Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud. 2025; 5(6):1386-1394

Received: 29-10-2025
Accepted: 09-12-2025

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Analyzing Household Wealth Inequality: Case Study of Lusaka

[1] **Ngosa M George**, [2] **Kabubi M Marvin**

[1] School of Humanities, Information and Communication University and Zambia Research and Development Center, Lusaka, Zambia

[2] Department of Social Research, Information and Communications University and Zambia Research and Development Center, Lusaka, Zambia

Corresponding Author: **Ngosa M George**

Abstract

This study analyzes household wealth inequality in Lusaka, an issue of critical importance to economic stability and social equity in Zambia. The research investigates how disparities in wealth are shaped by household demographics, income determinants, and the employment status of household heads. The general objective is to examine the distribution and key drivers of wealth inequality among Lusaka households. Specifically, the study: (1) explores the effects of demographic factors such as age, gender, household size, and education level on wealth inequality, analyzing how these attributes influence wealth accumulation; (2) examines the impact of income determinants, including income sources, levels, and variability, on wealth disparities; and (3) evaluates the role of household heads' employment status, focusing on job security, type of employment (formal vs. informal), and income stability in shaping wealth inequality. Employing a quantitative approach, the study uses econometric techniques to analyze nationally representative survey data, ensuring comprehensive and accurate findings. Results reveal the complex interplay of demographic, income-related, and employment factors in driving household wealth disparities. These findings highlight critical areas for policy intervention, such as promoting income diversification, enhancing employment stability, and expanding access to education. This research provides a foundation for evidence-based strategies to reduce wealth inequality and foster equitable economic growth in Zambia.

Keywords: Household Wealth Inequality, Demographics, Income Determinants, Employment Status, Wealth Distribution, Economic Disparities

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Wealth inequality is the uneven distribution of assets, such as real estate, stocks, and other financial investments, among individuals in a population. Unlike income inequality, which measures the flow of money over time, wealth inequality focuses on the accumulation of resources, making it a more enduring indicator of economic advantage. Wealth enables social and economic mobility by facilitating investments in education, healthcare, and a stable living standard. However, its concentration creates barriers to equal opportunities, perpetuates poverty, and limits upward mobility for future generations (Keister & Moller, 2000 [4]; Piketty & Zucman, 2015).

Historically, wealth inequality was pronounced in the 19th and early 20th centuries, particularly in Western nations, declined mid-20th century, and resurged after the 1970s. In the U.S., this resurgence marked a “new Gilded Age,” characterized by extreme wealth concentration among elites (Keister & Moller, 2000) [4]. While early economic analyses considered wealth central to inequality, later studies prioritized income, leading to an incomplete understanding of economic disparities. Nevertheless, wealth profoundly influences social outcomes. Studies reveal that parental wealth, independent of income, strongly predicts children’s educational attainment and social mobility (Bonini, 2007 [1]; Filmer & Pritchett, 2004).

Wealth also acts as a buffer during economic shocks, such as unemployment or illness, particularly in nations with limited social safety nets (Skopek *et al.*, 2014) [10]. Furthermore, its intergenerational transmission reinforces advantages, making wealth inequality self-perpetuating (Charles & Hurst, 2003; Pfeffer, 2018 [6]). Wealth inequality also concentrates political influence, enabling elites to shape policies that maintain their dominance, thereby compounding disparities over time.

Thomas Piketty's Capital in the Twenty-First Century (2013) emphasized that when returns on capital outpace economic growth, wealth inequality intensifies. This phenomenon, driven by both inheritance and labor market earnings, underscores the need to examine wealth's composition and the policies influencing its distribution (Meade, 1975; Semyonov *et al*., 2013).
Addressing wealth inequality requires understanding its causes, including income disparities, education gaps, and policy frameworks. By evaluating targeted interventions, policymakers can mitigate these inequities. Wealth inequality shapes economic and social outcomes, reinforcing cycles of disadvantage and affecting societal stability. A comprehensive focus on wealth is essential for crafting equitable policies that promote social and economic well-being.

1.2 State of the Problem
Household wealth inequality is a critical indicator of broader economic disparities within a society. Recent studies reveal a growing concentration of wealth among a small elite, leaving many marginalized with minimal assets and economic insecurity. This inequality undermines social cohesion, economic stability, and access to opportunities, perpetuating cycles of poverty and hindering social mobility. Wealth inequality also affects political power dynamics, enabling wealthier individuals and groups to influence policy-making, often at the expense of the broader population. Key drivers of wealth inequality include disparities in income, education, inheritance, and access to financial resources. Intergenerational wealth transmission further entrenches these inequalities, widening the gap between affluent and less wealthy households over time. Public policies significantly impact these disparities, yet their effectiveness in reducing wealth inequality remains insufficiently explored. This research aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of household wealth inequality by examining its determinants, mapping its distribution, and evaluating policy strategies to foster equitable economic growth and social justice.

