleviation. *Journal of Development Economics*, 93(1): 137-151.

Milanovic, B. 2014. *All the Ginis Dataset*. Available at data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/all-the-ginis

Montalvo, J., and Ravallion, M. 2010. The Pattern of Growth and Poverty Reduction in China. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 38(1): 2-16.

Neves, P., and Silva, S. 2014. Inequality and Growth: Uncovering Main Conclusions from the Empirics. *Journal of Development Studies*, 50(1): 1-21.

Ram, R. 2011. Growth Elasticity of Poverty: Direct Estimates from Recent Data. *Applied Economics*, 43(19): 2433-2440.

Ravallion, M. 1997. Can High-inequality Developing Countries Escape Absolute Poverty? *Economics Letters*, 56(1): 51-57.

Ravallion, M. 2001. Growth, Inequality, and Poverty: Looking Beyond Averages. *World Development*, 29(11): 1803-1815.

Ravallion, M. 2003. Measuring Aggregate Welfare in Developing Countries: How Well Do National Accounts and Surveys Agree? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85(3): 645-652.

Ravallion, M. and Chen, S. 1997. What can new survey data tell us about recent changes in distribution and poverty? *The World Bank Economic Review*, 11(2): 357-382.

Ravallion, M., and Chen, S. 2007. China's (Uneven) Progress Against Poverty. *Journal of Development Economics*, 82(1): 1-42.

Ravallion, M., and Datt, G. 1996. How Important to India's Poor Is the Sectoral Composition of Economic Growth? *The World Bank Economic Review*, 10(1): 1-25.

Ravallion, M., and Datt, G. 2002. Why Has Economic Growth Been More Pro-poor in Some States of India Than Others? *Journal of Development Economics*, 68(2): 381-400.

Suryahadi, A., Suryadarma, D., and Sumarto, S. 2009. The Effects of Location and Sectoral Components of Economic Growth on Poverty: Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Development Economics*, 89(1): 109-117.

Wooldridge, J. 2002. *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

World Bank. 2017. *World Development Indicators*. Available at data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators.

Appendix: tables and figures

Table 1 Variable sources and definitions

| Variable | Source | Definition |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <i>overall</i> | International Fund for Agricultural Development (2016) and World Bank (2017) | Annual change in a country's headcount ratio |
| <i>rural</i> | International Fund for Agricultural Development (2016) and World Bank (2017) | Change in overall poverty measure due to changes in rural poverty |
| <i>urban</i> | International Fund for Agricultural Development (2016) and World Bank (2017) | Change in overall poverty measure due to changes in urban poverty |
| <i>GDP per capita</i> | World Bank (2017) | Annual growth of GDP per capita |
| <i>agriculture</i> | World Bank (2017) | GDP per capita growth due to the agricultural sector |
| <i>agricultural productivity</i> | International Labour Organization (2017) and World Bank (2017) | GDP per capita growth due to agricultural productivity growth |
| <i>agricultural employment</i> | International Labour Organization (2017) and World Bank (2017) | GDP per capita growth due to agricultural employment expansion |
| <i>non-agriculture</i> | World Bank (2017) | GDP per capita growth due to the non-agricultural sector |
| <i>non-agricultural productivity</i> | International Labour Organization (2017) and World Bank (2017) | GDP per capita growth due to non-agricultural productivity growth |
| <i>non-agricultural employment</i> | International Labour Organization (2017) and World Bank (2017) | GDP per capita growth due to non-agricultural employment expansion |
| <i>transformation</i> | International Labour Organization (2017) and World Bank (2017) | GDP per capita growth due to structural transformation |
| <i>employment</i> | World Bank (2017) | GDP per capita growth due to overall employment expansion |
| <i>Gini</i> | Milanovic (2014) and World Bank (2017) | Gini coefficient of income/consumption |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | World Bank (2017) | Ratio of poverty line to daily GDP per capita |
| <i>NR rents</i> | World Bank (2017) | Total natural resource rents (share of GDP) |
| <i>spell</i> | International Fund for Agricultural Development (2016) | Duration of poverty spell (in years) |

Table 2 Data coverage

| Region | Number of spells | Number of countries | Countries with > 1 spell | Average spell length |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| East Asia and the Pacific (EAP) | 32 | 7 | 5 | 2.97 |
| Europe and Central Asia (ECA) | 13 | 7 | 5 | 4.92 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) | 32 | 15 | 12 | 5.28 |
| Middle East and North Africa (MNA) | 5 | 5 | 0 | 6.60 |
| South Asia (SAS) | 11 | 5 | 4 | 6.00 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) | 53 | 31 | 16 | 6.08 |
| Total | 146 | 70 | 42 | 5.13 |

