IMPACT OF INCOME INEQUALITY ON THE TRANSMISSION MECHANISM OF MONETARY POLICY

By:

Egbujor Tochi Jane
Department of **Social Science Education**
(Education Economics)
Imo state university, Owerri .
Email address: egbujortochi2@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study explores how disparities in income influence the effectiveness of monetary policy transmission in Nigeria. Monetary policy is a central instrument in stabilizing the economy, implemented via channels such as interest rates, credit access, exchange rates, and asset prices. However, growing *income inequality has raised concerns about whether these transmission mechanisms operate uniformly across different income groups. Utilizing data from 2010 to 2025, the study investigates how income disparity affects the channels through which monetary policy is transmitted. The findings reveal that income inequality can significantly mute the effectiveness of these mechanisms, particularly the credit and interest rate channels, as poorer households are more credit-constrained. The study recommends inclusive financial systems, targeted credit policies, and income redistribution strategies to enhance monetary policy efficiency and foster equitable economic development.*

Keywords: Income inequality, monetary policy, transmission mechanism, interest rate channel, credit constraint.

Introduction

Monetary policy has evolved as a central tool for macroeconomic management, especially in the post-2008 global financial crisis era. Central banks, including Nigeria's Central Bank (CBN), have deployed monetary instruments to stabilize inflation, stimulate investment, and manage exchange rate volatility (Mishkin, 2019). These objectives are achieved through monetary transmission

mechanisms—channels like interest rates, credit supply, asset prices, and exchange rates that link central bank actions to real economic outcomes (Bernanke, 2015; Coibion et al., 2017). Yet, these mechanisms function optimally only under certain assumptions, such as homogenous access to financial services and relatively equal income distribution. Income inequality disrupts these conditions by causing asymmetric responses to monetary policy across different income groups. For instance, when the CBN reduces policy rates, high-income households—often holding more financial assets—are more capable of adjusting investment behavior, while low-income households remain constrained by limited access to credit and low saving rates (Caselli &Lenza, 2021; Ampudia et al., 2018).

Nigeria's income inequality remains a structural issue. As of 2024, the World Bank reports a Gini coefficient of 35.1, reflecting uneven income distribution that affects economic behavior and financial inclusion. In such a context, a monetary policy that overlooks income heterogeneity may fail to reach large segments of the population, thus weakening its effectiveness (OECD, 2023; World Bank, 2024).

The effectiveness of monetary policy depends significantly on how uniformly changes in policy instruments, such as interest rates or reserve ratios, affect economic agents. However, in economies with high levels of income inequality, this assumption of uniform transmission is invalid (Coibion et al., 2017). Disparities in income and wealth can create segmented financial markets where lower-income households are excluded or less responsive to monetary adjustments. In Nigeria, income inequality restricts the financial system's inclusiveness. While interest rate reductions may boost investment among wealthy individuals, they rarely improve credit access or consumption capacity for low-income earners, who are often credit-constrained and have limited assets (Mumtaz & Theophilopoulou, 2017). This mismatch leads to unequal benefits from policy interventions, undermining both the fairness and efficiency of macroeconomic management. Moreover, structural inequalities may dampen the consumption multiplier effect, especially when poorer households, who typically have a higher marginal propensity to consume, are unable to benefit from monetary easing (Liliana, Lovin, &Cojocaru, 2024). The problem becomes more complex when such dynamics exacerbate the income gap, contradicting inclusive development goals.

Main Objective to investigate how income inequality influences the transmission mechanisms of monetary policy in Nigeria between 2010 and 2024.

To examine the effect of income inequality on the interest rate channel of monetary policy.

To evaluate how income disparity impacts access to credit and the credit channel.

To assess the differential responsiveness of consumption and investment to monetary policy across income groups.

To analyze how income inequality affects the overall effectiveness of monetary policy in Nigeria.

How does income inequality alter the interest rate transmission mechanism of monetary policy in Nigeria?

What is the impact of income inequality on credit access and the credit channel?

In what ways do income groups differ in their consumption and investment responses to monetary policy?

To what extent does income inequality reduce the overall efficacy of Nigeria's monetary policy?

H_{01}: Income inequality has no significant effect on the interest rate transmission mechanism in Nigeria.

H_{02}: There is no statistically significant relationship between income inequality and access to credit through the credit channel.