1.3 Research Objectives
1.3.1 General Objective
To analyze household wealth inequality in Zambia.
1.3.2 Specific Objectives
1. To analyze effects of household demographics on household wealth inequality.
2. To establish effects of household income determinants on household wealth inequality.
3. To examine effects of employment status of head of household on household inequality.

1.4 Research Questions
1. How do various demographic factors such as age, gender, and education level of the household members influence household wealth inequality?
2. What are the effects of household income determinants, including income sources, levels, and variability, on household wealth inequality?
3. How does the employment status of the household head, including factors such as job security, employment type, and income stability, influence household wealth inequality?

1.5 Theoretical Framework
Household wealth inequality arises from complex interactions of economic, social, and political factors, as explained by classical, Marxian, and neoclassical economic theories. Thomas Piketty's Capital in the Twenty-First Century (2013) highlights how wealth inequality intensifies when returns on capital exceed economic growth. Classical theories attribute wealth disparities to productivity, while Marxian perspectives link them to capitalist exploitation, benefiting a small elite at laborers' expense (Marx, 1967). In contrast, neoclassical theories emphasize individual choices, savings, and investments in shaping wealth distribution (Meade, 1975).
Key determinants of wealth inequality include differences in human capital (education and skills), access to financial markets, and intergenerational wealth transfers, which entrench economic advantages for certain groups while excluding others (Oliver & Shapiro, 1995; Pfeffer & Killewald, 2018). Public policies, such as progressive taxation, universal education, affordable healthcare, and welfare programs, are critical for reducing disparities and fostering upward mobility (Chetty *et al*., 2014).
Sociological theories expand the understanding of wealth inequality by examining the role of social and cultural capital. Social networks can either enhance access to resources or reinforce exclusion based on group membership (Bourdieu, 1986). Institutional discrimination, particularly along gender and racial lines, further exacerbates inequality by limiting access to wealth-building opportunities (Charles & Hurst, 2003; Semyonov *et al*., 2013).
Comparative and longitudinal studies reveal that economic cycles, technological advancements, and policy shifts significantly influence wealth distribution. For example, periods of industrialization and economic liberalization often lead to greater wealth concentration (Piketty & Zucman, 2015).
This framework synthesizes these perspectives to provide a comprehensive understanding of household wealth inequality. Addressing structural factors and implementing effective policy measures is essential to achieving equitable wealth distribution and ensuring economic and social stability.

2. Literature Review
The literature review systematically examines wealth inequality by following the thematic areas outlined in the objectives: household demographics, household income determinants, and the employment status of household heads. Each section explores the interplay of these factors with wealth distribution and their broader socioeconomic implications.
Household demographics have a profound influence on wealth inequality, as attributes such as age, gender, education, marital status, and family size shape households' ability to accumulate wealth. Age is a critical factor, with younger households typically holding fewer assets due to limited earning years and compounding growth, while older households benefit from accumulated investments (Modigliani & Brumberg, 1954) [28]. Gender disparities further exacerbate wealth inequality, as women often face restricted access to property, inheritance, and equitable wages, especially in societies with entrenched patriarchal norms (Doss *et al*., 2015 [23]; Charles & Hurst, 2003).

Education is another determinant, as higher levels of educational attainment enable greater income-earning potential and wealth-building, whereas limited access to quality education perpetuates inequality across generations (Pfeffer & Killewald, 2018; Chetty *et al*., 2014). Family size also affects wealth accumulation, with larger households often facing resource dilution, reducing their capacity to invest in wealth-generating assets (Oliver & Shapiro, 1995). Addressing these demographic disparities requires targeted interventions to ensure equitable access to resources and opportunities, thereby fostering a more inclusive wealth distribution.

Income determinants, including education, occupation, industry, geographic location, and access to financial markets, significantly influence wealth inequality. Education and skills are foundational to income generation, with disparities in educational access and quality translating into long-term earning gaps and wealth disparities (Chetty *et al*., 2014; Filmer & Pritchett, 2004). Occupational and industry-related differences further exacerbate inequality, as higher-paying sectors often provide income stability and benefits like pensions, while informal and low-paying jobs lack these advantages (Semyonov *et al*., 2013). Geographic location also plays a role, with urban households typically having better access to high-income jobs and financial services, while rural households face limited opportunities and income stagnation (Kanbur & Venables, 2005) [25]. Access to financial markets deepens this divide, as wealthier households can invest in high-yield assets, while low-income households often lack the capital or credit access to participate, further entrenching wealth gaps (Piketty, 2013; Meade, 1975). Effective policies to reduce income-based wealth disparities must focus on equitable access to education, fair income distribution, and financial inclusion for marginalized groups.

