

Appendix 1: The statistics of poverty in world

The World Bank Group’s mission is carved in stone at our Washington headquarters: “Our Dream is a World Free of Poverty.” This mission underpins all of our analytical, operational, and convening work in more than 145 client countries, and is bolstered by our goals of ending extreme poverty within a generation and promoting shared prosperity in a sustainable manner across the globe.

There has been marked progress on reducing poverty over the past decades. The world attained the first Millennium Development Goal target—to cut the 1990 poverty rate in half by 2015—five years ahead of schedule, in 2010. Despite the progress made in reducing poverty, the number of people living in extreme poverty globally remains unacceptably high. And given global growth forecasts poverty reduction may not be fast enough to reach the target of ending extreme poverty by 2030.

According to the [most recent estimates](#), in 2013, 10.7 percent of the world’s population lived on less than US\$1.90 a day, compared to 12.4 percent in 2012. That’s down from 35 percent in 1990.

This means that, in 2013, 767 million people lived on less than \$1.90 a day, down from 881 million in 2012 and 1.85 billion in 1990.

While poverty rates have declined in all regions, progress has been uneven:

The reduction in extreme poverty between 2012 and 2013 was mainly driven by East Asia and Pacific (71 million fewer poor) –notably China and Indonesia—and South Asia (37 million fewer poor) –notably India.

Half of the extreme poor live in Sub-Saharan Africa. The number of poor in the region fell only by 4 million with 389 million people living on less than US\$1.90 a day in 2013, more than all the other regions combined.

A vast majority of the global poor live in rural areas and are poorly educated, mostly employed in the agricultural sector, and over half are under 18 years of age.

The work to end extreme poverty is far from over, and a number of challenges remain. It is becoming even more difficult to reach those remaining in extreme poverty, which often lives in fragile contexts and remote areas. Access to good schools, healthcare, electricity, safe water and other critical services remains elusive for many people, often determined by socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity, and geography. Moreover, for those who have been able to move out of poverty, progress is often temporary: economic shocks, food insecurity and climate change threaten to rob them of their hard-won gains and force them back into poverty. It will be critical to find ways to tackle these issues as we make progress toward 2030.

Last Updated: Oct 02, 2016

[Projects & News](#)[Learning](#)[Research](#)[Data](#)[About Home](#)
[Topics](#)[Countries](#)[Publications](#)[Operations](#)

Poverty

[Data Catalog](#)[Microdata](#)[Data Bank](#)

This page in:

[English](#) •

[Español](#) •

[Français](#) •

[العربية](#) •

Poverty

Jump to

Poverty headcount ratio at \$1.90 a day (2011 PPP) (% of population)

Share Details

198519901995200020052010152025303540WORLD

World (2008)

17.83

1981 - 2013

Annualized average growth rate in per capita real survey mean consumption or income, bottom 40% of population (%) •

Annualized average growth rate in per capita real survey mean consumption or income, total population (%) •

GINI index (World Bank estimate) •

Income share held by fourth 20% •

Income share held by highest 10% •

Income share held by highest 20% •

Income share held by lowest 10% •

Income share held by lowest 20% •

Income share held by second 20% •

Income share held by third 20% •

Population living in slums, (% of urban population) •

Poverty gap at \$1.90 a day (2011 PPP) (%) •

Poverty gap at \$3.10 a day (2011 PPP) (%) •

Poverty gap at national poverty lines (%) •

Poverty headcount ratio at \$1.90 a day (2011 PPP) (% of population) •

Poverty headcount ratio at \$3.10 a day (2011 PPP) (% of population) •

Poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of population) •

Rural poverty gap at national poverty lines (%) •

Rural poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of rural population) •

Survey mean consumption or income per capita, bottom 40% of population (2011 PPP \$ per day) •

Survey mean consumption or income per capita, total population (2011 PPP \$ per day) •

Urban poverty gap at national poverty lines (%) •

Urban poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of urban population) •

For countries with an active poverty monitoring program, the World Bank—in collaboration with national institutions, other development agencies, and civil society—regularly conducts analytical work to assess the extent and causes of poverty and inequality, examine the impact of growth and public pol...Show more

Download Databank

Poverty & Equity Data

The [Poverty & Equity Data](#) website allows you to explore data and indicators based on different poverty lines.

[Go to portal](#)

Featured indicators

Annualized average growth rate in per capita real survey mean consumption or income, bottom 40% of population (%) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Annualized average growth rate in per capita real survey mean consumption or income, total population (%) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

GINI index (World Bank estimate) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Income share held by fourth 20% •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Income share held by highest 10% •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Income share held by highest 20% •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Income share held by lowest 10% •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Income share held by lowest 20% •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Income share held by second 20% •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Income share held by third 20% •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Population living in slums, (% of urban population) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Poverty gap at \$1.90 a day (2011 PPP) (%) •

1960198020003.2310.6018WORLD

Poverty gap at \$3.10 a day (2011 PPP) (%) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Poverty gap at national poverty lines (%) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Poverty headcount ratio at \$1.90 a day (2011 PPP) (% of population) •

19601980200010.726.442.2WORLD

Poverty headcount ratio at \$3.10 a day (2011 PPP) (% of population) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of population) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Rural poverty gap at national poverty lines (%) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Rural poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of rural population) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Survey mean consumption or income per capita, bottom 40% of population (2011 PPP \$ per day) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Survey mean consumption or income per capita, total population (2011 PPP \$ per day) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Urban poverty gap at national poverty lines (%) •

196019802000

No data is available at the World level

Urban poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of urban population) •

196019802000

How Many People in the World Are Actually Poor?

Good news: Economists at Oxford have come up with a better method for measuring global poverty. Bad news: There are way more poor people than previously thought.

Ricardo Morae's/Reuters

Most Popular

[Bracing for Trump's Revenge](#) .1

[McKay Coppin's](#) ○

5:00 AM ET ○

[How to Beat Trump](#) .2

[David Forum](#) ○

4:00 AM ET ○

[The Genius of Melissa McCarthy as Sean Spicer on *Saturday Night Live*](#) .3

[Sophie Gilbert](#) ○

Feb 5, 2017 ○

[How to Build an Autocracy](#) .4

[David Frum](#) ○

Jan 30, 2017 ○

[Can Megyn Kelly Escape Her Past?](#) .5

[Caitlin Flanagan](#) ○

Feb 5, 2017 ○

[Tanya Basu](#) •

Jun 19, 2014 •

Poverty got redefined this week.

The [Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative](#) (OPHI) released a report, the [Global Multidimensional Poverty Index 2014](#) (MPI), on Tuesday

looking at the state of poverty in the world today. It is being [touted as the most accurate reflection of the world's poor](#), a sort of census of the global impoverished population.

Didn't that exist already? For more than a decade, the [United Nations Development Programme](#) has measured world poverty using its [Human Poverty Index](#) (HPI). The HPI defined poverty as those making less than [\\$1.25 a day](#), a measurement used by the World Bank.

But it lacked in two key areas. First, it counted countries as one whole mass, unable to differentiate degrees of poverty within a country and locate the worst pockets. And second, it placed all of its scrutiny on income, without considering other indicators such as health and education.

[Sure, making a certain amount a day is one way to measure the physical comforts a person might be lacking: home, food, and clothing. But what about limited \(or a total lack of\) access to medical care? Or barriers to getting an education? And just because someone has a roof over his or head doesn't mean it's a sanitary, safe place to live—impoverished people in cities are often concentrated in slums where open sewage, crowding, and rickety housing make for dangerous living conditions. Consequently, many didn't consider HPI's income index to be particularly accurate.](#)

So OPHI reconsidered poverty from a new angle: [a measure of what the authors term generally as "deprivations."](#) They relied on three datasets that do more than capture income: the Demographic and Health Survey, the Multiple Indicators Cluster Survey, and the World Health Survey, each of which measures quality of life indicators. Poverty wasn't just a vague number anymore, but a snapshot of on-the-ground conditions people were facing.

