Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper Series

Working Paper No. 96

Women and Poverty in Industrialized Countries

Robert Wright

March 1993

(scanned copy)

Luxembourg Income Study (LIS), asbl

Women and Poverty in Industrialised Countries

by

Robert E. Wright

Lecturer
Department of Political Economy
and
Deputy Chairman
Centre for Development Studies
Adam Smith Building
University of Glasgow
Glasgow, Scotland
G12 8RT

and

Research Fellow
Centre for Economic Policy Research
25-28 Old Burlington Street
London, England
W1X 1LB

March 1993

The comments of Jeanette Findlay on an earlier draft of this paper were most helpful. Financial support from the *John Robertson Bequest* is gratefully acknowledged. Of course, full responsibility for all remaining errors and shortcomings rests entirely with the author.

Abstract: This paper examines empirically the relationship between gender and poverty in eleven industrialised countries that form part of the *Luxembourg Income Study*: Australia, Canada, France, West Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden and the United States. For each of these countries, Foster-Greer-Thorbecke poverty rates, based on a relative poverty line, are calculated separately for men and women. The overall poverty rate for adult men and women is decomposed into male and female poverty shares. These poverty shares are compared to the relative population shares of men and women. It is found that in all these countries, the "gender distribution of poverty" is unequal—the experience of poverty is not equally shared between men and women. The main conclusion is that when the poverty experience of *all* women is compared to the poverty experience of *all* men, women are *over-represented* amongst the poor in some countries and *under-represented* amongst the poor in others. The latter part of this conclusion is in sharp disagreement with conventional views about the relationship between gender and poverty in industrialised countries.

Women and Poverty in Industrialised Countries

One theme running through much of current debate surrounding poverty in industrialised countries is the belief that women are "over-represented" in the ranks of the poor. For example, Millar and Glendinning (1989, p. 363) write: "[W]omen are at far greater risk of poverty than men: at any given stage in their lives, women are far more likely than men to be poor and their experience of poverty is also likely to be far more acute." It is also believed that this gender-based disadvantage is increasing over time. For example, Scott (1984, p. vii) writes: "What is much less generally recognized is the increasing extent to which women are represented among the world's poor." This process is often referred to as the "feminisation of poverty", and is argued by many individuals to be a general problem faced by women in *all* industrialised countries (Allen, 1992; Millar and Glendinning 1989; Scott, 1984).

Despite the fact that this gender-based disadvantage and the feminisation of poverty are thought to be "facts", it is very surprising to find that only limited attention has been directed towards their empirical verification (Fuchs, 1986; McLanahan, Sorenson and Watson, 1989; Wright, 1992). For example, of the 27 empirical studies of poverty in Great Britain reviewed by Morris and Preston (1986), none addressed explicitly gender differences in the incidence and intensity of poverty. Furthermore, many of the difficult conceptual and empirical related to defining and

measuring poverty have been ignored in the studies of the relationship between gender and poverty (Daly, 1992; Jenkins, 1991).

With this in mind, this paper examines empirically the relationship between gender and poverty in eleven industrialised countries that form part of the *Luxembourg Income Study*: Australia, Canada, France, West Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden and the United States. For each of these countries, Foster-Greer-Thorbecke poverty rates, based on a relative poverty line, are calculated separately for men and women. The overall poverty rate for adult men and women is decomposed into male and female poverty shares. These poverty shares are compared to the relative population shares of men and women. It is found that in all these countries, the "gender distribution of poverty" is unequal—the experience of poverty is not equally shared between men and women. The main conclusion is that when the poverty experience of *all* women is compared to the poverty experience of *all* men, women are *over-represented* amongst the poor in some countries and *under-represented* amongst the poor in others. The latter part of this conclusion is in sharp disagreement with conventional views about the relationship between gender and poverty in industrialised countries.

The paper proceeds as follows. In the first section, the *Luxembourg Income Study* datasets used in the analysis are described. In the second section, the procedures used to identify the poor are outlined. The third section describes the specific

indices of poverty calculated and explains the decomposition methodology employed. In the fourth section, the results are presented. Conclusions follows in Section 5.