Table 3 Descriptive statistics for interaction effects

| Descriptive statistics | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| | <i>Gini</i> | <i>PI ratio</i> | <i>NR rents</i> | <i>spell</i> |
| Mean | 43.98 | 0.21 | 6.58 | 5.13 |
| Standard deviation | 8.95 | 0.19 | 7.67 | 2.17 |
| Minimum | 28.67 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 1.00 |
| Maximum | 65.76 | 1.05 | 55.94 | 11.00 |
| Initial/final values | | | | |
| | <i>Gini (1990s)</i> | <i>Gini (c. 2010)</i> | <i>NR rents (1990s)</i> | <i>NR rents (c. 2010)</i> |
| EAP | 37.63 | 45.80 | 4.15 | 5.09 |
| ECA | 35.58 | 36.05 | 6.93 | 10.64 |
| LAC | 54.92 | 50.87 | 2.42 | 6.20 |
| MNA | 38.36 | 36.23 | 7.73 | 15.72 |
| SAS | 35.14 | 34.65 | 1.74 | 3.73 |
| SSA | 45.16 | 42.75 | 15.86 | 12.63 |

Note: EAP = East Asia and the Pacific; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; MNA = Middle East and North Africa; SAS = South Asia; SSA = sub-Saharan Africa.

Table 4 Baseline estimates of growth semi-elasticities of extreme poverty

| | | Dependent variable | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Decomposition | Variable | overall | rural | urban |
| (1) | <i>agriculture</i> | -0.05 (0.07) | -0.06 (0.10) | -0.04 (0.03) |
| | <i>non-agriculture</i> | -0.20* (0.11) | -0.21 (0.17) | -0.20*** (0.05) |
| (2) | <i>agricultural productivity</i> | -0.08 (0.06) | -0.11 (0.09) | -0.04 (0.04) |
| | <i>agricultural employment</i> | 0.06 (0.10) | 0.12 (0.16) | -0.02 (0.04) |
| | <i>non-agricultural productivity</i> | -0.16 (0.10) | -0.13 (0.15) | -0.21*** (0.05) |
| | <i>non-agricultural employment</i> | -0.31** (0.12) | -0.43** (0.21) | -0.16 (0.10) |
| (3) | <i>agricultural productivity</i> | -0.08 (0.06) | -0.11 (0.10) | -0.05 (0.03) |
| | <i>non-agricultural productivity</i> | -0.11 (0.10) | -0.06 (0.14) | -0.19*** (0.05) |
| | <i>transformation</i> | -0.28** (0.12) | -0.42* (0.23) | -0.10* (0.06) |
| | <i>employment</i> | -0.17 (0.16) | -0.18 (0.22) | -0.18 (0.16) |

Note: Country-clustered standard errors are in parentheses. * denotes p-value < 0.10; ** denotes p-value < 0.05; and *** denotes p-value < 0.01.

Table 5 Growth semi-elasticities of extreme poverty with interaction effects

| | | Dependent variable | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Variable | | overall | rural | urban |
| <i>agricultural productivity</i> | | -0.14*** (0.04) | -0.23*** (0.07) | -0.03 (0.03) |
| <i>Gini</i> | | -0.08 (0.10) | -0.18 (0.14) | 0.04 (0.06) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | | 0.05 (0.11) | 0.11 (0.17) | -0.03 (0.05) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | | 0.09** (0.04) | 0.15** (0.06) | 0.01 (0.03) |
| <i>spell</i> | | -0.13 (0.08) | -0.19 (0.12) | -0.04 (0.05) |
| <i>non-agricultural productivity</i> | | -0.10 (0.10) | -0.04 (0.14) | -0.19*** (0.06) |
| <i>Gini</i> | | 0.14 (0.13) | 0.19 (0.19) | 0.07 (0.07) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | | 0.07 (0.18) | 0.09 (0.26) | 0.06 (0.09) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | | 0.10 (0.09) | 0.18 (0.13) | -0.00 (0.05) |
| <i>spell</i> | | -0.07 (0.10) | -0.10 (0.14) | -0.04 (0.06) |
| <i>transformation</i> | | -0.13 (0.10) | -0.16 (0.16) | -0.10** (0.05) |
| <i>Gini</i> | | 0.00 (0.15) | 0.06 (0.21) | -0.08 (0.08) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | | -0.59* (0.35) | -0.85* (0.49) | -0.25 (0.19) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | | 0.10 (0.12) | 0.11 (0.18) | 0.08 (0.07) |
| <i>spell</i> | | 0.49** (0.20) | 0.80*** (0.28) | 0.09 (0.13) |
| <i>employment</i> | | -0.19 (0.22) | -0.41 (0.33) | 0.07 (0.14) |
| <i>Gini</i> | | 0.05 (0.31) | 0.26 (0.44) | -0.25 (0.19) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | | 0.27 (0.45) | 0.51 (0.64) | -0.03 (0.25) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | | -0.06 (0.31) | -0.08 (0.50) | -0.06 (0.16) |
| <i>spell</i> | | -0.15 (0.38) | -0.49 (0.52) | 0.31 (0.23) |