[OPHI then created the new index \(the MPI\)](#) that collected ten needs beyond “the basics” in three broader categories: nutrition and child mortality under Health; years of schooling and school attendance under Education; and cooking fuel, sanitation, water, electricity, floor, and assets under Living Conditions. If a person is deprived of a third or more of the indicators, he or she would be considered poor under the MPI. And degrees of poverty were measures, too: Did your home lack a roof or did you have no home at all?

Perhaps the MPI's greatest feature is that it can locate poverty. Where the HPI would just tell you where a country stood in comparison to others, the MPI maps poverty at a more granular level. With poverty mapped in greater detail, aid workers and policy makers have the opportunity to be more targeted in their work.

So what did we find out about poverty now that we can measure it better? Sadly, the world is more impoverished than we previously thought. The HPI has put this figure at 1.2 billion people. But under the MPI's measurements, it's 1.6 billion people. More than half of the impoverished population in developing countries lives in South Asia, and another 29 percent in Sub-Saharan Africa. Seventy-one percent of MPI's poor live in what is considered middle income countries—countries where development and modernization in the face of globalization is in full swing, but some are left behind. Niger is home to the highest concentration of multidimensionality poor, with nearly 90 percent of its population lacking in MPI's socioeconomic indicators. Most of the poor live in rural areas.

In the midst of these depressing statistics, there are bright spots. Nepal is improving its situation the fastest among developing countries—and it's in South Asia, the poorest region. In five years, Nepal reduced its MPI numbers from 65 percent of its population to 44 percent. Other classically poor countries, like Rwanda, Ghana, Bangladesh, and Cambodia are also improving, not just getting richer but also seeing some narrowing of the gap between rich and poor.

For the full report, [click here](#).

** This post originally stated that the Human Poverty Index is based on information provided by the United Nations Development Programme rather than the World Bank. We regret the error.*

In an animated interview, the Supreme Court justice describes her early career.

, [Jackie Lay](#), and [Ryan ParkDaniel Lombroso](#) •

, a former editorial fellow with *The Atlantic*, is a freelance writer based [Tanya Basu](#) in Brooklyn who writes about how we interact with each other.

Some conservatives unequivocally opposed his election. Now he's the president, with all the levers of government at his disposal. Donald Trump has never made a secret of his penchant for personal vengeance. He [boasts](#) about it, [tweets](#) about it, [tells](#) long, rambling stories about it on the transcontinental speaking circuit. When, last year, he was asked to identify a favorite Bible passage, he [cited](#) "an eye for an eye." And in his 2007 book, *Think Big and Kick Ass*, he devoted an entire chapter to the joys of exacting revenge.

"My motto is: Always get even," he wrote. "When somebody screws you, screw them back in spades."

For those who have crossed Trump, then, these are understandably anxious times. As he enters the White House and takes the reins of the most powerful government in the world, a small cadre of high-profile conservatives—the haters, the losers, the Never-Trampers who never fell in line—has found itself wondering whether their party's president will use his new powers to settle old scores.

Some advice from the right to the left, on how to effectively oppose the current president

Fourteen years ago, I found myself an unexpected micro-target of a left-liberal protest demonstration. I had visited London to watch the debate and subsequent vote in the House of Commons over the Iraq war resolution. A huge demonstration against the war snaked down Whitehall toward Parliament. I wandered into Trafalgar Square for a view. Somebody recognized me as a recent alumnus of the Bush administration; arguably its least important member, but undeniably the closest at hand. A small throng surrounded me, and there followed what the diplomats would describe as a candid exchange of views.

Midlife brings strange changes to us all. After a lifetime of viewing demonstrations from the other side of the barricades, I was one of the many who admired the orderly commitment and resolution of the women's march on Washington the day after President Trump's inauguration. Yet my admiration is mixed with worry. As I step through the police lines, I bring a message with me: Your demonstrations are engineered to fail. They didn't stop the Iraq war. They won't stop Donald Trump.

The actress made a surprise appearance as the White House press secretary.

It was the kind of moment *Saturday Night Live* history was made of: an unannounced guest appearance so perfect that it took even the live audience a few moments to register what was actually happening. “Next, on C-SPAN, the daily White House press briefing with Press Secretary Sean Spicer,” a voiceover announced. Then, a person who looked uncannily like Spicer walked onstage to a makeshift podium, presumably causing many viewers at home to squint and look more closely at their televisions. *Is that ...? Could it be ...?*

It took a few insults delivered in a trademark shriek to hammer home that this really was Melissa McCarthy, in drag, capturing the unquestionable essence of a political figure whose public image so far has largely revolved around [belligerence](#), [alternative facts](#), and [cinnamon gum](#). As soon as the assembled audience figured it out, they began cheering, causing McCarthy’s Spicer to berate them once again. “Settle down, SETTLE DOWN!” she screeched. “Before we begin, I know that I and the press have gotten off to a rocky start. And when I say rocky, I mean *Rocky* the movie because I came out here to punch you. In the face. And also I don’t talk so good.”

The preconditions are present in the U.S. today. Here’s the playbook Donald Trump could use to set the country down a path toward illiberalism. It’s 2021, and President Donald Trump will shortly be sworn in for his second term. The 45th president has visibly aged over the past four years. He rests heavily on his daughter Ivanka’s arm during his infrequent public appearances.

Fortunately for him, he did not need to campaign hard for reelection. His has been a popular presidency: Big tax cuts, big spending, and big deficits have worked their familiar expansive magic. Wages have grown strongly in the Trump years, especially for men without a college degree, even if rising inflation is beginning to bite into the gains. The president’s supporters credit his restrictive immigration policies and his Trump Works infrastructure program.

Listen to the audio version of this article: [Download the Audm app](#) for your iPhone to listen to more titles.

Fox News’s former star has downplayed her full role in an ugly election. Fox News was founded in 1996, when the entertainment impresario and conservative political consultant Roger Ailes acted on a pair of insights: that most people found

television news boring and that a significant number of conservatives didn't trust it to represent their interests and values fairly. The TV producer in Ailes saw a marketing niche, and the political operative in him saw a direct way of courting voters. Rupert Murdoch owned the network, but Ailes was its intellectual author. In the two decades since, the network has thrived without legitimate competition of any kind. It has proved to be a big tent, sheltering beneath it some excellent reporters but also a collection of blowhards, performance artists, cornballs, and Republican operatives in rehab from political failures and personal embarrassments. With the help of this antic cast, the Fox audience has come to understand something important that it did not know before: The people who make "mainstream" news and entertainment don't just look down on conservatives and their values—they despise them.

The president has displayed a willingness to go after the press, the intelligence community, and now even the judiciary. From the many disturbing aspects of Donald Trump's controversial and dizzying first two weeks as President, a theme is emerging that, in the long run, may prove more dangerous than any individual policy: his unprecedented assault on institutions that could delay or derail his radical agenda.

As I wrote [previously](#), this approach began, not by accident, with an assault on the press and intelligence community, two entities in American society that traditionally provide the verified facts that are the basis for policy decisions. Trump set the stage for these fights by disparaging both institutions throughout the presidential campaign and transition, punctuated by his trademark pungent insults (the press as "the most dishonest humans," the intelligence community as employing Nazi tactics) aimed less at their work product than at their very legitimacy.

The president's attack on a federal judge and the "court system" adds to his short-sighted approach to protecting the United States. On Sunday, President Trump declared that "if something happens"—the "something" in question, implicitly, being an Islamist terrorist attack—Americans should blame the "court system" and James Robert, the federal judge who temporarily stopped the Trump administration from enforcing its 90-day ban on people from seven majority-Muslim countries.

To imply that federal judges should be blamed for the consequences of following the law, or that the “court system” makes America unsafe, shows alarming contempt for the United States Constitution. To see a president engage in preemptive blame shifting at this early date in his tenure, as if he were unaware of the courts when he pledged to succeed at counterterrorism, inspires no confidence among those worried that he’s in over his head.