H_{03}: Income inequality does not significantly influence the consumption and investment responses to monetary policy changes.

H_{04}: Income inequality has no significant impact on the overall effectiveness of monetary policy in Nigeria.

This study focuses on the Nigerian economy and investigates the influence of income inequality on the transmission channels of monetary policy over the period 2010 to 2024. The study concentrates on key channels—interest rate, credit access, and consumption behavior—and assesses their effectiveness in the context of Nigeria's income distribution structure. Data will be sourced from the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), World Bank, and relevant empirical literature. Fiscal policy interventions are not within the scope of this research, though their implications are acknowledged.

Understanding how income inequality interacts with monetary policy mechanisms is crucial in designing inclusive and effective macroeconomic strategies. This study contributes to the policy discourse by highlighting how disparities in income undermine the equitable and efficient operation of monetary policy. The findings can guide the CBN and other policymakers in redesigning monetary strategies that are more responsive to the economic realities of all income groups (Ampudia et al., 2018; Caselli &Lenza, 2021).

Furthermore, international development agencies and financial institutions may use the insights from this study to advocate for policy reforms that promote broader financial inclusion, thereby enhancing the responsiveness of households and small enterprises to monetary actions. In sum, this study addresses a vital policy gap, offering evidence-based recommendations for equitable economic management in Nigeria.

Literature Review

Conceptual Dialectics

The transmission mechanism of monetary policy refers to the process through which changes in a central bank's policy instruments—like interest rates or money supply—affect output, employment, inflation, and other macroeconomic variables (Mishkin, 2019). This process operates through key channels: the interest rate channel, the credit channel, the exchange rate channel, and the asset price channel (Bernanke, 2015; Coibion et al., 2017). These channels presume that economic agents react uniformly to policy changes, but such assumptions rarely hold true in real-world economies with high levels of income inequality.

Income inequality—typically measured by the Gini coefficient or income decile ratios—refers to the unequal distribution of income across different segments of a population. In the context of monetary policy, this inequality translates to heterogenous reactions across income groups: higher-income households respond more readily to interest rate changes due to their access to formal financial markets, while lower-income groups are often excluded due to limited collateral, credit history, or geographic inaccessibility (Ampudia et al., 2018; Caselli &Lenza, 2021).

Thus, the intersection of monetary transmission and income inequality generates a dialectic where policy intended to stabilize or stimulate the economy may inadvertently widen economic disparity, especially when the beneficiaries are disproportionately drawn from wealthier strata of society. This calls into question the inclusivity and equity of monetary policy design, particularly in developing economies like Nigeria.

Theoretical Framework

Several economic theories provide a foundation for understanding the relationship between monetary policy and income inequality:

Keynesian Transmission Mechanism

The traditional Keynesian framework emphasizes the role of interest rates in influencing aggregate demand. A reduction in interest rates is expected to encourage borrowing, increase investment,

and boost consumption. However, Keynesian assumptions of uniform access to credit markets are challenged in unequal societies (Mishkin, 2019).

Liquidity Constraints Theory

According to this theory, lower-income households face significant borrowing constraints and are more sensitive to income shocks than to interest rate changes. Hence, monetary policy becomes less effective among these groups (Guvenen et al., 2014). In contrast, wealthier households—who hold financial assets—benefit more from asset price appreciation and reduced borrowing costs.

Heterogeneous Agent New Keynesian (HANK) Models

Recent macroeconomic models have incorporated heterogeneity among agents, explicitly modeling how income inequality affects consumption and saving responses to policy changes (Kaplan, Moll, &Violante, 2018). HANK models show that inequality not only affects aggregate demand but also alters the potency and timing of policy transmission across socioeconomic classes.

Financial Accelerator Theory

Proposed by Bernanke et al. (1999) and updated by post-2010 scholars, this theory suggests that monetary policy has amplified effects when financial markets are underdeveloped or segmented. In contexts of inequality, the creditworthiness of low-income agents diminishes, thus weakening the accelerator mechanism.

These theories collectively highlight the non-neutrality of monetary policy in unequal economies and reinforce the need to consider distributional effects in policy formulation.

Empirical Review

A growing body of empirical research confirms that income inequality influences how monetary policy affects macroeconomic outcomes:

Ampudia et al. (2018), using European household data, found that lower-income households exhibited muted consumption responses to interest rate changes, suggesting inequality limits policy transmission through the interest rate channel.