Note: Country-clustered standard errors are in parentheses. * denotes p-value < 0.10; ** denotes p-value < 0.05; and *** denotes p-value < 0.01.

Table 6 Sensitivity analysis for extreme rural poverty results

| Variable | Baseline results | Moderate poverty | Standard model | Extreme observations | Survey mean growth |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| <i>agricultural productivity</i> | -0.23*** (0.07) | -0.16** (0.07) | -0.23*** (0.08) | -0.24*** (0.07) | -0.20*** (0.07) |
| <i>Gini</i> | -0.18 (0.14) | 0.01 (0.17) | -0.17 (0.13) | -0.19 (0.15) | -0.18 (0.14) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | 0.11 (0.17) | 0.33** (0.15) | 0.11 (0.17) | 0.11 (0.17) | 0.11 (0.16) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | 0.15** (0.06) | 0.14*** (0.04) | 0.15** (0.07) | 0.16** (0.06) | 0.11** (0.05) |
| <i>spell</i> | -0.19 (0.12) | -0.17* (0.09) | -0.19 (0.12) | -0.20 (0.12) | -0.16 (0.12) |
| <i>non-agricultural productivity</i> | -0.04 (0.14) | -0.02 (0.10) | -0.05 (0.15) | -0.06 (0.16) | 0.03 (0.15) |
| <i>Gini</i> | 0.19 (0.19) | 0.32 (0.21) | 0.19 (0.17) | 0.19 (0.19) | 0.16 (0.18) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | 0.09 (0.26) | 0.43* (0.25) | 0.09 (0.25) | 0.08 (0.26) | 0.06 (0.24) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | 0.18 (0.13) | -0.06 (0.14) | 0.18 (0.13) | 0.20 (0.13) | 0.11 (0.10) |
| <i>spell</i> | -0.10 (0.14) | -0.08 (0.16) | -0.10 (0.14) | -0.10 (0.14) | -0.09 (0.13) |
| <i>transformation</i> | -0.16 (0.16) | 0.06 (0.15) | -0.17 (0.20) | -0.21 (0.16) | -0.13 (0.16) |
| <i>Gini</i> | 0.06 (0.21) | -0.46** (0.21) | 0.07 (0.22) | 0.07 (0.21) | 0.07 (0.21) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | -0.85* (0.49) | -1.29*** (0.46) | -0.85* (0.50) | -0.83* (0.49) | -0.73* (0.43) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | 0.11 (0.18) | 0.41** (0.17) | 0.11 (0.17) | 0.11 (0.18) | 0.05 (0.15) |
| <i>spell</i> | 0.80*** (0.28) | 0.91*** (0.30) | 0.80*** (0.27) | 0.77*** (0.27) | 0.70*** (0.25) |
| <i>employment</i> | -0.41 (0.33) | -0.35 (0.26) | -0.42 (0.34) | -0.40 (0.33) | -0.34 (0.31) |
| <i>Gini</i> | 0.26 (0.44) | 0.82 (0.54) | 0.29 (0.31) | 0.22 (0.47) | 0.42 (0.45) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | 0.51 (0.64) | 1.50 (0.91) | 0.52 (0.53) | 0.46 (0.66) | 0.45 (0.53) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | -0.08 (0.50) | -0.23 (0.48) | -0.07 (0.53) | -0.08 (0.52) | -0.09 (0.40) |
| <i>spell</i> | -0.49 (0.52) | -0.95 (0.69) | -0.50 (0.43) | -0.45 (0.53) | -0.48 (0.46) |
| <i>% Δ Gini</i> | - | - | 0.02 (0.18) | - | - |
| <i>% Δ Inc./Cons.</i> | - | - | - | - | -0.15 (0.11) |

Note: Country-clustered standard errors are in parentheses. * denotes p-value < 0.10; ** denotes p-value < 0.05; and *** denotes p-value < 0.01.