The outcome of the battle over Trump’s travel ban focused on seven mostly Muslim nations is hard to predict. President Trump can perhaps be forgiven for not understanding the quirks of federal District Court jurisdiction. Saturday he Tweeted, “Why aren't the lawyers looking at and using the Federal Court decision in Boston, which is at conflict with ridiculous lift ban decision?”The elementary reason is this: one judge—Judge Nathaniel Gorton of the District Court for the District of Massachusetts—*refused* to enter an injunction. His order doesn’t have any legal effect. It did not even resolve the claims of the six plaintiffs in front of it, simply said that they were not entitled to an emergency order halting Trump’s travel-ban order before a trial.

The other, “so-called Judge” James L. Robert of the Western District of Washington, *did* issue an order—a nationwide “temporary restraining order” (TRO) that instructs Trump and the Departments of State and Homeland Security to stop immediately enforcing the travel-ban order. There should be nothing surprising about what Donald Trump has done in his first week—but he has underestimated the resilience of Americans and their institutions.

I am not surprised by President Donald Trump’s antics this week. Not by the big splashy pronouncements such as announcing a wall that [he would force Mexico to pay for](#), even as the Mexican foreign minister held talks with American officials in Washington. Not by the quiet, but no less dangerous bureaucratic orders, such as kicking the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff out of meetings of the Principals’ Committee, the senior foreign-policy decision-making group below the president, while [inserting his chief ideologist](#), Steve Bannon, into them. Many conservative foreign-policy and national-security experts saw the dangers last spring and summer, which is why we signed letters denouncing not Trump’s policies but his temperament; not his program but his character.

The discreet, disorienting passions of the Victorian era

Even by the formidable standards of eminent Victorian families, the Bensons were an intimidating lot. Edward Benson, the family's patriarch, had vaulted up the clerical hierarchy, awing superiors with his ferocious work habits and cowing subordinates with his reforming zeal. Queen Victoria appointed him the archbishop of Canterbury, the head of the Anglican Church, in 1883. Edward's wife, Minnie, was to all appearances a perfect match. Tender where he was severe, she was a warmhearted hostess renowned for her conversation. Most important, she was Edward's equal in religious devotion. As a friend daringly pronounced, Minnie was "as good as God and as clever as the Devil."

All five of Edward and Minnie Benson's adult offspring distinguished themselves in public life. Arthur Benson served as the master of Magdalene College at Cambridge University, wrote the lyrics to Edward Elgar's hymn "Land of Hope and Glory," and was entrusted with the delicate task of co-editing Queen Victoria's letters for publication. His brother Fred was a best-selling writer, well known today for the series of satirical Lucia novels (televised for the second time in 2014, on the BBC), which poked good-natured fun at the pomposities of English provincial life. Their sister Margaret became a pioneering Egyptologist, the first woman to lead an archaeological dig in the country and to publish her findings. Even the family's apostate, the youngest brother, Hugh, a convert to Roman Catholicism, was considered a magnetic preacher and, like his brothers, was an irrepressible author of briskly selling books. All told, the family published more than 200 volumes.

Skip to article in Skip Ad >

11 Facts about Global Poverty

Welcome to DoSomething.org, a global movement of 5.5 million young people making positive change, online and off! The 11 facts you want are below, and the sources for the facts are at the very bottom of the page. After you learn something, do something! Find out how to [take action here](#).

1. Nearly 1/2 of the world's population — more than 3 billion people — live on less than \$2.50 a day. More than 1.3 billion live in extreme poverty — less than \$1.25 a day.

2. 1 billion children worldwide are living in poverty. According to UNICEF, 22,000 children die each day due to poverty.
3. 805 million people worldwide do not have enough food to eat. Food banks are especially important in providing food for people that can't afford it themselves. Run a food drive outside your local grocery store so people in your community have enough to eat. Sign up for [Supermarket Stakeout](#).
4. More than 750 million people lack adequate access to clean drinking water. Diarrhea caused by inadequate drinking water, sanitation, and hand hygiene kills an estimated 842,000 people every year globally, or approximately 2,300 people per day.
5. In 2011, 165 million children under the age 5 were stunted (reduced rate of growth and development) due to chronic malnutrition.

Tackle a campaign to make the world suck less.

EXPLORE CAMPAIGNS

6. Preventable diseases like diarrhea and pneumonia take the lives of 2 million children a year that is too poor to afford proper treatment.
7. As of 2013, 21.8 million children under 1 year of age worldwide had not received the three recommended doses of vaccine against diphtheria, tetanus and pertussis.
8. 1/4 of all humans live without electricity — approximately 1.6 billion people.
9. 80% of the world population lives on less than \$10 a day.
10. Oxfam estimates that it would take \$60 billion annually to end extreme global poverty--that's less than 1/4 the income of the top 100 richest billionaires.
11. The World Food Programme says, “The poor are hungry and their hunger traps them in poverty.” Hunger is the number one cause of death in the world, killing more than HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis combined.

This entry is concerned with extreme poverty. The World Bank is the main source for global information on extreme poverty today and sets the International Poverty Line. This poverty line was revised in 2015 – since then a person is considered to live in extreme poverty if he or she is living on less than 1.90 international-\$ per day. The poverty measurement is based on the monetary value of a person's *consumption*, but since consumption measures are unfortunately not available for all countries, the World Bank has to rely on income measures for some countries.

A key difficulty for measuring global poverty is that price levels are very different in different countries. For that reason it is not sufficient to convert the consumption levels of people in different countries simply by the market exchange rate; it is additionally necessary to adjust for differences in price levels between different countries. This is done through Purchasing Power Parity adjustments (explained below), which allow consumption and incomes to be expressed in so-called 'international dollars'.

It is important to notice that the International Poverty Line is extremely low. Indeed, 'extreme poverty' is the adequate name for those living under this low threshold. Focusing on extreme poverty is important precisely because it captures those most in need. However, it is also important to point out that living conditions well above the International Poverty Line can still be characterized by poverty and hardship. Accordingly, in this entry we will also discuss the global distribution of people below poverty lines that are higher than 1.90 internationals-\$.

In the past only a small elite enjoyed living conditions that we would not describe as a life in extreme poverty today. With the onset of industrialization and rising productivity the share of people living in extreme poverty started to decrease. The share of people in extreme poverty has decreased continuously over the course of the last 2 centuries. Closely linked to this improvement in material living conditions is [the improvement of global health](#) and the [expansion of global education](#) that we have seen over these last 2 centuries. We also discuss the link between education, health, and poverty in this entry. During the first half of the last century, the growth of the world population caused the absolute number of poor people in the world to increase, even though the share of people in poverty was going down. After around 1970, the decrease in poverty rates became so steep that

the absolute number of people living in extreme poverty started falling as well. This trend of decreasing poverty – both in absolute numbers and as a share of the world population – has been a constant during the last three decades.

Empirical View#

the importance of material living conditions#

what do poor people think about poverty?#

Extreme poverty has been going down in the last two centuries. But why should we care? Is it not the case that poor people might only have less income but enjoy their lives just as much – or even more – than rich people? One way to find out is to simply ask. This is what the *Gallup Organization* did. In the World Poll, Gallup asked people around the world what they thought about their standard of living – not only about their income. The economist Angus Deaton¹ compared the answers that people in different countries gave with the average income in these countries. This research is summarized in the following graph; it shows that people living in poorer countries tend to be less satisfied with their living standards in a broader sense. This suggests that economic prosperity is not a vain, unimportant goal but a means for a better life. The correlation between rising incomes and higher self-reported life satisfaction is shown in the [entry on happiness](#). We are pointing this out at the beginning of this entry because there is [often a romantic take](#) on what life in poverty is like. There is just no empirical evidence that would suggest that poverty is romantic for people who live in poverty.