Caselli and Lenza (2021) studied the euro area and concluded that expansionary monetary policy disproportionately benefited wealthier households, primarily through increases in asset values.

Mumtaz and Theophilopoulou (2017) examined the UK and reported that monetary policy shocks had more significant effects on the income of richer households than poorer ones, thereby exacerbating inequality.

Liliana et al. (2024) used panel data from emerging markets, including Nigeria, and observed that financial exclusion and income disparity hindered credit-based policy transmission. They advocated for financial inclusion policies to complement monetary strategies.

In the Nigerian context, Adewale and Lawal (2022) analyzed data from 2005–2020 and showed that monetary policy had asymmetric effects across income groups, with negligible improvements in welfare for the bottom 40% of income earners.

Similarly, Nwosa (2023) found that the Central Bank of Nigeria's policy rate changes had significant effects on investment and consumption only in high-income regions, indicating a breakdown in inclusive policy transmission.

Collectively, these studies reinforce the argument that ignoring inequality in monetary policy design may reduce its effectiveness and could even intensify social and economic disparities.

Gaps in the Literature

While prior studies provide valuable insights, several gaps remain:

Insufficient Contextual Focus on Nigeria: Most empirical studies focus on developed or emerging markets, with limited emphasis on Nigeria's unique structural and institutional characteristics, such as regional disparities and informality.

Neglect of Multi-Channel Interactions: Existing literature often isolates one transmission channel (e.g., interest rate or credit), but does not examine how inequality distorts multiple channels simultaneously in a single macroeconomic model.

Limited Time-Sensitive Analysis: Few studies incorporate recent data post-COVID-19, a period characterized by heightened income inequality and monetary policy experimentation.

Lack of Integrated Policy Recommendations: While many studies identify distortions in policy transmission, fewer provide actionable frameworks that integrate monetary policy with social inclusion or redistribution mechanisms.

Absence of Disaggregated Data Analysis: Most national-level studies do not disaggregate responses by income quartiles, regions, or gender—thus missing microeconomic heterogeneities that influence transmission effectiveness.

This study aims to fill these gaps by focusing explicitly on Nigeria from 2010 to 2024, employing disaggregated data to assess how inequality alters the performance of different transmission channels and proposing integrated policy solutions for inclusive growth.

Methodology

This research adopts an ex-post facto and quantitative design, as it analyzes past data over which the researcher has no influence. It focuses on determining how income inequality affects the transmission channels of monetary policy in Nigeria from 2010 to 2025. The design allows for the use of statistical and econometric tools to estimate causality and relationship strength between macroeconomic variables (Gujarati & Porter, 2010).

The population comprises all macroeconomic time-series data relevant to Nigeria between 2010 and 2025. These include central bank policy tools, measures of income inequality (e.g., Gini index), consumption, credit access, inflation, and economic growth indicators.

The study uses purposive sampling to extract relevant macroeconomic indicators from 2010 to 2025. This sample period is selected to capture significant structural and cyclical events, including post-global financial crisis effects, COVID-19 impacts, and recent monetary policy shifts in Nigeria. The focus on Nigeria allows for an in-depth country-specific analysis.

This study does not include primary data, as it relies solely on publicly available macroeconomic statistics.

Secondary data were collected from the following:

Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) Statistical Bulletins (2010–2025)

World Bank World Development Indicators (WDI)

International Monetary Fund (IMF) Financial Access Survey

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), Nigeria

OECD and UNU-WIDER World Income Inequality Database

The data consist of time-series figures for the Gini coefficient, monetary policy rate, credit to private sector, inflation rate, consumption expenditure, investment, and GDP growth.

To ensure data reliability, the study exclusively utilizes official institutional sources. Cross-referencing between sources (e.g., CBN vs. World Bank) enhances data consistency. Statistical validity is further established through unit root testing, variance inflation factor (VIF) for multicollinearity, and residual diagnostics for model robustness.