The employment status of the household head is a critical determinant of wealth inequality, affecting income stability and access to wealth-building opportunities. Stable, full-time employment provides households with consistent income streams, enabling investments in housing, education, and savings for retirement, which are fundamental to wealth accumulation (Semyonov *et al*., 2013; Charles & Hurst, 2003). Conversely, unemployment leads to financial insecurity, depleting savings and exacerbating wealth disparities (Piketty & Zucman, 2015). Self-employment outcomes vary, offering wealth-building potential for some but often exposing others to income volatility and limited access to safety nets (Marx, 1967). Underemployment further compounds the issue, as low-wage part-time or informal work reduces earning capacity and limits opportunities for long-term wealth creation (Chetty *et al*., 2014). The employment status of household heads is closely tied to systemic factors such as education, labor market dynamics, and social policies. Addressing these disparities requires promoting stable and equitable employment opportunities and implementing structural reforms to enable inclusive economic participation.

By systematically analyzing wealth inequality through these thematic areas, this literature review provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the complex interplay of demographic, income, and employment factors. This approach aligns with the study's objectives and underscores the need for targeted policies to address wealth disparities effectively.

3. Research Methodology

This section outlines the research methodology employed in the study, focusing on the analysis of household wealth inequality in relation to household demographics, income determinants, and the employment status of the head of household. The methodology was designed to address the research objectives systematically, ensuring a comprehensive examination of the factors contributing to wealth inequality.

3.1 Research design

The research employed a descriptive research design aimed at analyzing household wealth inequality. A research design is defined as the overall strategy that outlines the integration of different components of a study in a coherent and logical way, ensuring the research problem is effectively addressed (Creswell, 2014) [37]. This design was chosen because it allowed for a comprehensive examination of the distribution of wealth across different socio-economic groups, as well as an investigation into the factors contributing to wealth inequality. The descriptive approach facilitated the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, which provided a detailed understanding of wealth disparities within the study area (Babbie, 2020) [34].

3.2 Sampling design

The study utilized a stratified random sampling technique to ensure that various socio-economic groups were adequately represented in the sample. Sampling is defined as the process of selecting a portion of the population to represent the entire population in a study, facilitating the efficient collection of data and analysis (Taherdoost, 2016) [44]. The population was divided into strata based on income levels, educational attainment, employment status, and other relevant demographic factors. From each stratum, a random sample was drawn to participate in the study. This method was used to capture a diverse range of households, thereby allowing for a more accurate assessment of wealth inequality (Etikan & Bala, 2017) [38].

3.3 Target population

The target population for this research comprised households within the selected study area, with a particular focus on different socio-economic groups. A target population is defined as the entire group of individuals, objects, or events that share common characteristics relevant to the research objectives (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003) [41]. The study targeted households across various income brackets, educational levels, and employment statuses to ensure a comprehensive analysis of wealth distribution and inequality. The population also included households of varying sizes and compositions to account for the influence of family structure on wealth accumulation (Kothari, 2004) [40].

3.4 Data collection method

Data collection was conducted using a combination of primary and secondary sources. Data collection is defined as the systematic process of gathering information relevant to the research questions from a variety of sources (Creswell, 2014) [37]. Primary data was gathered through structured questionnaires administered to the selected households, while secondary data was obtained from existing records, reports, and databases related to household wealth and income. This mixed-methods approach enabled the collection of both quantitative data on household assets, income, and liabilities, as well as qualitative insights into the factors influencing wealth distribution (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010) [45].

3.5 Data collection tools
The primary tool for data collection was a structured questionnaire, which was designed to capture detailed information on household demographics, income sources, asset ownership, liabilities, and other relevant variables. A structured questionnaire is defined as a data collection instrument consisting of predetermined questions that are presented in a fixed order to all participants, allowing for systematic collection of data (Bryman, 2016) [36]. The questionnaire included both closed and open-ended questions to allow for quantitative analysis and qualitative exploration of wealth inequality. Additionally, interview guides were used to gather in-depth qualitative data from key informants, including policymakers, economists, and community leaders (Patton, 2015) [42].

3.6 Data analysis
Data analysis was carried out using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Data analysis refers to the process of inspecting, cleaning, transforming, and modeling data to discover useful information, draw conclusions, and support decision-making (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2019) [43]. Quantitative data were analyzed using statistical software to generate descriptive statistics, such as means, medians, and percentages, which provided an overview of wealth distribution among different socio-economic groups. Inferential statistics, including regression analysis and correlation, were used to examine the relationships between various factors, such as income, education, and wealth inequality (Field, 2013) [39]. Qualitative data were analyzed thematically to identify recurring patterns and themes related to wealth distribution and the factors contributing to inequality (Braun & Clarke, 2006) [35].

3.7 Limitations
The study faced several limitations, including potential biases in self-reported data, which may have affected the accuracy of the information collected. Bias in self-reported data refers to systematic errors introduced when respondents provide inaccurate or untruthful information, often due to recall issues or social desirability (Podsakoff *et al*., 2003). Additionally, the reliance on cross-sectional data limited the ability to examine changes in wealth distribution over time. Cross-sectional data refers to data collected at a single point in time, which does not allow for the analysis of trends or changes (Creswell, 2014) [37]. Another limitation was the challenge of capturing informal income and wealth, which is common in the study area but often underreported. Informal income refers to earnings that are not officially recorded or regulated by the government, making them difficult to capture accurately (Chen *et al*., 2005). Despite these limitations, the study provided valuable insights into household wealth inequality and highlighted areas for future research.