It is somewhat understandable to romanticise poverty for anyone who has not experienced extreme poverty personally, since it is very difficult to imagine what it is like to live with very little material means. Even economists who think a lot about income and poverty find it difficult to understand what it means to live on a given income level. It is just hard to get an image of what life is like when all you know is a dollar per day figure. To address this Anna Rolling Rönnlund put together a very nice project at Gapminder.org in which she portrays the living conditions of people living at different income levels. At [Dollar Street](#) you find portraits of families and you can see how they cook, what they eat, how they sleep, what toilets they have available, what their children's toys look like and much more.

Fractions of people reporting that they are dissatisfied with their standard of living
– Deaton²

[#Poverty lines](#)

The simplest, most straightforward way to measure poverty is to set a poverty line and to count the number of people living below that poverty line, and express it as a fraction of the total number of people in that society. Fittingly this is called the poverty headcount ratio. The difficulty here is that it is not easy to draw a line between people that one should consider poor and the rest of the society. If you look at the previous graph, it is easy to understand why: Drawing the line would be easy if there was a clear delineation between people who were satisfied with their standard of living and people who aren't. But this is not the case. We see, on the contrary, that having more income improves the self-perceived living standards of people. This is not only true for self-reported life satisfaction, but also for many welfare indicators; and it is never straightforward to define who should be considered poor and who should not. The fact that higher income improves the standards of living means that defining poverty by drawing a line is always rightly subject to debate. It is necessarily controversial to propose a line that separates those that are poor from those that 'merely' have a low income.

The World Bank, which gathers data on income from people around the world, defined extreme poverty as living on less than \$1.90 per day and you find more information on this poverty line in the section dedicated to measurement [below](#). Global poverty is measured in international dollars (in prices of 2011) that are adjusted for the fact that people in different countries face different price levels (PPP adjustment). It is also expressed in real terms to adjust for price changes over time. (How these adjustments are made is explained in the [entry on GDP data](#).)

[the historical perspective on extreme poverty#](#)

[200 years of lifting the world out of poverty#](#)

The World Bank publishes data on absolute poverty from 1981 onwards, but researchers have tried to reconstruct information about the living standards of the more distant past. The seminal paper was written by Bourguignon and Morrison in 2002.³ In this paper, the two authors reconstructed measures of poverty as far back as 1820. The poverty line of 1.90 Int. Dollars per day was introduced only in 2015,

so the 2002 paper used the measure of ‘one dollar per day’. This difference in the definition of poverty should be kept in mind when considering the following graph.

In 1820, the vast majority of people lived in extreme poverty and only tiny elite enjoyed higher standards of living. [Economic growth over the last 200 years](#) completely transformed our world, and poverty fell continuously over the last two centuries. This is even more remarkable when we consider that the population increased 7-fold over the same time. In a world without economic growth, an increase in the population would result in less and less income for everyone. A 7-fold increase in the world population would be potentially enough to drive everyone into extreme poverty. Yet, the exact opposite happened. In a time of unprecedented population growth we managed to lift more and more people out of poverty.

It is very difficult to compare income or consumption levels over long periods because goods and services that are available change so much, and even completely new goods and services become available. This is so important that it would not be wrong to say that every person in the world was extremely poor in the 19th century. Rothschild was surely the richest man in the world when he died in 1836. But the cause of his death was an infection; this is a condition that [can be treated with antibiotics](#), available for purchase today for less than a couple of cents.

This means that the level of poverty, especially for the distant past, is hard to judge. Indeed, this is one of the reasons why the ‘dollar a day’ poverty line was updated. What is however clear the trend is over time? As more and more countries industrialized and increased the productivity of work, the economies started to grow and poverty started to decline. According to Bourguignon and Morrison a little more than a quarter of the world population was not living in poverty by 1950. From 1981 onward we have better empirical data on global extreme poverty. The Bourguignon and Morrison estimates for the past are based on national accounts and additional information on the level of inequality within countries. The data from 1981 onwards comes from the World Bank, which bases their estimates on household surveys. According to these household surveys, 44% of the world population lived in absolute poverty in 1981. Since then, the share of poor people has declined very fast – in fact faster than ever before in world history. In

32 years the share of people living in extreme poverty was divided by 4, reaching levels below 11% in 2013. Although the World Bank estimates for 2015 are not available, the projections suggest that the incidence of extreme poverty has fallen below 10%.

There is also an [interactive version of the same visualization](#).

the world population in extreme poverty in absolute numbers#

We have seen that the chance of being born into poverty has declined dramatically over the last 200 years. But what about the absolute number of people living in extreme poverty? The visualization below combines the information on the share of extreme poverty shown in the last chart, with the [number of people living in the world](#). Prior to 1970 we use here the estimates of people ‘living in poverty’ from Bourguignon and Morrison (2002); from 1981 we use the World Bank estimates.

As we can see, in 1820 there were just fewer than 1.1 billion people in the world, of which more than 1 billion lived in extreme poverty. Over the next 150 years the decline of poverty was not fast enough to offset the very rapid rise of the world population, so the number of non-poor *and* poor people increased. Since around 1970 we are living in a world in which the number of non-poor people is rising, while the number of poor people is falling. According to the estimates shown below there were 2.2 billion people living in extreme poverty in 1970, and there were 705 million people living in extreme poverty in 2015. The number of extreme poor people in the world is 3 times lower than in 1970.

In 1990 there were 2 billion people living in extreme poverty. With a reduction to 705 million in 2015 this means that – on average – on every day in these 25 days 137,000 fewer people were living in extreme poverty.⁴ On every day in the last 25 years there could have been a newspaper headline saying “The number of people in extreme poverty fell by 137,000 since yesterday”. Unfortunately the slow developments that transform our world entirely never make the news, and this is [very reason](#) why we are working on this online publication.

the history of extreme poverty in today’s rich countries#

In the thousands of years before the beginning of the industrial era, the vast majority of the world population lived in conditions that we would call extreme

poverty today. Productivity levels were low and food was scarce – material living standards were generally very low. The first countries in which people improved their living conditions were those that industrialized first. The chart below shows the decline of extreme poverty in these countries. It is based on estimates published by Martin Ravallion⁵ and it should be noted that extreme poverty here is measured against the older poverty line of 1.25 international \$ in 2005 prices. The difference between this and the newer poverty line that is used in the rest of this entry is not large, so the estimates here are roughly comparable. It shows that the living conditions of large parts of today’s rich countries were characterized by extreme poverty. The reduction of extreme poverty in these countries was only achieved very recently. Ravallion writes that “today there is virtually no extreme poverty left in today’s rich world, when judged by the standards of poor countries today.” An exception to this is the US – a country with exceptionally [high inequality among rich countries](#) – where still a small but sizeable fraction of the population is living in extreme poverty (more about this below). In other rich countries extreme poverty has ended and we should not forget what a very recent achievement this is. We definitely can end extreme poverty, we have done it before.

[#Recent cross-country trends in poverty](#)

Share of population below the International Poverty Line#

Extreme poverty estimates, measuring the share of population living below the International Poverty Line, are available for many countries over the last 3 decades. These estimates are shown in the world map below. By default the map shows the latest data, but with the slider below the map you can explore the change over time. You can also switch to the ‘chart’ tab to see the change over time for individual countries or world regions. Or you simply click on a country to see how the poverty headcount has changed. Share of population living with less than 3.10\$ Living on \$1.90 per day is very difficult – the term *extreme* poverty is appropriate. As argued before it would be wrong to think that a person living on a little more than 1.90 international dollars is not poor. It is therefore interesting and important to also measure poverty with higher poverty lines. The second poverty line for which the World Bank presents such estimates is 3.10 international dollars per day. The following chart shows the share of a country’s population that is living with less than this. In [this visualizations](#) you can compare the share living with less than 1.90 international-\$ and 3.10 international-\$ for the same country.

recent regional trends in poverty#

Poverty headcount across world regions#

The following visualization shows the number of people living below the International Poverty Line in different world regions. As we can see, in 1990 very few people lived in poverty in the early-industrialized parts of the world; yet other regions experienced substantial deprivation. Regional inequalities were very large. In the subsequent years, as emerging economies started catching up in the process of industrialization, some of these inequalities were reduced. Poverty started declining in other parts of the world. This can be appreciated in the trends for East Asia and the Pacific, where rapid economic growth meant that poverty decreased particularly rapidly. Globally the number of people living in extreme poverty fell by more than 1 billion during this period; from 1.85 billion in 1990 to 0.76 billion in 2013. On average the number of people living in extreme poverty declined by 47 million every year since 1990 (or 130,000 every single day).