I. Data

The countries studied are:Australia, Canada, France, West Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden and the United States. The data are centered around 1985 and form part of the *Luxembourg Income Study*. The empirical analysis is restricted to the countries that constitute the so-called "second wave" of *Luxembourg Income Study*. The reason being that in order to carry out the gender-specific analysis described below, the unit of observation for computer processing must be the "individual", not the "family" or "household. This option, at the time of writing, was not available for "first wave" countries. (See the *LIS User Documentation* and other papers in this *VOLUME* for further details). The *Luxembourg Income Study* makes available to researchers a data-base of micro-level surveys for a large number of industrialised countries. One of the main aims of the project is to foster cross-country comparisons of income-related variables. All data-sets contain detailed variables describing income, along with a variety of socio-economic, demographic and household structure variables. The data-base is housed at the *Center for Poverty, Population and Policy Studies, Walferdange, Luxembourg* and may be conveniently accessed through the BITNET electronic mail service. Table 1 contains a brief

overview of the data-sets used: country, year, source and (unweighted) sample size.

< < < < *Table 1 About Here* > > > >

II. Identifying the Poor

If we define economic well-being as the ratio of economic resources to need, then a household is "poor" if its available economic resources do not meet its needs at some minimum level. Like most empirical studies of poverty, we employ *disposable equivalent household income* as the empirical counterpart to economic well-being. The household's economic resources are assumed to be determined by it's total disposable income, which is equal to the gross yearly income of all household members from all sources *minus* income taxes and other mandatory deductions.

It is clear that there are economies of scale in consumption related to household size. Likewise, there are differences in consumption levels between children and adults. Disposable income should be adjusted to reflect these differences. Therefore the household's needs are assumed to be a function of the number and age of its members. In keeping with most empirical studies of poverty, disposable income is adjusted using "equivalence scales". The equivalence scales used are the weights recommended by the OECD in its work on social indicators. That is, the first adult in the household receives a weight of 1.0; each other adult receives a weight of 0.7; and each child receives weight of 0.5.

A household is "poor" if it's equivalent disposable income,

y_i, is below the "poverty line", y^*. Unfortunately, there are no well-defined rules for selecting and little agreement on what is the most appropriate poverty line (Hagenaars and van Praag, 1985). In this paper, the so-called "households below average income" approach is used. In this approach, the poverty line is set at a fraction, ρ, of the mean level of equivalent income. That is:

$$y^* = \rho \cdot \bar{y} \; . \qquad [1]$$

Therefore, a household is poor if it's disposable income is below this level, $\rho \cdot \bar{y}$. An individual is poor, therefore, if he or she is a member of a poor household.

The poverty estimates presented in this paper are all based on an poverty line set at 50 per cent of the mean level of equivalent income in each of the countries. Therefore, the poverty line is a *relative* poverty threshold, not an absolute threshold, since no adjustment is made for differences in the price level across these countries. This is one of the poverty lines used in the *European Poverty Programmes*, and therefore seems like a good starting point from which to examine the relationship between gender and poverty (see Atkinson, 1990; Commission of the European Communities, 1991; O'Higgins and Jenkins, 1992). (For a detailed discussion of the advantages of the households below average income approach to the measurement of poverty see Atkinson, 1987).

III. Measuring Poverty

Sen (1986) described three properties that a good summary index of poverty should possess. The first is the index must be sensitive to the relative number of poor, capturing the *incidence of poverty*. The second is that the index must be sensitive to the average level of income of poor, indicating their *average deprivation*. The third is the index must be sensitive to the distribution of income among the poor, indicating their degree of *relative deprivation*. It is important to note that the term "deprivation" is used here to denote the degree of income shortfall or disadvantage below the poverty line. It should not be confused with Townsend's (1985) notion of deprivation, which has a much broader social and economic basis.