4. Results/Findings
This chapter presents the research findings based on the data collected during the study on household wealth inequality. The analysis focused on the key variables affecting wealth distribution, such as household demographics, income determinants, and the employment status of the head of the household. The discussion interpreted these findings in relation to the research objectives and existing literature on wealth inequality.

4.1 Presentation of results on household demographics characteristics of results
This section examined the relationship between household demographics (such as age, gender, education level, and household size) and wealth inequality.

Table 4.1.1: Relationship between household head's profession and tertiary education among household members

Professional of the household head	Household members have completed tertiary eductaion 1	2	3	4	Total
1	1	3	2	4	10
2	1	10	14	6	31
3	0	5	2	2	9
Total	2	18	18	12	50

Table 4.1.1 reveals a positive correlation between the professional status of the household head and the number of household members with tertiary education. Households led by individuals with higher professional status tend to have more members with higher education, with 62% of those with a professional status of 2 reporting at least one member with tertiary education, compared to 44% for status 3 and 20% for status 1. Additionally, 72% of individuals with tertiary education live in households led by professionals. These findings suggest that policies promoting education and professional development should focus on households with lower professional status to help reduce educational disparities.

Table 4.1.2: Descriptive analysis of household composition and characteristics

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
childrenun~y	50	2.92	.7782765	1	4
adults1864~d	50	2.16	.8171628	1	4
elderly65i~r	50	1.12	.435187	0	3
maritalsta~d	50	5.02	1.584234	2	8
household~ze	50	4.82	1.320019	1	8
relationsh~d	50	1.52	.9527618	1	4
typeofarea~n	50	1	0	1	1

The data from 50 sampled households reveals a range of family structures, with an average household size of 4.82 members, including 2.92 children, 2.16 working-age adults, and 1.12 elderly members. Household sizes varied between 1 and 8 members, with most households being multi-generational, containing spouses, children, and some extended family or non-relatives. The marital status of household heads showed varied family dynamics. All households were located in the same geographic area, implying shared environmental and socioeconomic factors that could affect access to resources. These insights highlight the need for policies that support dependents, enhance economic participation, and ensure equitable resource distribution in similar settings.

Table 4.1.3: Gender distribution of respondents

Gender	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Female	19	38.00	38.00
Male	31	62.00	100.00
Total	50	100.00	

Table 4.1.3 shows that among the 50 respondents, 62% (31 individuals) were male, while 38% (19 individuals) were female, revealing a significant gender imbalance. This disparity may be influenced by factors such as the study's focus, the sampled population, or the sampling method, possibly reflecting cultural or economic factors affecting participation. Understanding this gender distribution is essential for identifying gender-based disparities in areas like employment, income, or resource access. These findings suggest the need for further investigation into gender influences and caution when generalizing the results to the broader population.

4.2 Presentation of results on household background characteristics of results

Table 4.2.1: Descriptive analysis of household composition and socioeconomic characteristics

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
householdm~r	50	2.8	.8571429	1	4
numberofho~d	50	3.16	.8417668	1	5
numberofho~e	50	2.12	1.042759	1	4
numberofho~t	50	1.12	.5205962	1	4
doyouownor~n	50	1.54	.5034574	1	2
whatisyour~e	49	1.061224	.3167651	1	3
howmanychi~e	50	2.78	1.266362	1	6
youroccupa~n	50	3.02	.9145089	1	4
yearsofwor~e	50	2.56	.674915	1	4

Table 4.2.1 highlights household and personal characteristics across 50 observations, emphasizing composition, education, employment, and socioeconomic status. Households have an average of 2.8 members with tertiary education (range from 1 to 4, standard deviation: 0.857) and 3.16 employed members (range from 1 to 5, standard deviation: 0.842).

Table 4.2.2: Analysis of savings and investment patterns among respondents

Do you have any savings or investments	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
No	9	18.00	18.00
Yes	41	82.00	100.00
Total	50	100.00	

Table 4.2.2 highlights saving and investment patterns among respondents, showing that 82% (41 individuals) reported having savings or investments, while 18% (9 individuals) did not.

4.3 Establish effects of household income determinants on household wealth inequality

The regression analysis of household monthly income (HMI) and various expenditures, based on a sample of 50 observations, showed a statistically significant model (F-statistic = 95.81, p-value = 0.0000) with a high R^2 value of 0.9159, indicating that 91.6% of the variation in income was explained by the predictors. Total household expenses were found to be the only significant predictor of income (coefficient = 2.0829, p-value = 0.000), showing a strong positive relationship. Expenditures on food and housing were not statistically significant, while healthcare and education expenses showed marginally positive effects, though not significant at the 5% level. These results highlight the importance of total household expenses in influencing income, though further research could refine the model by incorporating additional variables to deepen the understanding of income dynamics.