Table 7 Sensitivity analysis for extreme urban poverty results

| Variable | Baseline results | Moderate poverty | Standard model | Extreme observations | Survey mean growth |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| <i>agricultural productivity</i> | -0.03 (0.03) | 0.01 (0.05) | -0.05 (0.03) | -0.02 (0.03) | -0.02 (0.03) |
| <i>Gini</i> | 0.04 (0.06) | 0.19 (0.13) | 0.01 (0.05) | 0.05 (0.07) | 0.03 (0.06) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | -0.03 (0.05) | 0.08 (0.10) | -0.03 (0.05) | -0.03 (0.05) | -0.03 (0.05) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | 0.01 (0.03) | 0.02 (0.04) | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.03) | 0.00 (0.03) |
| <i>spell</i> | -0.04 (0.05) | -0.08 (0.07) | -0.04 (0.05) | -0.04 (0.05) | -0.03 (0.05) |
| <i>non-agricultural productivity</i> | -0.19*** (0.06) | -0.27*** (0.09) | -0.17*** (0.06) | -0.18** (0.07) | -0.15** (0.07) |
| <i>Gini</i> | 0.07 (0.07) | 0.20* (0.12) | 0.03 (0.06) | 0.07 (0.07) | 0.05 (0.06) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | 0.06 (0.09) | 0.25 (0.17) | 0.05 (0.09) | 0.07 (0.09) | 0.04 (0.08) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | -0.00 (0.05) | -0.04 (0.10) | -0.00 (0.05) | -0.01 (0.05) | -0.01 (0.04) |
| <i>spell</i> | -0.04 (0.06) | -0.13 (0.11) | -0.05 (0.05) | -0.05 (0.06) | -0.03 (0.06) |
| <i>transformation</i> | -0.10** (0.05) | -0.13 (0.10) | -0.07 (0.05) | -0.11** (0.04) | -0.06 (0.05) |
| <i>Gini</i> | -0.08 (0.08) | -0.28* (0.16) | -0.09 (0.08) | -0.09 (0.08) | -0.04 (0.08) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | -0.25 (0.19) | -0.55* (0.32) | -0.25 (0.19) | -0.26 (0.20) | -0.20 (0.18) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | 0.08 (0.07) | 0.24* (0.12) | 0.07 (0.06) | 0.09 (0.07) | 0.03 (0.05) |
| <i>spell</i> | 0.09 (0.13) | 0.29 (0.22) | 0.08 (0.13) | 0.10 (0.13) | 0.05 (0.12) |
| <i>employment</i> | 0.07 (0.14) | -0.05 (0.15) | 0.11 (0.15) | 0.07 (0.14) | 0.10 (0.14) |
| <i>Gini</i> | -0.25 (0.19) | 0.14 (0.40) | -0.38** (0.18) | -0.25 (0.21) | -0.22 (0.21) |
| <i>PI ratio</i> | -0.03 (0.25) | 0.52 (0.59) | -0.11 (0.21) | -0.03 (0.26) | -0.03 (0.22) |
| <i>NR rents</i> | -0.06 (0.16) | 0.05 (0.30) | -0.10 (0.16) | -0.07 (0.18) | -0.06 (0.14) |
| <i>spell</i> | 0.31 (0.23) | 0.01 (0.49) | 0.38* (0.20) | 0.31 (0.24) | 0.34 (0.21) |
| % Δ Gini | - | - | -0.08** (0.04) | - | - |
| % Δ Inc./Cons. | - | - | - | - | -0.07 (0.05) |

Note: Country-clustered standard errors are in parentheses. * denotes p-value < 0.10; ** denotes p-value < 0.05; and *** denotes p-value < 0.01.

Figure 1 Scatter plot of changes in extreme (US\$1.25 per day) poverty rates on GDP per capita growth rates






Figure 2 Decomposition of extreme poverty rate changes by region




Note: EAP = East Asia and the Pacific; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; MNA = Middle East and North Africa; SAS = South Asia; SSA = sub-Saharan Africa.