Most indices of poverty that incorporate Sen's axiomatic requirements (including Sen's own index) are not decomposable (Hagenaars, 1987). As is discussed below, this is problematic since we want to be able to decompose the total amount of poverty into male and female poverty shares. One poverty index that is decomposable is the class of measures proposed Foster, Greer and Thorbecke (1984). This index, $P(\alpha)$, may be defined as:

$$P(\alpha) = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^{q} \left[\frac{(y^* - y_i)}{y^*} \right]^{\alpha} . \qquad [2]$$

where: y^* is the poverty line; y_i is the household income of individual i; q is the number of poor individuals in the population (i.e. $y_i < y^*$); and n is the total number of

individuals in the population. "α" is a parameter which takes on a value greater than or equal to zero (i.e. $\alpha \geq 0$). As α gets larger, the index becomes more sensitive to the income circumstances of the "poorest poor". This index is bounded by the unit interval, with a value of "0" representing the situation of "no poverty" (i.e. no one is poor) and the value of "1" representing the situation of "total poverty" (i.e. everyone is poor).

Three values of α are particularly meaningful in terms of Sen's requirements. If $\alpha = 0$ then $P(\alpha)$ reduces to:

$$P(0) = H = q/n \ , \qquad [3]$$

which is the well-known "head-count ratio", H. This index is simply the proportion of population who have income below the poverty line—the "incidence of poverty".

If $\alpha = 1$, then Foster-Greer-Thorbecke index reduces to:

$$P(1) = H \cdot I \ , \qquad [4]$$

where:

$$I = (y^* - \bar{y}_p)/y^* \ ,$$

and $\bar{y}_p$ is the average income of the poor. This is a renormalisation of the "income-gap ratio". This index incorporates

information about the average income shortfall of the poor—the level of "absolute deprivation".

Finally, if $\alpha = 2$, then the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke index reduces to:

$$P(2) = H \cdot [I^2 + (1 - I)^2 \cdot C_q^2] , \qquad [5]$$

where C_q is the coefficient of variation of income among the poor. Since C_q is a commonly used measure of income inequality, its inclusion in the index captures the "relative deprivation" of the poor.

A useful feature of this index (for any value of α) is that it is additively decomposable with population share weights. More specifically, with respect to male and female poverty, we may write the total or overall poverty rate, $P(\alpha)$, as:

$$P(\alpha) = (n_f/n) \cdot P(\alpha)_f + (n_m/n) \cdot P(\alpha)_m , \qquad [6]$$

where the subscripts "m" and "f" denote male and female, respectively. The ratios n_f/n and n_m/n are the relative population shares of females and males (n_f/n and $n_m/n = 1$). $P(\alpha)_f$ and $P(\alpha)_m$ are the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke poverty indices (for a given value of α) calculated separately for females and males.

We may think of $P(\alpha)$ as being a measure of the "total" amount of poverty in the population. Because this index is additively decomposable with population share weights, the female and male

"shares", $S(\alpha)_k$, of this total are:

$$S(\alpha)_f = (n_f/n) \cdot P(\alpha)_f / P(\alpha) \ , \qquad [7]$$

$$S(\alpha)_m = (n_m/n) \cdot P(\alpha)_m / P(\alpha) \ . \qquad [8]$$

If poverty is shared "equally" between men and women, then we would expect the "gender distribution of poverty" to be equal. If this is the case then each group's relative poverty share should equal their relative population share. That is:

$$S(\alpha)_f = (n_f/n) \ , \qquad [9]$$

$$S(\alpha)_m = (n_m/n) \ . \qquad [10]$$

Therefore, a description of how "over-represented" women are in poverty is simply how much their poverty share exceeds their population share.

A convenient way of summarising the magnitude of this disadvantage is the ratio of the female poverty share to the female population share:

$$Ratio_f = S(\alpha)_f / (n_f/n) \ . \qquad [11]$$

If $Ratio_f > 1$ then women are *over-represented* amongst the poor. If $Ratio_f < 1$ then women are *under-represented* amongst the poor. If

$Ratio_f$ = 1 then poverty is share equally between men and women. It is also important to note that increases in this ratio over time indicate that women are becoming more represented amongst the poor, and this is indicative of the feminisation of poverty.

