









schools and facilities. So this expand the inequality between poor and non poor. It is the question where to invest to improve the performance of enrollment students, to increase attendance or to increase the access of excluded group.

Shenggen Fan (2008) shows that targeted education subsidies can be a very cost-effective way of making education more accessible to children from the poorest households [4]. Once a basic level of quality is attained, intensive expansion is more likely to have an effect on improving student performance than on increasing enrollment and is thus likely to be only slightly progressive even if confined to primary education.

An important indicator that influences the attendance of the school is the household education history. This means that if parents have had the chance to be educated than also they will send the children at school. This is related with possibilities but also with mentality. Also development of the society is related with education of the mother or the females in the household, infrastructure and quality of the education; etc.

The education level or having the possibility of taking necessary education is influenced by income level. The percentage of expenditures for education is increased by years but still remains low compared with other those categories. The average cost of education in Albania was 177 lek/person in 2002, 275 lek/person in 2005, 432 leke/person in 2008, and 338 lek/person in 2012. The highest quintile (the fourth and fifth) have more expenditures for education and non-food products compare with lowest quintiles where the highest share of per capita consumption goes for food. Also, the lowest quintiles tend to have more expenditure to have basic utilities compared with the individuals that are on the top (Table A1).

As the health sector, the informality in the education sector influence the poor and the most vulnerable part of the society. The main source of informal payment are in cash, in kind or services or also indirect way through courses. As not all individuals could pay for informal payment so the poor are more affected and could be socially excluded [15]. Being education has an important role for poverty reduction and to pass the poverty line. Being without education have more chances to feel as poor but also to have less access in the basic needs and to fall in poverty and bad living condition. During the increase of education level the chances to be non-monetary poor decreases. Being without completed education has 8.5 chances to be non-monetary poor and 6.7 chances to be subjectively poor (significant in 0.1%, Table A2).

### 3.3 Access in Basic Needs

Albania has made a good progress as regards to housing and improvement of dwelling condition. The internal migration and also emigration have influenced social indicators and also the geographic differences related with dwelling conditions. Figures show an increase of surface or decrease the percentage of people that live in overcrowded household, this both for poor and non poor.

The analyse of data shows that as monetary poverty measured by consumption have been decreasing until 2008 but it is turned up in 2012, the non-monetary poverty is still high but lower than the objective poverty. The infrastructure related with basic services like having adequate water supply and sanitation, keeping home in the good condition and adequate warm are still in the risk to worry about. So some individuals do not have the possibility to have a minimum consumption not being poor but they also do not have necessary basic needs and this affect a deply inequality and possibility that poors being in a "trap". Still in some areas it is not possible to have running water inside the dwelling. This is related with a not efficient allocation of the resources and the investments.

The poverty and non having access in basic needs is influenced by household and individual characteristics like gender, age, perception for health, employment, and household composition. Being male have more chances to be non-monetary poor but also subjectively poor (significant at  $p=0.1\%$ ). Also the gender of the head have an important influence in the probability of being non-income measure of poverty. Being a female head have 1.5 chances to be poor compared with the other category of the people. Civil status have an important role in the concept of the poverty and also in the non-monetary poverty. Being married or live together with the partner have less chances to be poor but it happen the oposite if the individuals are divorced. Being divorcet have more chances to me non-monetary and subjectively poor compared with single persons. Having elder people at home means less chances to be poor (Table A2).

## 4. Conclusion

Another important measure of poverty is non-monetary aspect of the poverty and factors that influence on it. Measuring this indicator and possible indicators that influence in the non-monetary dimensions of poverty is an important tool for long-term living condition. To increase the opportunities for the poor, focusing attention should be paid to increasing access of the poor to education and health services, infrastructure services in urban, rural and regional etc mainly in mountainous areas. The poverty is influenced by household and individual characteristics like gender, age, perception for health, employment, and household composition. The study of these factors and identification of the groups that are at risk of poverty and with very poor living conditions will make possible the efficiency of public spending on the target group. The lower is education level, being divorced, being male, not in Tirana region, being sick or having bad health conditions means more chances to be poor.

## References

- [1] Alexandre Marc and Zeynep Kudatgobilik, the World Bank, (2002), "Poverty and Informality in South East Europe"
- [2] Oxford University Press (1997), HUMAN DEVELOPMENT REPORT 1997 Published for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