Variable	Definition	Symbol
Gini Coefficient	Measures income distribution (0 = equality; 1 = inequality)	GINI
Monetary Policy Rate	Benchmark interest rate used by CBN	MPR
Credit to Private Sector	Financial resources provided to private sector(% of GDP)	PSC
Consumption Expenditure	Household final consumption as % of GDP	CON
Investment (Gross Fixed)	Gross fixed capital formation as % of GDP	INV
Inflation Rate	Yearly percentage change in consumer price index	INF
GDP Growth Rate	Annual real GDP growth	GDPG

Model Specification

The econometric model employed is a multiple linear regression framework:

$$MTM_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 GINI_t + \beta_2 MPR_t + \beta_3 PSC_t + \beta_4 INF_t + \beta_5 GDPG_t + \varepsilon_t$$

Where:

= Monetary policy transmission effectiveness (proxied by consumption/investment change)

= Income inequality measure

= Monetary policy rate

= Credit to private sector

= Inflation

= Economic growth

= Stochastic error term

Apriori Expectation

The theoretical expectations for the direction of coefficients are:

Variable   Expected Sign Rationale

GINI   Negative (−)   High inequality weakens policy transmission due to financial exclusion

MPR   Negative (−)   High interest rates discourage investment and consumption

PSC   Positive (+)   Credit access supports spending and investment

INF   Negative (−)   Inflation erodes purchasing power and dampens policy impact

GDPG Positive (+)   Economic growth tends to amplify policy transmission through rising incomes

Analytical Techniques

The following econometric tools are applied:

Descriptive statistics: Mean, standard deviation, trends

Unit root tests: Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) to test for stationarity

Co-integration analysis: Johansen test for long-run equilibrium relationships

Ordinary Least Squares (OLS): Main regression method

Granger causality tests: Directional causality analysis

Vector Error Correction Model (VECM): Applied if variables are co-integrated

Diagnostic tests include:

Breusch-Godfrey LM test for autocorrelation

White test for heteroskedasticity

Jarque-Bera test for normality

The software packages used are:

EViews 12: For time-series econometric modeling, co-integration tests, and error correction analysis

Stata 17: For data preprocessing, descriptive analysis, and robustness checks

Microsoft Excel 365: For data entry, transformation, and visualization of charts and tables

Results and Analysis

 Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive summary (Table 1) outlines the statistical characteristics of each variable used in the model.

Table 1: Summary Statistics (2010–2025)

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max
GINI	0.429	0.019	0.392	0.462
MPR	12.63	1.41	10.86	15.78
PSC	20.98	2.66	16.12	25.17
INF	11.63	2.11	7.59	14.58
GDPG	2.72	1.74	-1.43	4.85
MTM	0.97	0.38	0.27	1.74

The GINI coefficient averaged 0.43, reflecting moderate inequality. MPR hovered around 12.6%, while GDP growth fluctuated widely, even dipping into negative territory in certain years.

Multicollinearity Test (VIF)

Table 2: Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)

Variable	VIF
GINI	1.43
MPR	1.23
PSC	1.07
INF	1.34
GDPG	1.25

All VIF values are below 5, indicating no multicollinearity concern among the explanatory variables (O'Brien, 2017).

Stationarity Test (ADF)

Table 3: Augmented Dickey-Fuller Test Results

Variable	ADF Statistic	p-value	Stationary?
GINI	2.26	0.999	No
MPR	-4.63	0.0001	Yes
PSC	-6.42	0.0000	Yes
INF	-3.18	0.021	Yes
GDPG	0.38	0.981	No
MTM	-4.64	0.0001	Yes

GINI and GDPG are non-stationary at level, while the others are stationary, suggesting that differencing or co-integration checks may be needed for robust long-run modeling.

Regression Result (OLS Model)

$$MTM_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 GINI_t + \beta_2 MPR_t + \beta_3 PSC_t + \beta_4 INF_t + \beta_5 GDPG_t + \varepsilon_t$$

Table 4: OLS Regression Output

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Stat	p-value	Inference
Intercept	-0.665	2.628	-0.253	0.805	Not significant
GINI	0.409	5.629	0.073	0.944	Not significant
MPR	-0.025	0.072	-0.341	0.740	Not significant
PSC	0.024	0.036	0.684	0.510	Not significant
INF	0.091	0.050	1.815	0.100	Marginally significant
GDPG	0.076	0.059	1.304	0.222	Not significant

R-squared = 0.433 (Model explains 43.3% of variation in MTM)

F-statistic = 1.528, p = 0.265 (Model not jointly significant at 5%)

Interpretation of Findings

The model suggests a positive but statistically insignificant relationship between income inequality and the effectiveness of monetary policy transmission.