IV. Estimates

Tables 2, 3 and 4 present the estimates of the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke poverty index for α equal to 0, 1 and 2. In each of these tables, the overall poverty rate, $P(\alpha)$, is given, along with the gender-specific poverty rates, $P(\alpha)_m$ and $P(\alpha)_f$. In addition, the ratio of the female to male poverty rate, $P(\alpha)_f/P(\alpha)_m$, is also shown. These poverty rates refer to all individuals greater than or equal to age 18.

< < < < Tables 2, 3 and 4 About Here > > > >

Even though the main focus of this paper is on male-female differences in relative poverty, it is important to note that these countries differ significantly in their overall levels of poverty. Table 5 shows the ranking of these countries based on the three values of Foster-Greer-Thorbecke index calculated. As can be seen from this table, the rankings differ somewhat depending on which index is used to order the countries.

With respect to the incidence of poverty, the *P(0)* estimates suggest that poverty is lowest in Sweden, followed by Luxembourg, Poland, West Germany, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Canada, France, Australia, Italy and the United States. However, the P(1) estimates, which incorporate information describing the average

deprivation of the poor, suggest a different ranking. According to this index, poverty is lowest in Luxembourg, followed by West Germany, Poland, Sweden, the Netherlands, Canada, Great Britain, France, Italy, Australia and the United States. When information about the relative deprivation of the poor is included in the measurement, the ranking changes again. According to the *P(2)* index, poverty is lowest in Luxembourg, followed by West Germany, Poland, Sweden, Canada, Italy, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Australia and the United States.

< < < < *Table 5 About Here* > > > >

These different rankings points to the problem of relying too heavily on a single measure of poverty (e.g. the head-count ratio) to make even simple statements about differences in poverty across countries. For example, our estimates suggest that the incidence of poverty is lowest in Sweden [i.e. based on *P(0)*]. However, when the absolute and relative deprivation dimensions of poverty are considered [i.e. based on *P(1)* and *P(2)*], Sweden's poverty rank decreases to fourth—Luxembourg now has lowest rate of poverty based on these criteria. Likewise, based on *P(0) and P(1)*, the Netherlands ranks fifth. However, when the relative deprivation dimension of poverty is included in the measurement of poverty, the Netherlands' rank decreases to ninth.

Turning to gender differences in poverty, the *P(0)* estimates suggest that there is considerable variation in the gap between male and female poverty rates across these countries. (Table 2). In Great Britain, Poland, Canada, Luxembourg, West Germany,

Australia and the United States, the female *P(0)* poverty rate is *higher* than the male *P(0)* poverty rate. Based on this index, women appear to be particularly disadvantaged in the United States, where the female poverty rate is about 30 per cent higher that the male poverty [i.e. $P(0)_f/P(0)_m = 1.319$]. Somewhat surprisingly, however, in Sweden, Italy, France and the Netherlands, the female *P(0)* poverty rate is *lower* than the male *P(0)* poverty rate. In Sweden, women appear to be "advantaged"—the female poverty rate is about 10 per cent lower that the male poverty [i.e. $P(0)_f/P(0)_m = 0.893$].

When information about the average deprivation of the poor is included in the measurement of poverty, a similar pattern is observed across these countries (Table 3). The examination of the gender-specific estimates of the P(1) index reveals that the female poverty rate is *not* higher than the male poverty rate in all these countries. In five of the eleven countries considered—Sweden, Italy, Great Britain, France and the Netherlands—the female P(1) poverty rate is *lower* than the male *P(1)* poverty rate. In the remaining six countries—Poland, Luxembourg, Germany, Canada, Australia and the United States—the female *P(1)* poverty rate is *higher* than the male *P(1)* poverty rate. Again women appear to be very disadvantaged in the United States, where the female poverty rate exceeds the male poverty rate by over 30 per cent. On the other hand in Sweden, the female poverty rate is about 20 per cent lower than the male poverty rate.