- [3] M.H.Mukarama, A.R.Zakariah and N.Azali (2008), "Public Expenditure and Income Inequality in Malaysia"
- [4] Shenggen Fan, (2008), "Public Expenditures, Growth and Poverty: Lessons from Developing Countries".
- [5] Martin Ravallion and Benu Bidani (1994), "How Robust Is a Poverty Profile?", The World Bank Economic Review, 8(1): 75-102.
- [6] World Bank (2003), "Albania Poverty Assessment".
- [7] Foster, J., J. Greer and E. Thorbecke, (1984), "A class of decomposable poverty measures", Econometrica, 52, 761-766
- [8] INSTAT (2013), "Trends in poverty 2002-2005-2008-2012", www.instat.gov.al
- [9] World Bank, (2010), "Overview, understanding, measuring and overcoming poverty", <http://www.colorado.edu/philosophy/heathwood/pdf/worlbank.pdf>
- [10] World health organization (2012): "Dying for Change: Poor People's Experience of Health and Ill-Health," World Bank publication,
- [11] <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPAH/Resources/Publications/Dying-forchange/dyifull2.pdf>
- [12] Caryn Bredenkamp, Mariapia Mendola and Michele Gagnolati (2010), "Catastrophic and impoverishing effects of health expenditure: new evidence from the Western Balkans".
- [13] S. M Tomini, T. G Packard and F. Tomini, (2012), "Catastrophic and impoverishing effects of out-of-pocket payments for health care in Albania .
- [14] Maureen Lewis, (2010), "Informal Payments and the Financing of Health Care in Developing and Transition Countries".
- [15] UN (2010), "Albania National Report on Progress Toward Achieving the Millennium Development Goals".
- [16] Marc, A., and Z. Kudatgobilik (2003), "Poverty and Informality in Southeast Europe", Center for the Study of Democracy.
- [17] Institute of Statistics of Albania (INSTAT), (2014) Database and tables online at: <http://www.instat.gov.al/>
- [18] : evidence from Albania Living Standards Measurement Surveys 2002, 2005 and 2008".

ANNEX

**Table A1:** Ndarja e buxhetit të familjes sipas percentileve

Per capita consumption	Quintile of per capita consumption 2012				
	Lowest	2	3	4	Highest
Food	63.8	60.8	58.4	56.5	53.0
Non-food	13.1	17.2	20.1	22.3	27.3
Education	2.6	3.0	3.4	3.8	4.4
Durables	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8
Utilities	20.1	18.5	17.6	16.8	14.6

Source: Author's calculation based on Living Standard Measurement Survey, LSMS 2012

**Table A2:** Logistic regression on determinants of non-monetary poverty and subjective poverty

		Y1= Non-monetary poverty			Y2=Subjective poverty		
		B	Std. E	Odds ratio	B	Std. E	Odds ratio
	Intercept	-2,520	,017		-3,103	,016	
Area	Rural	,566	,005	1,761***	-,031	,005	,969***
	Urban	0(b)	.	.	0(b)	.	.
Region	Central	,206	,008	1,228***	,046	,007	1,047***
	Coastal	,100	,008	1,105***	,116	,007	1,123***
	Mountain	,136	,010	1,145***	,013	,009	1,013
	Tirana	0(b)	.	.	0(b)	.	.
Suffer from any chronic disease	Yes	,023	,007	1,023***	-,091	,007	,913***
	No	0(b)	.	.	0(b)	.	.
Health condition	Very good	-,586	,007	,557***	-,311	,007	,732***
	Bad	0(b)	.	.	0(b)	.	.
Health condition compared with previous year	Much better	-,097	,005	,907***	-,328	,004	,720***
	The same or worst	0(b)	.	.	0(b)	.	.
Civil status	Married	-,066	,005	,936***	,037	,005	1,038***
	Divorced/separated	,801	,019	2,228***	,823	,017	2,277***
	Living together	-,944	,059	,389***	-,668	,056	,513***
	Widow	-,902	,012	,406***	-,343	,011	,710***
Gender of head	Single	0(b)	.	.	0(b)	.	.
	Female	,440	,008	1,553***	,354	,008	1,425***
Elderly people	Male	0(b)	.	.	0(b)	.	.
	0	,141	,006	1,151***	,457	,006	1,580***
Household size	1	,211	,007	1,235***	,139	,007	1,150***
	2+	0(b)	.	.	0(b)	.	.
	1	,485	,031	1,624***	,587	,026	1,799***
	2	-,544	,010	,580***	,295	,008	1,343***
Number of children	3	-,313	,008	,731***	,173	,007	1,188***
	4+	0(b)	.	.	0(b)	.	.
	0	-,728	,007	,483***	-,308	,008	,735***
	1	-,724	,007	,485***	-,172	,008	,842***
3+	2	-,600	,007	,549***	,129	,008	1,137***
	0(b)	.	.	.	0(b)	.	.

Education	Without completed education	2,147	,015	8,555***	1,910	,014	6,752***
	Basic education	1,520	,013	4,572***	1,493	,011	4,449***
	Secondary	,279	,014	1,322***	,993	,011	2,700***
	Higher	0(b)	.	.	0(b)	.	.
$\wedge$ Logjistic regression: Y=1 $\rightarrow$ poor and Y=0 $\rightarrow$ non poor, as a reference category is used Y=0 $\wedge\wedge$ The significance level: *** p<0.001, **p < 0.01, * p< 0.05, +p < 0							

### Author Profile

**Ruzhdie Bici** received an university degree in Economics in 2007 at the University of Tirana, Albania. She takes a Msc in European Economic Studies and now is attending the Phd for Economics in the same university. After graduation have worked in Institute of Statistics of Albania and as a assistant professor at the University of Tirana.