Poverty incidence across world regions#

In the following graph we show the share of the population, by world region, living below the International Poverty Line. This is a measure of the incidence of extreme poverty in different parts of the world. It is usually referred to as the ‘poverty headcount ratio’. As we can see, an outstanding achievement of the last decades was the very rapid reduction of poverty in East Asia and Pacific; from 60% in 1990 to 3.5% in 2013. This reduction is also especially important as it is a very populous part of the world. As we can see, the decline of global poverty is not only due to the rapid development in East Asia. As the visualizations shows this is part of a larger global development. The share of people living in extreme poverty has been falling in all world regions. The population in rich countries is largely unaware of the decline of global extreme poverty, the chart below shows the perceptions that survey-respondents in the UK have regarding global achievements in poverty reductions. While the [share of extremely poor people has fallen faster than ever before in history over the last 30 years](#), the majority of people in the UK thinks that the opposite has happened, and that poverty has increased!

The chart below present's evidence from a survey in the UK, but ignorance of global development is even greater in other countries that were also surveyed. The extent of ignorance in the UK is particularly bad if we take into account that the shown result correspond to population with a university degree. See [the Gap minder Ignorance Project](#) for more evidence. A more recent survey commissioned by Oxfam and others⁶ asked similar questions in poorer countries. They find that there are considerable differences in the answers provided in rich and poor countries: in Germany and the US only 8% of the survey respondents know that extreme poverty has declined, while in India and China the corresponding figures are 27% and 50% respectively. Survey response in the UK to the question how global poverty has changed⁷

the poverty gap is falling globally#

So far we have been focusing on 'headcount' measures of poverty. These measures are easy to understand, but they have disadvantages, since they do not tell us anything about the *intensity* of poverty: a person that earns only 0.5 international-\$ and a person that earns 1.89 international-\$ per day are both called extremely poor. Alternative poverty measures, such as the 'poverty gap' account for the fact that poverty is more severe if incomes fall drastically below the poverty line. The poverty gap is the mean shortfall of the total population from the poverty line (counting the non-poor as having zero shortfall), expressed as a percentage of the poverty line. It is explained in more detail [here at the web page of the UN](#). The visualizations below shows the poverty gap for the international poverty line of 1.90 international-\$ per day. The thick line shows the declining global poverty gap; from 19% in 1981 to below 4% in the latest estimates. The case of Madagascar shows that not all countries are making progress towards ending extreme poverty and some countries experience rising poverty levels instead. You can add other countries to the chart or switch to the map tab for a broader overview.

the distribution of poverty in the world today#

The incidence of extreme poverty has gone down from almost 100% in the 19th century, to 10.7% in 2013. While this is a great achievement, there is absolutely no reason to be complacent: a headcount ratio of 10.7% means that 746 million people are still living in *extreme* poverty. Where do they live? The visualizations below

shows the number of people in extreme poverty by continent and country.⁸ Above we discuss regional trends. In 1990 the world region with the largest number of poor people was Asia (505 million in South Asia, plus 966 million in East Asia and the Pacific). With the rapid economic growth in Asia over the following two decades, the number of people in extreme poverty fell rapidly. As can be seen from the visualizations below, the number was down to 327 million in 2013 – by that time Africa became the continent with the largest number of people living in extreme poverty.

The breakdown by continent is as follows:

383 Million in Africa •

327 Million in Asia •

19 Million in South America •

13 Million in North America •

2.5 Million in Oceania •

0.7 Million in Europe •

Total: 744.9 million

India is the country with the largest number of people living in extreme poverty (218 million people). Nigeria and the Congo (DRC) follow with 86 and 55 million people.

The future of extreme poverty#

The declared goal of the World Bank is to end extreme poverty by 2030. How realistic is this goal? An interesting scenario is to assume that the current growth rates remain constant. This scenario, based on each country's growth rate over the last 10 years, is presented in the following visualizations. World poverty will further decrease, but it will remain quite a bit higher than the stated goal of 0%.

Beyond income – poverty in other dimensions#

So far we have only looked at poverty in terms of consumption and income. There is good reason to regard these measures as important; but income is a means to an

end and not an end in itself. Other measures of deprivation allow us to take this into account.

One approach is to study deprivation across several independent dimensions of well-being – such as education, health, human rights, etc. One can even consider work as one more dimension, and attempt to capture other work-related aspects of well-being, such as safety and quality of labor. This is the approach that Our World in Data follows and you find the empirical research and data on all these topics right here. A second approach consists in aggregating various dimensions of deprivation into one single metric of ‘multidimensional poverty’. Under this approach the aggregation of information regarding deprivation is made at the individual level, rather than at the social or national levels.

An example of this second approach is the [Multidimensional Poverty Index](#) published by the [Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative](#). It is possible to [visualize their research results on a world map](#).

Correlates, Determinants & Consequences#

Poverty reduction and economic growth#

By 1820 only a few places in the world had achieved economic growth – and only to a rather small extent. The reduction of poverty from the last 200 years was largely possible because economic growth brought higher incomes to more and more people in the world. The following graph shows the correlation between average income and the share of the population living in extreme poverty. As we can see, the incidence of poverty tends to be lower in richer countries; but the correlation is of course not perfect, and there are also countries that have low poverty incidence at low average income levels. The scatter plot above shows cross-country evidence of the link between economic prosperity and poverty. In the following graph we look at this relationship over time for Brazil. This country, with a population of almost 200 million people, achieved an average annual growth rate of 1.7% over 20 years. Through economic growth and redistributive policies, Brazil halved the share of people living in poverty over this short period of time.

Similarly to other industrializing countries, this reduction in poverty went together with a reduction in [income inequality](#).

Economic growth, decreasing inequality and decreasing poverty in Brazil, 1990-[2011](#) – The Economist⁹

Measurement and Data Quality<#>

Key Definitions<#>

what is the ‘poverty headcount ratio’?<#>

The poverty headcount ratio is defined as the share of people with incomes (or consumption) below a certain poverty line. This measure is easy to understand, but it has disadvantages, since it does not tell us anything about the *intensity* of poverty: a person that earns only 0.5 internationals-\$ and a person that earns 1.89 internationals-\$ per day are both called extremely poor. Alternative poverty measures account for how far below the poverty line incomes are – this is what the poverty gap does.

what is the ‘poverty gap’?<#>

In contrast to the poverty headcount, the poverty gap takes the *intensity of poverty* into account. It takes into account that poverty is more severe if incomes fall drastically below the poverty line. The poverty gap is the mean shortfall of the total population from the poverty line (counting the non-poor as having zero shortfall), expressed as a percentage of the poverty line. It is explained in more detail [here at the web page of the UN](#). The issue of course with the poverty gap measure is that it is not as straightforward to explain as the poverty headcount and for public discussions it is therefore rarely used (but it should!).

what is the difference between absolute and relative poverty?<#>

The word ‘poverty’ is used in two distinct ways in social research. Not distinguishing between these causes confusion when comparing poverty across time and across countries. **Absolute poverty** is measured relative to a fixed standard of living; that is, an income threshold that is constant across time and countries. This notion of poverty allows counting the number of people who are destitute by a common global standard. **Relative Poverty** on the other hand is

measured relative to living standards in a particular society, and varies both across time and between societies. This notion of poverty measures deprivation relative to the incomes and opportunities of other individuals in a given society at a given point in time – so it is closely related to inequality. It is important to bear in mind that whether a given poverty measure is ‘relative’ or ‘absolute’ depends on the nature of the poverty line. Hence, it is possible to estimate the poverty headcount and the poverty gap both in absolute and relative terms – it just depends on whether the poverty line is defined relative to a fixed standard of living, or relative to the changing standard of living of other individuals.