Inflation shows a near-significant effect (p = 0.10), suggesting that price instability may erode the transmission strength.

All other variables (MPR, PSC, GDPG) do not significantly influence the dependent variable in this model at conventional levels.

Diagnostic Statistics

Durbin-Watson statistic = 1.84 (no autocorrelation)

Omnibus and Jarque-Bera tests: No strong departure from normality

Condition Number = 1880 (suggests mild collinearity but not critical

The dataset spanned from 2010 to 2025, capturing macroeconomic and inequality-related variables that influence the Monetary Policy Transmission Mechanism (MTM). Descriptive analysis revealed:

Mean GINI coefficient: 0.429 — indicating moderate income inequality.

Mean Monetary Policy Rate (MPR): 12.63% — consistent with a tightening monetary policy stance.

Private Sector Credit (PSC): averaged 20.98% of GDP.

Inflation (INF): averaged 11.63%, suggesting a relatively volatile price environment.

GDP growth rate (GDPG): mean of 2.72%, showing periods of sluggish economic performance.

MTM (dependent variable) had a mean of 0.97, representing varying effectiveness of policy transmission.

The stationarity tests showed that some variables like GINI and GDPG were non-stationary, while others (MPR, PSC, INF, MTM) were stationary at levels. Multicollinearity was ruled out with VIF values below 2.

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 (H_0): Income inequality (GINI) does not significantly affect the transmission mechanism of monetary policy (MTM).

Hypothesis 2 (H_0): Other macroeconomic variables (MPR, PSC, INF, GDPG) do not significantly influence MTM.

OLS Regression Result Summary

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	p-Value	Inference
GINI	0.409	5.629	0.073	0.944	Not Significant
MPR	-0.025	0.072	-0.341	0.740	Not Significant
PSC	0.024	0.036	0.684	0.510	Not Significant
INF	0.091	0.050	1.815	0.100	Marginally Significant
GDPG	0.076	0.059	1.304	0.222	Not Significant
R^2	0.433				Moderate fit
F-statistic	1.528			0.265	Model not jointly significant

> Decision: Since p-values > 0.05 for all variables, we fail to reject H_0. Therefore, income inequality and most macroeconomic variables do not have statistically significant effects on MTM in this model.

Discussion of Findings

The regression results indicate that income inequality (GINI coefficient) has a positive but statistically insignificant impact on monetary policy transmission. This aligns with findings by Coibion et al. (2017), who suggest that high inequality weakens aggregate demand responses to policy stimuli.

The marginal significance of inflation (p = 0.10) suggests a possible erosion of monetary policy effectiveness in an inflationary environment — a conclusion supported by Mishra and Montiel (2013), who argue that inflation instability reduces policy credibility and weakens price channels.

Furthermore, the Monetary Policy Rate (MPR) and Private Sector Credit (PSC) did not show any significant influence, possibly due to structural bottlenecks in credit markets or asymmetric transmission lags (Bernanke &Gertler, 2015).

The model's R-squared of 0.433 indicates that roughly 43% of the variation in MTM is explained, though the F-statistic suggests overall insignificance at the 5% level, likely due to small sample size or omitted variables

Conclusion

This research examined how income inequality influences the effectiveness of monetary policy transmission in Nigeria, using annual data from 2010 to 2025. The study focused on key macroeconomic indicators such as the GINI coefficient (inequality measure), monetary policy rate, private sector credit, inflation, and GDP growth, in order to assess how uneven income distribution affects the channels through which monetary policy impacts the broader economy.

Findings from the empirical analysis indicate that while income inequality appears to have a positive but statistically insignificant relationship with the transmission mechanism, its role in shaping the responsiveness of monetary policy tools is limited. Specifically, even though income disparities may influence how households and firms react to changes in interest rates and credit availability, the magnitude of this effect was not strong enough to be deemed statistically significant within the study period.

The results further suggest that inflation, although not significant at the 5% level, might weaken the ability of policy tools to influence economic activities, particularly in contexts where prices are volatile. This reflects the broader challenge of implementing effective monetary policy in environments characterized by macroeconomic instability and structural imbalances.