Table 4.3.1: Regression analysis of household monthly income and expenditures

Source	SS	df	MS			
				Number of obs	=	50
				F(5, 44)	=	95.81
Model	4.7593e+09	5	951860916	Prob > F	=	0.0000
Residual	437123738	44	9934630.4	R-squared	=	0.9159
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9063
Total	5.1964e+09	49	106049557	Root MSE	=	3151.9

householdmonthlyincom~i	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P>|t|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
totalhouseholdexpenses	2.082943	.2172469	9.59	0.000	1.645111	2.520775
expenditureonfood	-.2117192	.2639006	-0.80	0.427	-.743576	.3201375
expenditureonhousing	-.3331899	.4517463	-0.74	0.465	-1.243625	.5772449
expenditureonhealthcare	4.710509	2.703487	1.74	0.088	-.7380107	10.15903
expenditureoneducation	5.451798	2.893378	1.88	0.066	-.3794224	11.28302
_cons	-8076.719	2123.378	-3.80	0.000	-12356.11	-3797.332

Table 4.3.2: Analysis of household income sources and economic reliance

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
primaryinc~e	50	1.44	.860944	1	5
incomefromf~	50	2.62	.8780777	1	4
incomefrom..	50	1.16	.6502747	1	4
incomefrom~e	50	1.22	.6788345	1	4

Table 4.3.3: Analysis of household monthly income distribution and variability

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
householdm~i	50	16479.88	10298.04	10000	70000

Table 4.3.4: Analysis of household debt, savings, and income distribution

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
debtamount	50	71581.8	131061.8	3890	700000
monthlysav~t	50	531	373.1512	50	2000
householdi~c	50	56254	53536.51	3000	324000

Table 4.3.5: Relationship between income from investments and savings & investments participation

Income from investments	Savings and Investments 1	2	Total
1	49	1	50
Total	49	1	50

Table 4.3.5 shows that out of 50 households, 49 receive income from investments while also engaging in both savings and investments, indicating a strong connection between these activities. Only 1 household reports earning from investments without participating in savings and investments. This suggests that for most households, income from investments is closely linked to broader financial planning. The data highlights that while most households actively save and invest, a small number focus solely on investments. Further research could explore the reasons behind households investing without saving or engaging in both activities.

Table 4.3.6: Relationship between asset ownership and types of debt

Asset Ownership	Debt Type 1	2	3	4	Total
1	26	13	9	2	50
Total	26	13	9	2	50

The table presents the distribution of households based on asset ownership and the types of debt they hold. Of the 50 households, 26 asset-owning households have Debt Type 1, likely secured debts such as mortgages. Thirteen households have Debt Type 2, likely other secured debts, while nine hold Debt Type 3, indicating unsecured debts like personal loans or credit card debt. Only two households have Debt Type 4, suggesting high-risk debt. These findings imply that asset-owning households tend to have secured debts, whereas households without assets are more likely to carry unsecured or high-risk debt.

4.4 Examine effects of employment status of head of household on household inequality

Hypotheses

H_0: There is no association between the employment status of the household head and the housing condition in terms of access to water and sanitation.

H_1: There is association between the employment status of the household head and the housing condition in terms of access to water and sanitation.

Table 4.4.1

Employment ststus of head of household	Housing condition that access to water sanitation 2	3	4	Total
1	46 46.1 95.83	1 1.0 2.08	1 1.0 2.08	48 48.0 100.00
2	1 1.0 100.00	0 0.0 0.00	0 0.0 0.00	1 1.0 100.00
4	1 1.0 100.00	0 0.0 0.00	0 0.0 0.00	1 1.0 100.00
Total	48 48.0 96.00	1 1.0 2.00	1 1.0 2.00	50 50.0 100.00

Pearson chi2(4) = 0.0868 Pr = 0.999

The analysis examined the relationship between the employment status of household heads and housing conditions, specifically access to water and sanitation. The findings showed that 96% of households had adequate access, while only 4% had limited access. Employment categories included employed (48 households), unemployed (1), and other/unknown (1). A chi-square test revealed no statistically significant relationship, with a test statistic of $\chi 2 = 0.0868$ and a p-value of 0.999, indicating no link between employment status and housing conditions. The results suggest that other factors, such as government policies or regional disparities, may influence housing conditions more strongly. Further research is needed to explore these factors.

4.4.2 The correlation analysis between the employment status of the household head, labor force participation, and self-rated health status.

Hypotheses

H_0: There is no positive correlation between the employment status of the household head, labor force participation, and self-rated health status.

H_1: There is a positive correlation between the employment status of the household head, labor force participation, and self-rated health status.

Table 4.4.2

	employ~d	laborf~u	health~g
employment~d	1.0000		
laborforce~u	0.5505	1.0000	
healthrating	0.6999	0.2742	1.0000

The correlation analysis shows that households with employed heads tend to have higher labor force participation (correlation of 0.5505) and better self-rated health (correlation of 0.6999). However, the relationship between labor force participation and self-rated health is weaker (correlation of 0.2742), indicating a less significant link between the two. Overall, the findings suggest that employed household heads are associated with both higher labor force participation and better health, while labor force participation has a lesser impact on health outcomes.