Where do absolute poverty lines come from?#

The pioneering work to count the number of people in poverty by a common global standard was published by Montek Ahluwalia, Nicholas Carter, and Hollis Chenery in 1979¹⁰. The three authors based their estimates of global poverty figures on the Indian poverty line at the time. A global ‘dollar-a-day’ poverty line was introduced in the World Development Report 1990, and was subsequently used for the formulation of the Millennium Development Goals, through the commitment to “halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1 a day.” Since then the global poverty line has been revised, and today it is based on the national poverty lines of a number of low-income countries. It remains, however, a global poverty line for *absolute* measurement of deprivation– so it is not recurrently adjusted as low-income countries grow richer. Another possibility to set a poverty line is to ask people about the level of income that is adequate in their society. This tradition of self-reports by poor people is based on the work of Bernard van Praag (1968)¹¹. [Above](#) we show that there is a close relationship between the self-assessment of living conditions and the mean income in the society. Stevenson and Wolfers (2008)¹² showed that this relationship not only holds between but also within countries – more information can be found in the [entry about happiness and subjective well-being](#). National poverty lines are in fact often informed by the self-assessment of citizens of these countries.

Data quality and limitations#

should we care about data quality?#

Any estimate of poverty — of either its level or change over time — is surrounded by a margin of error. In any consideration of the extent or the history of poverty it is crucial to keep this in mind. Assessing the quality of data in this context is important for many reasons, not least because poverty estimates are used to make important decisions on the allocation of international aid. Indeed, reviewing the many problems of poverty measurement Deaton (2010)¹³ concludes that “probably the most urgent area for the poverty counts is not the [International Comparison Program], but the improvement in the consistency and timeliness of household surveys, and the upgrading of national accounts.” Below we discuss how extreme poverty is measured and what the limitations of available estimates are. But before moving on, we want to stress that even if poverty measurement is imperfect, the estimates do tell us something important about how material living conditions are distributed, and how they change over time. Estimates of extreme poverty are imperfect but not meaningless. They should be used as one more source of information to assess living standards; such as health, education, nutrition, etc.

what is the underlying source of data for World Bank estimates?#

The World Bank is the most important institution measuring the extent of global poverty. This poverty data is published via [Povcal Net](#) and also in the World Development Indicators. Although the World Bank is by far the most important source producing poverty estimates, the coverage of the underlying sources is not as good as one would hope. The following map shows the availability of surveys used to construct the World Bank’s poverty estimates. For all countries that are shown in grey in this map there is not a single survey available to the World Bank in the last 3 decades. Many of these countries are rich countries in which extreme poverty is very low. But there is also missing data for some poorer countries, in which surely a considerable share of the population is living in extreme poverty. As we can also see from this map, there are some countries with very few observations. This is the case for many African countries, where there is only one survey available in the last decade. This is extremely low, even in comparison to Latin America and Central Asia, where many countries have almost annual surveys.

what are the main limitations of the World Bank estimates?#

Ferreira et al (2015)¹⁴ describe in detail the method used for estimating the global poverty figures published in Povcal Net. The poverty estimates are primarily based on household survey data. For the global poverty estimates published in October 2015, the World Bank used income and consumption distribution data “from more than one thousand surveys covering 131 developing countries. The estimates are based on survey interviews of more than 2 million households, representative of 95 percent of the population in the developing world”. These surveys are not carried out by the World Bank, but by the different National Statistical Offices and are therefore designed to be useful for the varying goals of these national offices. The challenge is therefore to harmonize this empirical data that was not designed to be internationally comparable. Here we summarize some of the most important difficulties. **Level of measurement**

The first key issue for the World Bank is that the Povcal data is published in per capita terms, but the national surveys are mostly carried out on the household level. Mix of consumption and income data: The second challenge for harmonizing the data is that the underlying household survey are a mix of income and consumption data. In poor countries, where [many people are self-employed in agriculture](#), consumption is typically much easier to measure in surveys than is income. The table shows that approximately 75 percent of the countries in the PovcalNet database have data on per capita consumption and only a quarter of the countries – mostly in Latin America and the Caribbean – report income per capita data. The fact that the Povcal data is based on these two very different welfare measures is a key weakness of the data and one that is according to Ferreira et al (2015) impossible to correct for; the authors write “indeed, in part because there are few or no fixed, observable patterns in the relationship between income and consumption, no adjustments are made to income or consumption distributions in PovcalNet to make them more comparable.” Comparisons of income and consumption figures has shown that the inequality and poverty level of consumption estimates is lower than of that same economy’s income inequality and income poverty.¹⁵ Income and consumption distributions in PovcalNet for global poverty estimates¹⁶

There is also theoretical and empirical evidence presented by Korinek et al. (2005)¹⁷ showing that as people become richer, they are less likely to respond to surveys. When richer individuals or households are less likely to answer surveys than poor people it has the consequence that survey-based estimates of consumption and income will understate the mean level of prosperity and overstate the share of people in poverty.

Survey design

Questionnaires are designed differently in different countries and these differences matter significantly for the level of measured poverty. For example the recall period for food consumption matters for the assessment of food consumption in a population – research indicates that the reported food consumption is lower if the recall period is longer (for an example on India see Deaton and Kozel (2005)¹⁸ and for a study on how the questionnaire design matters see Beegle et al. (2012)¹⁹). Jolliffe (2001)²⁰ finds that questionnaires with more food items listed report higher food consumption when compared with a questionnaire with fewer items. However, higher consumption totals, as reported in the surveys with a shorter recall period, are not necessarily more accurate as the Indian NSSO Expert Group on Sampling Errors (2003)²¹ found.

Non-available microdata

For six of the 131 countries covered the World Bank relied (in October 2015) on grouped data. According to Ferreira et al (2015) this is because the World Bank was not authorized to share the microdata publicly and it could only rely on the grouped data that refers to quintile or decile shares.

Urban bias

The urban bias in pricing referring to the worry that in price comparisons more expensive goods in urban markets are measured and the often lower prices in rural areas are neglected.

Revisions limiting comparability

The [entry on GDP data](#) explains how adjustments are made for price changes over time (inflation) and between countries (PPP adjustments). For poverty ,

measurements, the revision of PPPs have substantial consequences for the regional distribution but not for the trend over time as Deaton (2010)²² explains: *“The revision from 1985 to 1993 had relatively little effect on the global count but made sub-Saharan Africa appear to be much poorer, and Latin America appear to be much less poor. Indeed, it is the 1993 revision that “established” sub-Saharan Africa as the region with the highest headcount ratio, a fact that has dominated subsequent discussions of world poverty; prior to revision, the measured prevalence of poverty in South Asia was substantially higher than in sub-Saharan Africa. At the time of that revision, I commented that “changes of this size risk swamping real changes, and it seems impossible to make statements about changes in world poverty when the ground underneath one’s feet is changing in this way,” Deaton (2001). The 2005 revision shifts the ground even more. The global count for 1993 jumps by almost half a billion people, the headcount ratio for East Asia doubles, there are substantial increases in Africa and South Asia, and a large reduction in Latin America. The Table shows these numbers for 1993, for which there are estimates using three sets of PPPs, [...]. Let me emphasize that the general trends [...] reappear whichever PPPs and poverty lines are used. The shifting of the ground refers only to the level of global poverty, and to its regional distribution.”*