Figure 3 Decomposition of GDP per capita growth by region




Note: EAP = East Asia and the Pacific; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; MNA = Middle East and North Africa; SAS = South Asia; SSA = sub-Saharan Africa.

Figure 4 Annual contribution of different sources of economic growth to changes in overall extreme poverty rates



Note: EAP = East Asia and the Pacific; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; MNA = Middle East and North Africa; SAS = South Asia; SSA = sub-Saharan Africa.

Figure 5 Annual contribution of different sources of economic growth to changes in rural and urban extreme poverty rates



Note: EAP = East Asia and the Pacific; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean; MNA = Middle East and North Africa; SAS = South Asia; SSA = sub-Saharan Africa.

The IFAD Research Series

01. **Agricultural and rural development reconsidered**
A guide to issues and debates
By Steve Wiggins
02. **Migration and transformative pathways**
A rural perspective
By David Suttie, Rosemary Vargas-Lundius
03. **Fostering inclusive outcomes in sub-Saharan African agriculture**
Improving agricultural productivity and expanding agribusiness opportunities
By David Suttie, Rui Benfica
04. **The effects of smallholder agricultural involvement on household food consumption and dietary diversity**
Evidence from Malawi
By Rui Benfica, Talip Kilic
05. **Rural-urban linkages and food systems in sub-Saharan Africa**
The rural dimension
By Karim Hussein, David Suttie
06. **Why food and nutrition security matters for inclusive structural and rural transformation**
By Steven Were Omamo
07. **Measuring IFAD's impact**
Background paper to the IFAD9 Impact Assessment Initiative
By Alessandra Garbero
08. **Fostering inclusive rural transformation in fragile states and situations**
By Karim Hussein
09. **Social protection and inclusive rural transformation**
By Carolina Trivelli, Silvana Vargas, Jhonatan Clausen
10. **Inclusive Finance and Inclusive Rural Transformation**
By Calum G. Turvey
11. **Food safety, trade, standards and the integration of smallholders into value chains**
A review of the literature
By John Humphrey
12. **An evidence-based assessment of IFAD's end of project reporting**
By Bia Carneiro, Alessandra Garbero
13. **Graduation models for rural financial inclusion**
By Khalid El Harizi, Xinjia Yan
14. **Disbursement performance of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)**
An in-depth analysis of drivers and trends
By Tim Balint, Daniel Higgins, Paola Mallia, Silvana Scalzo, Paul Winters
15. **Remittances, growth and poverty reduction in Asia**
A critical review of the literature and new evidence from cross-country panel data
By Katsushi S. Imai, Bilal Malaeb, Fabrizio Bresciani
16. **Getting the most out of impact evaluation for learning, reporting and influence**
Insights from piloting a Participatory Impact Assessment and Learning Approach (PIALA) with IFAD
By Edward Heinemann, Adinda Van Hemelrijck, Irene Guijt
17. **Population age structure and sex composition in sub-Saharan Africa**
A rural-urban perspective
By Ashira Menashe-Oren, Guy Stecklov

18. **Do agricultural support and cash transfer programmes improve nutritional status?**
By Seth R. Gitter, James Manley, Jill Bernstein, Paul Winters
19. **Measuring women's empowerment in agriculture**
A streamlined approach
By Alessandra Garbero, Emilie Perge
20. **Transformation and diversification of the rural economy in Asia**
By Roehlano M. Briones
21. **Does relative deprivation induce migration?**
Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa
By Kashi Kafle, Rui Benfica, Paul Winters
22. **Poverty reduction during the rural-urban transformation**
Rural development is still more important than urbanization
By Katsushi S. Imai, Raghav Gaiha, Alessandra Garbero
23. **The effect of the sectoral composition of economic growth on rural and urban poverty**
By Rui Benfica, Heath Henderson



International Fund for Agricultural Development

Via Paolo di Dono, 44 - 00142 Rome, Italy

Tel: +39 06 54591 - Fax: +39 06 5043463

Email: ifad@ifad.org

www.ifad.org

 ifad-un.blogspot.com

 www.facebook.com/ifad

 instagram.com/ifadnews

 www.twitter.com/ifadnews

 www.youtube.com/user/ifadTV

ISBN 978-92-9072-816-0



9 789290 728160