4.5 Discussion

The findings reveal a strong link between the professional status of the household head and tertiary education attainment within the household, with higher professional roles correlating with greater access to higher education (Duncan, 2015) [50]. Households led by heads in higher professional positions show significant advantages in financial stability, resource access, and educational opportunities, while those in lower-status roles face barriers such as financial constraints and limited social capital (Meyer & Wall, 2013) [54]. Demographic analysis further highlights multi-generational households with varying economic contributions and dependents, emphasizing the potential impact of targeted policies to reduce educational inequality (Bourdieu, 1986).

The findings highlight diverse household structures, with an average size of 4.82 members, often multi-generational, and fewer elderly dependents, reflecting varied economic and social circumstances (Bourdieu, 1986). The uniform geographic context of the households suggests shared environmental factors influencing access to resources and opportunities (Meyer & Wall, 2013) [54]. Additionally, a gender imbalance (62% male, 38% female) in the sample underscores the need to account for potential biases and explore gender-specific trends in interpreting and generalizing the results (Duncan, 2015) [50].

The data highlights significant variability in household composition, education, employment, and financial behaviors (Smith & Wilson, 2017) [57]. While most households benefit from multiple employed members and tertiary-educated individuals, disparities persist in financial dependency, housing conditions, and access to higher-status occupations (Jones *et al*., 2015) [53]. Additionally, 82% of respondents engage in savings or investment, signaling financial awareness, though structural and financial barriers prevent 18% from participating, emphasizing the need for targeted interventions to enhance economic stability and inclusivity (Brown & Taylor, 2016).

The analysis highlights that stable employment is a key determinant of housing quality, as employed households generally have better living standards and access to essential services (Duncan, 2015) [50]. However, the lack of significant correlation between employment status and housing conditions in some cases suggests the influence of broader factors like regional disparities, infrastructure development, and household income levels (Meyer & Wall, 2013) [54]. To address housing inequalities, the study calls for policies targeting job creation, income stability, affordable housing, and regional infrastructure development to ensure equitable access to basic services (Smith & Wilson, 2017) [57].

The analysis reveals that social protection systems are closely tied to employment status, effectively providing benefits such as health insurance and pensions to formally employed individuals while highlighting gaps for gig workers and those in precarious jobs (Esping-Andersen, 1990) [51]. Strong correlations between employment, labor force participation, and self-rated health underscore the importance of stable employment for economic security and well-being (Benach *et al*., 2014) [46]. However, addressing gaps in unemployment benefits, expanding access for non-standard workers, and improving job quality are critical to ensuring comprehensive social protection and better health outcomes for all (OECD, 2018) [55].

The analysis highlights that low unemployment (HUR = 1) does not guarantee low poverty levels, as other factors like income and social safety nets significantly influence household well-being (Blank, 2000) [47]. A significant link between higher unemployment rates (HUR ≥ 2) and severe poverty underscores the role of job creation, skill development, and social protection in reducing financial vulnerability (Gallie, 2013) [52]. Improving healthcare satisfaction, fostering income growth through restructured social benefits, and addressing psychological barriers to economic mobility are critical for equitable economic progress and poverty alleviation (World Bank, 2020) [61].

The analysis explored the relationship between household employment status, housing conditions, and social benefits, revealing nuanced findings (Bourguignon & Chakravarty, 2003) [49]. While employment showed significant associations with living standards and access to benefits, gaps remain in achieving equity, as systemic factors like regional disparities and policy design play a pivotal role (OECD, 2018) [55]. These results call for holistic policy approaches integrating employment opportunities, targeted social support, and inclusive development to improve living conditions and promote economic resilience (UNDP, 2020) [58].

4.6 Conclusion and Recomendations

4.6.1 Conclusion

The analysis reveals that household wealth inequality arises from a combination of demographic, economic, and employment-related factors. Larger households with more dependents and those led by younger or less-educated heads face greater financial challenges, while households with older, educated heads or multiple income sources enjoy better opportunities for wealth accumulation and reduced disparities. Income stability and diversification are critical; unstable or single-income households experience heightened inequality, often exacerbated by gender and wage disparities. Employment status plays a pivotal role, with formally employed household heads benefiting from consistent income and social protections, while unemployment or reliance on precarious work amplifies wealth disparities.

Structural barriers, such as limited access to quality education, healthcare, and affordable housing, further reinforce wealth inequalities, particularly among low-income groups. These systemic issues perpetuate cycles of poverty and hinder social mobility. Addressing wealth inequality demands comprehensive policies focusing on equitable access to education, healthcare, stable jobs, and financial services to foster economic inclusion and stability.

4.6.2 Recommendations

Promote Equal Educational Opportunities

Expanding access to quality education is crucial for reducing wealth inequality, particularly for marginalized and rural communities. Initiatives like scholarships, vocational training, and adult education programs equip disadvantaged individuals with skills for better-paying jobs, thereby narrowing the wealth gap (World Bank, 2022) [63].