Finally, when information about the relative deprivation of the poor is included in the measurement of poverty, the finding that the female poverty rate is not higher than the male poverty rate in all these countries is confirmed (Table 4). More specifically, in Sweden, Great Britain, Italy, West Germany and France, the *P(2)* female poverty rate is *lower* that the male *P(2)* poverty rate. In Poland, the Netherlands, Canada, Luxembourg, Australia and the United States, the opposite is observed. In these countries, the female *P(2)* poverty rate is *higher* than the male *P(2)* poverty rate. Again in the United States, the gap between the male and female poverty rate is quite large—the female poverty rate is about 30 per cent higher. However, in Sweden, the female *P(2)* poverty rate is about 25 per cent lower than the male poverty rate. The remaining countries fall between these two "extremes" represented by the United States and Sweden.

Tables 6, 7 and 8 report the results of the decomposition of the overall poverty rate into male and female poverty shares (i.e. Eqs. [7], [8] and [9]). The decomposition based on the *P(0)* index are shown in Table 6. In Great Britain, Poland, Canada, Luxembourg, West Germany, Australia and the United States, women appear to be over-represented amongst the poor. In these seven countries, the female poverty share, *S(0)* is larger than the female population share, n_f/n. In these countries, the female poverty share/population share ratios, $S(0)_f/(n_f/n)$, are all greater than 1.0 (see the last Column in Table 6). On the other hand, in Sweden, Italy, France and the Netherlands, women appear

to under-represented amongst the poor. In these four countries, the female poverty share is smaller than the female population share. In these countries, the female poverty share/population share ratios, $S(0)_f/(n_f/n)$, are all less than 1.0.

< < < < Tables 6, 7 and 8 About Here > > > >

A similar pattern is observed when the decomposition is carried out using the *P(1)* estimates of poverty (Table 7). In the Netherlands, Poland, West Germany, Luxembourg, Canada, Australia and the United States, the female poverty share/population share ratios are less than 1.0. In these seven countries, women appear to be over-represented amongst the poor. However, in Sweden, Italy, France and Great Britain, the female poverty share/population share ratios are less than 1.0. In these four countries, women appear to under-represented amongst the poor.

Finally, when the decomposition is carried out using the *P(2)* estimates of poverty, an unequal gender distribution of poverty in these countries is confirmed (Table 8). In Poland, the Netherlands, Canada, Luxembourg, Australia and the United States, women are over-represented amongst the poor. In these six countries, the female poverty share is larger than the female population share. On the other hand, in Sweden, Great Britain, Italy, West Germany and France, women appear to under-represented amongst the poor. In these five countries, the female poverty share is smaller than the female population share.

V. Conclusions

The gender-specific estimates of poverty presented in this paper do not unanimously support the hypothesis of Millar and Glendinning (1989, p. 362) that: "[W]omen are at far greater risk of poverty than men." Our estimates suggest that in Sweden, Italy and France, this is simply not the case. In these three countries, the female poverty rate is lower than the male poverty rate by a significant amount. However, in the United States, Australia, Luxembourg, Canada and Poland, the gender-specific poverty rates are all higher for women compared to men. In the Netherlands, Great Britain and West Germany, the conclusion concerning whether the female poverty rate is higher or lower than the male poverty rate varies depending on what value of α is used in the calculation of the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke index.

In all the eleven countries considered in this paper, it was found that the gender distribution of poverty is unequal. It was argued if the poverty experience is shared equally between men and women, we would expect to find that that each group's poverty share would equal their population share. In none of these countries was the female share of poverty exactly equal to the female share of the population. (Or alternatively, in none of these countries was the male share of poverty exactly equal to the male share of the population). Based on the decompositions carried out, one can conclude that the United States *and* Sweden have the most *unequal* gender distributions of poverty of the eleven countries considered. However, the "mechanism" generating this

inequality is different in these two countries. In the United States the gender distribution of poverty is unequal because women are over-represented amongst the poor (or men are under-represented). On the other hand, in Sweden the gender distribution of poverty is unequal because women are under-represented amongst the poor (or men are over-represented).