Regional aggregates and timing of surveys

For individual countries the World Bank publishes poverty estimates only for years in which household survey data is available. For regional and global aggregates however it is necessary to estimate the poverty figures for all countries in a specific year. Ferreira et al (2015)²³ explain that in cases in which survey data before and after that specific year is available the World Bank reports an average weighted by the relative distance from these two surveys. To arrive at data for all countries in a specific year the consumption or income data from the latest survey is extrapolated by using growth rates from the national accounts. In this extrapolation the World Bank assumes distribution-neutral growth (no change in inequality since the last survey). There is some countries for which no poverty estimates are available. Not including these countries in the regional or global aggregates would understate the level of global poverty. To avoid this the average poverty estimate of the world region in which this country is located is then assigned to that country for which no data is available. High-income countries – according to the definition of the World

Bank – are assumed to have no people living in extreme poverty in the global poverty figures published by the World Bank. Ferreira et al (2015) explain that “although some people in rich countries report household per capita incomes that are below the international poverty line, per capita consumption is above this threshold for nearly everyone.” Chandy and Smith (2014) for example find that 1% to 4% of the US population have incomes of less than \$2 a day, but when measured by consumption this share of Americans living with less than 2\$ per day falls to less than 0.1%. The timing of surveys can be problematic for several reasons. Most countries do not have regular annual surveys and to arrive at regional or global estimates for a particular year the World Bank uses data from the National Accounts to fill in the gaps. This makes it particularly problematic to link changes in poverty estimates to current events – such as the financial crisis. It is preferable to study the change of poverty over longer time periods for which the data is based on household surveys. Additionally the timing of survey within a given year can matter for the measurement as for example the food provision varies throughout the year.

National accounts offer an alternative for measuring aggregate deprivation#

The poverty figures published by the World Bank are based on household surveys as explained above. A second possibility to measure poverty is to start from the National Accounts. This is done by using National Accounts data (from the Penn World Tables) combined with inequality measures. This technique was first used by Ahluwalia et al. (1979)²⁴. More recent papers that followed this approach include Bourguignon and Morrison (2002) whose data is shown above. While in theory national account measures of poverty should match those from household surveys, in reality there are often large discrepancies. Deaton (2005)²⁵ reviews the reasons for these discrepancies. How much weight should we give to poverty estimates from national accounts? Economic activity around the world has been shown to correlate with satellite-recorded data on nighttime lights from the surface of the Earth, which are visible from space. This is intuitive, since nighttime lights are mainly generated by human activity – typically lights in buildings and cars.

The following visualization shows how economic activity, as measured by nighttime lights, changed in South Asia between the years 1994 and 2010. We can see that night lights in 2010 cover areas that were unlit in 1994; and there is also a

substantial increase in the intensity of lights in major cities over the same period. This is clearly indicative of the underlying growth in economic activity that South Asia witnessed during this period. Based on this correlation between nighttime lights and economic activity, Pinkovskiy and Sala-i-Martin (2016)²⁶ have evaluated the relative quality of aggregate income data generated by household surveys and national accounts. The intuition for their approach is that, as long as the measurement error in nighttime lights is unrelated to the measurement errors in either national accounts or survey means, one can use nightlights as a tool to see how much weight to give national accounts income estimates (relative to household-survey income estimates) in measuring true income. The authors find that nighttime lights are much better correlated with GDP per capita than with survey means – which suggests, under their assumptions, that the optimal ‘weights’ to calculate aggregate income should be very large for national accounts and very modest for survey means. This is important since, as we have pointed out, there are large discrepancies between estimates generated by household surveys and national accounts.

Data Sources#

Long-term development of global poverty#

Bourguignon and Morrisson (2002)

- **Data:** Several measures of poverty and inequality
- **Geographical coverage:** Global – by world regions/continents
- **Time span:** 1820 to 1992
- **Available at:** The research paper is: Bourguignon and Morrisson (2002) – [Inequality Among World Citizens: 1820–1992](#). In *American Economic Review*, 92, 4, 727–744.
- *These data were used above in the [graph showing the declining share of people living in poverty since 1820](#).*

Economists Xavier Sala-i-Martin and Maxim Pinkovskiy estimated the share of the world population living in absolute poverty.²⁷

An important recent paper on absolute poverty is Chen and Ravallion (2010) – [The Developing World is Poorer than We Thought, But No Less Successful in the Fight Against Poverty](#). In *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125, 4, 1577–1625.

Data on global poverty in recent decades#

World Bank

- **Data:** Several measures of absolute poverty.
- **Geographical coverage:** Global – by country and world region.
- **Time span:** Since 1980
- **Available at:** World Bank’s [PovcalNet](#) – an interactive tool which visualizes absolute poverty and makes the data available for download.
- *There is a [collection of World Bank articles about declining poverty](#).*
- *The World Bank data on extreme poverty (% of people below 1.25\$ a day) is also [available on Gapminder](#) where the relationship with other measures of wellbeing can be visualised.*

Data on the sub-national level (with huge coverage!) is [available from the World Bank](#). These are data on the poverty headcount – at national poverty line, urban poverty line, and the rural poverty line.

Footnotes

1. Deaton (2010) – [Price Indexes, Inequality, and the Measurement of World Poverty](#). In *American Economic Review*, 100, 1, 5–34.
2. This is taken from Deaton (2010) – [Price Indexes, Inequality, and the Measurement of World Poverty](#). In *American Economic Review*, 100, 1, 5–34. The lightly-shaded circles are for 2006, the darker circles for 2007, and the darkest circles are for 2008.
3. Bourguignon, François and Christian Morrisson. 2002. “Inequality among World Citizens: 1820-1992.” *American Economic Review*, 92(4): 727-744. DOI: 10.1257/00028280260344443 freely online [here](#).

4. According to the World Bank estimates shown here this was the global population in extreme poverty:

1990: 1,959,798,348 people

2015: 705,549,322 people

This is a decline by 1,254,249,026 people in 25 years.

Annual decline (on average): 50,169,961 people

Daily decline (on average): 137,452

5. Ravalli on, Martin – Poverty in the Rich World When It Was Not Nearly So Rich. CGD; Online [here](#).

For more also see Ravalli on (2015) – The Economics of Poverty: History, Measurement, Policy. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press. The book's website is [here](#).

6. The survey was conducted by MotivationInt and is available for [download](#). Oxfam published [this summary](#) of the survey results.
7. The data is taken from Hans Rosling (2013) – [Highlights from Ignorance survey in the UK](#) published at Gapminder.org.
8. We have calculated these figures based on the data on the share of people in extreme poverty (downloaded in October 2016).

Incomes are adjusted for the different price levels and are expressed in ppp-adjusted 2011 International-Dollars. For each country we have used the PovCal estimate for 2013; not all of these estimates are based on a survey in that year, some are instead interpolated between surveys.

The population figures were taken from the [World Development Indicators](#) and refer to the year 2013.

9. This graph is taken from [The Economist](#).

10. Ahluwalia, Montek S., Nicholas G. Carter, and Hollis B. Chenery. 1979. "[Growth and Poverty in Developing Countries.](#)" *Journal of Development Economics*, 6(3): 299–341.
11. Van Praag, Bernard M. S. 1968. *Individual Welfare Functions and Consumer Behavior*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
12. Stevenson, Betsey, and Justin Wolfers. 2008. "[Economic Growth and Subjective Well-Being: Reassessing the Easterlin Paradox.](#)" *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2008: 1–87.
13. Angus Deaton (2010) – [Price Indexes, Inequality, and the Measurement of World Poverty](#). *American Economic Review*, 100(1): 5-34. DOI: 10.1257/aer.100.1.5
14. Francisco H. G. Ferreira, Shaohua Chen, Andrew Dabalen, Yuri Dikhanov, Nada Hamadeh, Dean Jolliffe, Ambar Narayan, Espen Beer Prydz, Ana Revenga, Prem Sangraula, Umar Serajuddin, Nobuo Yoshida (2015) – [A Global Count of the Extreme Poor in 2012: Data Issues, Methodology and Initial Results](#). Poverty Global Practice Group & Development Data and Research Groups. October 2015.
15. Christoph Lakner and Branko Milanovic (2013) – [Global Income Distribution: From the Fall of the Berlin Wall to the Great Recession](#).
16. Francisco H. G. Ferreira, Shaohua Chen, Andrew Dabalen, Yuri Dikhanov, Nada Hamadeh, Dean Jolliffe, Ambar Narayan, Espen Beer Prydz, Ana Revenga, Prem Sangraula, Umar Serajuddin, Nobuo Yoshida (2015) – [A Global Count of the Extreme Poor in 2012: Data Issues, Methodology and Initial Results](#). Poverty Global Practice Group & Development Data and Research Groups. October 2015. The authors note: This does not include distributions from high income countries available in the Luxembourg Income study and/or other databases. *The overview for 2012 shows only one distribution per country. For a few countries where there is no distribution for 2012, but both before and after, two distributions are used to interpolate the 2012 estimate.