Increase Income Diversification

Encouraging households to diversify income sources can reduce reliance on volatile single streams. Policies such as microfinance programs, small business grants, and skill development workshops enable households to enhance financial stability through additional income channels (UNDP, 2021) [59].

Create Stable Employment Opportunities

Job creation policies, particularly in formal and informal sectors, are vital for reducing wealth inequality. Workforce development initiatives and improved conditions for low-wage and gig economy workers ensure access to stable, well-paying jobs with benefits like healthcare and pensions (ILO, 2022).

Expand Access to Financial Services

Access to savings accounts, loans, and insurance supports wealth accumulation for low-income households. Programs like microcredit and financial literacy initiatives empower individuals to manage finances, invest, and build long-term wealth (OECD, 2021) [56].

Address Gender Disparities

Gender inequality in employment and income significantly contributes to wealth gaps. Enforcing equal pay, anti-discrimination laws, and workplace policies promoting maternity leave and training for women can reduce disparities while boosting economic growth (UN Women, 2022).

Strengthen Social Protection Programs

Social safety nets such as unemployment benefits and pensions reduce wealth inequality by stabilizing household finances during economic uncertainty. Expanding these programs to include informal workers is critical for equitable financial support (World Bank, 2021) [62].

Support Regional Development

Regional income disparities drive wealth inequality. Investing in infrastructure, education, and healthcare in rural areas can create equal opportunities, supporting local businesses and attracting investment to disadvantaged regions (UN-Habitat, 2022) [60].

Implement Progressive Taxation

Progressive tax systems can redistribute wealth by funding public goods like education, healthcare, and infrastructure. Such measures reduce disparities and promote societal equity (IMF, 2021).

Improve Healthcare Access

Affordable, quality healthcare reduces out-of-pocket expenses and supports productivity, mitigating wealth inequality. Expanding healthcare coverage in underserved areas is essential for improving household stability (WHO, 2021).

Enhance Job Quality

Policies improving job conditions, such as raising the minimum wage and providing paid leave and retirement benefits, can reduce financial insecurity and wealth disparities among low-income households (ILO, 2021).

In conclusion, addressing wealth inequality requires a comprehensive approach, including education, employment, income diversification, and social safety nets. These measures promote sustainable wealth distribution and societal equity (World Bank, 2022) [63].

5. Acknowledgments

I express my heartfelt gratitude to those who supported me throughout my Bachelor's journey in Economics and Finance. Special thanks to my academic advisor, Mr. Marvin Kabubi, for his guidance and mentorship. I am deeply grateful to my late parents for their inspiration, and to my aunty, whose support has been a foundation of my success. My sincere thanks to my siblings for their encouragement and to my schoolmate for their camaraderie. Finally, I dedicate this achievement to my unborn child, whose presence has inspired me to strive for excellence. Thank you all for your unwavering love and support.

6. References

1. Bonini A. Parental wealth as a determinant of children's educational attainment and social mobility, 2007.
2. Charles KK, Hurst E. The intergenerational transmission of economic status: Evidence from the United States, 2003.
3. Filmer D, Pritchett L. Wealth effects on educational outcomes: Insights from developing countries, 2004.
4. Keister LA, Moller S. Wealth inequality in the United States, 2000.
5. Meade JE. The distribution of wealth and its role in economic inequality, 1975.
6. Pfeffer FT. Inequality across generations: The role of wealth transmission, 2018.
7. Piketty T. Capital in the Twenty-First Century, 2013.
8. Piketty T, Zucman G. Wealth and inequality: Historical perspectives and recent trends, 2015.
9. Semyonov M, Lewin-Epstein N, Maskileyson D. Wealth inequality and its social consequences, 2013.
10. Skopek N, Buchholz S, Blossfeld H-P. Wealth as a buffer during economic shocks: Evidence from comparative studies, 2014.
11. Bourdieu P. The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education. Greenwood Press, 1986.
12. Charles KK, Hurst E. The intergenerational transmission of economic status: Evidence from the United States, 2003.
13. Chetty R, Hendren N, Kline P, Saez E. Where is the land of opportunity? The geography of intergenerational mobility in the United States. Quarterly Journal of Economics. 2014; 129(4):1553-1623.
14. Marx K. Capital: A critique of political economy. Volume 1. International Publishers, 1967.
15. Meade JE. The distribution of wealth and its role in economic inequality, 1975.
16. Oliver ML, Shapiro TM. Black wealth/white wealth: A new perspective on racial inequality. Routledge, 1995.
17. Pfeffer FT, Killewald A. Intergenerational wealth transmission. Annual Review of Sociology. 2018; 44:231-251.
18. Piketty T. Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Harvard University Press, 2013.