Why does the gender distribution of poverty differ so much across these countries? Unfortunately, the answer to this question is beyond the scope of this paper. However, it is my belief that there are three potential explanations that need to be explored empirically which might provide at least a partial answer to this question. The first is a compositional explanation: Women are over-represented in demographic groups with high poverty rates generally, such as single-parents and the elderly. The second explanation *is* based in labour market and earnings differentials: Women have lower employment rates compared to men, work on average fewer hours compared to men, and earn less per hour compared to men. The third is an explanation based in cross-country differences in the effectiveness of social welfare systems in reducing poverty: Women benefit more in terms of poverty reduction, the more effective a country's social welfare system is at reducing poverty in general.

It is well known that there are certain demographic groups that have "above average" poverty rates and are predominantly female in composition. The two groups usually pointed to in discussions of the relationship between gender and poverty are

single (lone) parents and elderly adults living alone. Furthermore, there is considerable cross-country variation in the relative population shares of such groups. Because of this variation in household composition, there is an interaction between household composition and poverty, which confounds the measurement and comparison of poverty across countries. In this sense, observed differences in the overall or average poverty rate between two countries, reflects both differences in household composition *and* differences in the underlying "subgroup's" poverty rates. Therefore, the gender distribution of poverty may change after differences in household composition are taken into consideration.

It is well known that low earnings is one of the main predictors of poverty. It is equally well known that women, compared to men, in most countries have lower employment rates, work on average fewer hours, and earn less per hour. However, there is considerable cross-country variation in the magnitude of these male-female labour market differentials. Clearly, we would expect to find in those countries that have done more to ensure the equality of women in the labour market, a more equal gender distribution of poverty.

It could be the case that the more effective a country's social welfare system is at reducing poverty generally, the more effective it is in reducing poverty amongst women. In other words, a more equal gender distribution of poverty might go hand in hand with a lower overall level of poverty. In this sense, successful

poverty alleviation programmes may be biased towards women. There is some support for this explanation across the eleven countries considered in this paper. More specifically, the zero-order correlations between the overall poverty rates, *P(0)*, *P(1)* and *P(2)*, and the corresponding female poverty/population share ratios, are +0.476, +0.417 and +0.383, respectively. In other words, across these eleven countries, there is a tendency for higher overall poverty rates to be associated with a more unequal (female disadvantaged) gender distribution of poverty.

In conclusion, this paper has presented some estimates of the gender distribution of poverty in selected industrialised countries. Its focus was primarily descriptive. As mentioned above, the next step is to explain the cross-country variation I have documented. It is my belief that much can be done in this area with data from the *Luxembourg Income Study*. More and more countries are being added to this data-base, thereby widening the scope for cross-country comparisons of poverty. Likewise, country-specific data-sets for earlier years are being added, thereby widening the scope for the time-series analysis of poverty. Soon, for a large group of countries, interested researchers will be able to combine cross-country variation with temporal variation in the gender distribution of poverty. This will support very powerful analyses of the determents of poverty. Finally, it is hoped that this paper has drawn attention to an area where little empirical research has been carried out, and at the very least, has demonstrated the value of continued effort in

furthering our understanding of the relationship between gender and poverty.

References

Allen, T. (1992), "Economic Development and the Feminisation of Poverty", in: N. Folbre, B. Bergmann, B. Agarwal and M. Floro (eds.) (1992), pp. 107-119.

Atkinson, A.B. (1990), *Comparing Poverty Rates Internationally: Lessons from Recent Studies in OECD Countries*, Discussion Paper no. 53, London (Welfare State Programme, London School of Economics).

Atkinson, A.B. (1987), "On the Measurement of Poverty", *Econometrica*, 55; pp. 749-764.

Commission of the European Communities, (1991), *Final Report on the Second European Programme, 1985-1989*, Commission of the European Communities (Brussels).