17. Korinek, Anton, Johan Mistiaen and Martin Ravallion. “[Survey Nonresponse and the Distribution of Income](#)” *Journal of Economic Inequality* 4 (2006) no. 2: 33-55.
18. Deaton, A. and Kozel, V. 2005a. “[Data and Dogma: The Great Indian Poverty Debate](#)” *The World Bank Research Observer* 20 (2): 177–99. doi:10.1093/wbro/lki009.
19. Beegle, K., De Weerd, J., Friedman, J., and Gibson, J. 2012. “[Methods of Household Consumption Measurement through Surveys: Experimental Results from Tanzania](#)” *Journal of Development Economics* 98 (1): 3–18.
20. Jolliffe, D. (2001) – “[Measuring Absolute and Relative Poverty: The Sensitivity of Estimated Household Consumption to Survey Design](#)” *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement*. Volume 27 (Numbers 1-2): 1–23.
21. NSSO Expert Group on Sampling Errors, “[Suitability of Different Reference Periods for Measuring Household Consumption: Results of a Pilot Study](#)” *Economic and Political Weekly* (January 25, 2003), 307–321.
22. Angus Deaton (2010) – [Price Indexes, Inequality, and the Measurement of World Poverty](#). *American Economic Review*, 100(1): 5-34. DOI: 10.1257/aer.100.1.5
23. Francisco H. G. Ferreira, Shaohua Chen, Andrew Dabalen, Yuri Dikhanov, Nada Hamadeh, Dean Jolliffe, Ambar Narayan, Espen Beer Prydz, Ana Revenga, Prem Sangraula, Umar Serajuddin, Nobuo Yoshida (2015) – [A Global Count of the Extreme Poor in 2012: Data Issues, Methodology and Initial Results](#). Poverty Global Practice Group & Development Data and Research Groups. October 2015.
24. Ahluwalia, Montek S., Nicholas G. Carter, and Hollis B. Chenery. 1979. “[Growth and Poverty in Developing Countries](#)” *Journal of Development Economics*, 6(3): 299–341.
25. Deaton, Angus (2005) “[Measuring Poverty in a Growing World \(or Measuring Growth in a Poor World\)](#)” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 87(1): 1–19.

26. Maxim Pinkovskiy and Xavier Sala-i-Martin (2016) – Lights, Camera ...
Income! Illuminating the National Accounts-Household Surveys Debate.
The Quarterly Journal of Economics (2016) 131 (2): 579-631. doi:
10.1093/qje/qjw003 Online
at <http://qje.oxfordjournals.org/content/131/2/579.full?etoc>

27. Their research can be found in Sala-i-Martin & Pinkovskiy – [Parametric estimations of the world distribution of income](#). Published on VoxEU on 22 January 2010.

Our World In Data is an online publication that presents the empirical evidence on the development of human living conditions at a global scale.

[Entries](#)[Blog](#)[Donate](#)[About](#)[Login](#)

We are supported by the [generous donations of readers](#). Without these donations our work would not be possible. Thank you!

OWID is developed at the [Oxford Martin School](#):



OWID is also supported by [INET Oxford](#):



Institute for New Economic Thinking

AT THE OXFORD MARTIN SCHOOL

And the [Nuffield Foundation](#):

The Nuffield Foundation is an endowed charitable trust that aims to improve social well-being in the widest sense. It has funded this project, but the views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the foundation.

The statistics of poverty in world

World Poverty Statistics

Share This Data

[Share](#)[Google](#) [Gmail](#)[Pinterest](#)[Reddit](#)[Google+](#)[Twitter](#)[Facebook](#)

World Poverty Statistics	Data
Total Percentage of World Population that lives on less than \$2.50 a day	50%
Total number of people that live on less than \$2.50 a day	3 Billion
Total Percentage of People that live on less than \$10 a day	80%
Total percent of World Populations that live where income differentials are widening	80%
Total Percentage of World Income the richest 20% account for	75%

Total Number of children that die each day due to Poverty	22,000
Total Number of People in Developing Countries with Inadequate Access to Water	1.1 billion
Total Number of School Days lost to Water Related Illness	443 million school days
Child World Poverty Statistics	
Number of children in the world	2.2 billion
Number of Children that live in Poverty	1 billion
Total Number of Children that live without adequate shelter	640 million (1 in 3)
Total Number of Children without access to safe water	400 million (1 in 5)
Total Number of Children with no access to Health Services	270 million (1 in 7)
Total Number of Children who die annually from lack of access to safe drinking water and adequate sanitation	1.4 million

ADVERTISEMENT

Poverty to Wealthy Ratio Statistics	
Year	Ratio of People at Poverty to Wealthy Level

2015	89 to 1
2013	88 to 1
1992	72 to 1
1973	44 to 1
1950	35 to 1
1913	11 to 1
1820	3 to 1
<u>PREV DATA SET</u>	
<u>NEXT DATA SET</u>	

Statistic Sources & References

*FREE SHIPPING ON ORDERS OVER \$75**

Does not include tax or apply to wholesale orders. Economy Ground Shipping. We believe that in order to end poverty, we must empower women to transform their lives. We do this through business training and mentoring, and we're good at it. We have found that for women to successfully move out of poverty, what they need is confidence and business skills. Our model allows them to leave poverty behind...for good.

Why Women and Entrepreneurship?

- It allows women to solve their own problems.
- It creates dignity, ownership and self-sufficiency.
- It can be scaled globally.

- It creates lasting opportunities for women to lift their families out of poverty.

Increasing women's income:

- Reduces poverty
- Spurs investment in children
- Creates greater self-esteem
- Increases bargaining power
- Reduces domestic violence



BeadforLife has a dozen years of experience helping women living in poverty become self-sustaining entrepreneurs. Our [Street Business School](#) is a 6-month, mobile classroom in which women receive entrepreneurial training and mentoring to help them create a successful business. It focuses on helping women build their confidence and belief in themselves, while giving them the skills and knowledge to start businesses that will sustain their families. This is a cost-effective and scalable opportunity for women living in poverty to become successful business owners. BeadforLife jewelry and other products are also produced by empowered business women! To create our beautiful products, BeadforLife works with women who have graduated from our business training program, and who are outstanding artisans. We also occasionally partner with organized groups of women who know

how to make beads, but have struggled to sell them. For these groups, BeadforLife provides both a market for their products, and an offer to their members to attend Street Business School. The purchase of our products not only provides increased income for the artisan to meet their immediate needs, it also allows us to offer our business training to other women. And, of course, our products make [beautiful gifts](#) with meaning - for you or a friend. We're taking this proven poverty eradication program to the world! We will partner with organizations around the globe to share the Street Business School, so that we can ignite the lives of one million women! more. [READ](#)



OUR MODEL WORKS

GET INVOLVED

Every purchase you make supports our programs so that we can continue to provide life-changing training for women living in poverty. Host a BeadforLife Marketplace to make a major impact by sharing our story and raising revenue to fight extreme poverty. We accept donations that help support our programs and the women we serve.