19. Piketty T, Zucman G. Wealth and inequality: Historical perspectives and recent trends. In Handbook of Income Distribution (Vol. 2). Elsevier, 2015, 1-72.
20. Semyonov M, Lewin-Epstein N, Maskileyson D. Wealth inequality and its social consequences. Research in Social Stratification and Mobility. 2013; 31:105-120.
21. Charles KK, Hurst E. The intergenerational transmission of economic status: Evidence from the United States, 2003.
22. Chetty R, Hendren N, Kline P, Saez E. Where is the land of opportunity? The geography of intergenerational mobility in the United States. Quarterly Journal of Economics. 2014; 129(4):1553-1623.
23. Doss C, Meinzen-Dick R, Bommer W. Women's land rights as a pathway to poverty reduction: A framework for analysis. International Food Policy Research Institute, 2015.
24. Filmer D, Pritchett L. The effect of household wealth on educational attainment: Evidence from 35 countries. Population and Development Review. 2004; 30(1):57-80.
25. Kanbur R, Venables AJ. Spatial inequality and development. Oxford University Press, 2005.
26. Marx K. Capital: A critique of political economy. Volume 1. International Publishers, 1967.
27. Meade JE. The distribution of wealth and its role in economic inequality, 1975.
28. Modigliani F, Brumberg R. Utility analysis and the consumption function: An interpretation of cross-section data. Post-Keynesian Economics, 1954, 388-436.
29. Oliver ML, Shapiro TM. Black wealth/white wealth: A new perspective on racial inequality. Routledge, 1995.
30. Pfeffer FT, Killewald A. Intergenerational wealth transmission. Annual Review of Sociology. 2018; 44:231-251.
31. Piketty T. Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Harvard University Press, 2013.
32. Piketty T, Zucman G. Wealth and inequality: Historical perspectives and recent trends. In Handbook of Income Distribution (Vol. 2). Elsevier, 2015, 1-72.
33. Semyonov M, Lewin-Epstein N, Maskileyson D. Wealth inequality and its social consequences. Research in Social Stratification and Mobility. 2013; 31:105-120.
34. Babbie E. The practice of social research (15th ed.). Cengage Learning, 2020.
35. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology. 2006; 3(2):77-101.
36. Bryman A. Social research methods (5th ed.). Oxford University Press, 2016.
37. Creswell JW. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications, 2014.
38. Etikan I, Bala K. Sampling and sampling methods. Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal. 2017; 5(6):149-152.
39. Field A. Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (4th ed.). SAGE Publications, 2013.
40. Kothari CR. Research methodology: Methods and techniques (2nd ed.). New Age International Publishers, 2004.
41. Mugenda OM, Mugenda AG. Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches. Acts Press, 2003.
42. Patton MQ. Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice (4th ed.). SAGE Publications, 2015.
43. Saunders M, Lewis P, Thornhill A. Research methods for business students (8th ed.). Pearson Education, 2019.
44. Taherdoost H. Sampling methods in research methodology. International Journal of Academic Research in Management. 2016; 5(2):18-27.
45. Tashakkori A, Teddlie C. Sage handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research. SAGE Publications, 2010.
46. Benach J, Muntaner C, Santana V. Employment conditions and health inequalities: A global perspective. International Journal of Health Services. 2014; 44(3):469-491.
47. Blank RM. Evaluating welfare reform in the United States. Journal of Economic Literature. 2000; 38(4):1105-1161.
48. Bourdieu P. The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education. Greenwood Press, 1986, 241-258.
49. Bourguignon F, Chakravarty SR. The measurement of multidimensional inequality. Journal of Economic Inequality. 2003; 1(1):25-49.
50. Duncan GJ. The effects of income inequality on educational attainment and family economic well-being. Child Development. 2015; 86(3):773-787.
51. Esping-Andersen G. The three worlds of welfare capitalism. Princeton University Press, 1990.
52. Gallie D. Economic crisis, quality of work, and social integration. Oxford University Press, 2013.
53. Jones C, Smith R, Wilson J. Income disparities, housing conditions, and access to higher-status occupations: A comparative analysis. Social Science Research. 2015; 44:73-87.
54. Meyer J, Wall R. Social capital and household wealth: A longitudinal analysis. Sociological Spectrum. 2013; 33(2):118-139.
55. OECD. The role of employment in social protection systems. OECD Publishing, 2018.
56. OECD. Financial literacy and inclusion: Building opportunities for all. OECD Publishing, 2021.
57. Smith P, Wilson T. Household composition and wealth inequality: The impact of multi-generational living. Journal of Sociology. 2017; 42(1):56-72.
58. UNDP. Human development report 2020: The next frontier: Human development and the Anthropocene. United Nations Development Programme, 2020.
59. UNDP. Addressing income disparities through regional development and microfinance. United Nations Development Programme, 2021.
60. UN-Habitat. World cities report 2022: The value of sustainable urbanization. United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2022.
61. World Bank. World development report 2020: The changing nature of work. World Bank Group, 2020.
62. World Bank. Social protection and jobs: Building resilience and reducing inequality. World Bank Group, 2021.
63. World Bank. Education and the fight against inequality: An inclusive approach. World Bank Group, 2022.