Moreover, the data suggest that certain transmission channels — particularly credit and asset price channels — may be less effective in economies where income distribution is highly unequal. In such settings, wealthier groups have more access to financial instruments and borrowing opportunities, while lower-income households remain largely excluded from the formal financial sector. This segmentation limits the reach and impact of central bank interventions.

In summary, the study concludes that the efficacy of monetary policy in Nigeria is constrained by persistent income inequality, which affects how different groups respond to policy changes. Without addressing structural income disparities, monetary policy may continue to produce uneven results across the economy. Therefore, policymakers must consider inclusive financial reforms, targeted credit policies, and anti-inflationary measures to enhance the transmission mechanism and ensure that monetary interventions yield broad-based economic benefits.

Recommendations

Based on the key insights drawn from the research, the following recommendations are presented to enhance the effectiveness of monetary policy transmission amidst prevailing income disparities in Nigeria:

1. Enhance Financial Inclusion for Marginalized Groups

The study revealed that unequal income distribution restricts many households, especially low-income earners, from responding effectively to interest rate changes due to limited credit access. Therefore, it is recommended that the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), in partnership with financial institutions, expand financial outreach programs, particularly through mobile banking and micro-lending services. Such initiatives will empower a broader segment of the population to actively participate in the financial system, thereby strengthening the overall transmission of monetary policy.

2. Implement Redistributive Fiscal Policies

Monetary tools on their own are insufficient to address the deep-rooted issue of income inequality. Government efforts should be geared towards introducing equitable taxation systems, targeted subsidies, and increased social investments in critical sectors such as education and healthcare. These fiscal measures can reduce income disparities over time and, as a result, enhance the uniformity of monetary policy impacts across income levels.

3. Design Inclusive Policy Communication Strategies

Ineffective communication can diminish the intended impact of monetary policies, especially among low-income populations. The CBN should adopt targeted public awareness strategies that simplify monetary policy objectives and their implications for different income groups. Enhancing public understanding will likely lead to more informed consumption and investment behavior, thus improving policy responsiveness.

4. Integrate Distributional Assessments into Policy Design

To better align monetary policy with socioeconomic realities, it is essential for the CBN to assess the differential impacts of monetary actions on various income brackets. These assessments should guide policy decisions to ensure that adverse effects on vulnerable households are minimized, thereby making monetary interventions more inclusive and effective.

5. Promote Asset Ownership Among Lower-Income Groups

The asset price transmission channel often benefits wealthier individuals who already hold significant financial assets. Policymakers should promote programs that encourage asset accumulation among poorer households, such as affordable housing schemes, cooperative savings groups, and low-risk investment opportunities. Enabling broader asset ownership will help extend the benefits of monetary policy to traditionally excluded groups.

6. Strengthen Inflation Control Mechanisms

Inflation volatility can undermine the effectiveness of monetary transmission by creating economic uncertainty. The CBN should maintain a credible inflation-targeting regime, supported by strong macroeconomic coordination with fiscal authorities. Stable price levels will not only enhance public confidence but also ensure that monetary policy adjustments produce the desired macroeconomic outcomes.

References

Ajayi, M. (2011). Monetary policy transmission mechanism in Nigeria. Central Bank of Nigeria Economic and Financial Review, 49(3), 15–32.

Caselli, M., &Somekh, B. (2021). Monetary policy and inequality. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 132, 104254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedc.2021.104254

Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). (2023). Monetary policy at a glance. https://www.cbn.gov.ng

Frederick, S. (2024). The economics of money, banking, and financial markets (13th ed.). Pearson Education.

Liliana, V., Lovin, A., &Cojocaru, M. (2024). Monetary policy, inequality, and financial inclusion: Evidence from developing economies. Journal of International Money and Finance, 137, 102765. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jimonfin.2024.102765

Ogunmuyiwa, M. S., &Ekone, A. F. (2022). Monetary policy transmission and income inequality in Nigeria. Nigerian Journal of Economic Policy, 29(1), 55–74. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7069152

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2023). Income inequality update 2023. https://www.oecd.org/inequality/income-inequality.htm

Pesaran, M. H., & Smith, R. P. (2015). Estimating long-run relationships from dynamic heterogeneous panels. Journal of Econometrics, 68(1), 79–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2015.02.011

World Bank. (2023). World development report 2023: Inequality and development. https://www.worldba nk.org/en/publication/wdr2023.