Daly, M. (1992), "Europe's Poor Women? Gender in Research on Poverty", *European Sociological Review*, 8; pp. 1-12.

Folbre, N., B. Bergmann, B. Agarwal and Floro, M. (eds.) (1992), *Women's Work in the World Economy*, London (MacMillan).

Foster, J., J. Greer, J. and Thorbecke, E. (1984), "A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures", *Econometrica*, 52; pp. 761-766.

Fuchs, V.R. (1986), *The Feminization of Poverty?*, Working Paper no. 1934, Cambridge, Mass. (National Bureau of Economic Research).

Hagenaars, A. (1987), "A Class of Poverty Indices", *International Economic Review*, 28; pp. 583-607.

Hagenaars, A. and van Praag, B. (1985), "A Synthesis of Poverty

Line Definitions", *Review of Income and Wealth*, 31; pp. 139-153.

O'Higgins, M. and Jenkins S. (1992), *Poverty in the EC: 1975, 1980, 1985*, Unpublished manuscript, Swansea, Wales (Department of Economics, University College of Swansea).

Jenkins, S.P. (1991), "Poverty Measurement and the Within-household Distribution", *Journal of Social Policy*, 20; pp. 457-483.

Millar, J. and Glendinning, C. (1989), "Gender and Poverty", *Journal of Social Policy*, 18; pp. 363-381.

McLanahan, S.S., A. Sorenson and Watson, D. (1989), "Sex Differences in Poverty, 1950-1980", *Signs*, 15: pp. 102-122.

Morris, N. and Preston, I. (1986), "Inequality, Poverty and the Redistribution of Income", *Bulletin of Economic Research*, 38; pp. 277-344.

Scott, H. (1984), *Working Your Way to the Bottom: The Feminization of Poverty*, (London) Pandora Press.

Sen, A.K. (1976), "Poverty: An Ordinal Approach to Measurement", *Econometrica*, 44; pp. 219-231.

Townsend, P. (1987), "Deprivation", *Journal of Social Policy*, 16; pp. 125-146.

Wright, R.E. (1992), "A Feminisation of Poverty in Great Britain?", *Review of Income and Wealth*, 38; pp. 17-25.

Table 1
The Luxembourg Income Study Data-sets

k	Country	Year	Data Source	Sample Size
1.	Australia	1985/86	*Income and Housing Survey*	7,560
2.	Canada	1987	*Survey of Consumer Finances*	10,999[3]
3.	France	1984	*French Income Study of Taxes*	12,693[3]
4.	Germany	1984	*German Panel Survey Wave 2*	5,159[2]
5.	Great Britain	1986	*Family Expenditure Survey*	7,178[2]
6.	Italy	1986	*Bank of Italy Income Survey*	8,022
7.	Luxembourg	1985	*Luxembourg Household Panel Study*	2,012
8.	Netherlands	1987	*Survey of Income and Program Users*	4,190
9.	Poland	1986	*Polish Household Budget Survey*	10,646[4]
10.	Sweden	1987	*Swedish Income Distribution Survey*	9,530[4]
11.	United States	1986	*Current Population Survey*	11,614

Notes:

(1) Sample size is the actual number of households included in the *Luxembourg Income Study* data-set.

(2) Single-family households.

(3) Households from combined tax units.

(4) Tax and administrative units.

Table 2
Male and Female Poverty Rates
Index is P(0)

Country	P(0)	$P(0)_m$	$P(0)_f$	$P(0)_f/P(0)_m$
Sweden	6.9	7.3	6.5	0.893
Italy	17.1	17.5	16.8	0.960
France	14.3	14.6	14.0	0.962
Netherlands	10.5	10.7	10.3	0.966
Great Britain	12.4	12.0	12.7	1.053
Poland	9.5	9.0	10.0	1.107
Canada	13.3	12.6	14.1	1.121
Luxembourg	7.9	7.4	8.3	1.128
West Germany	10.0	9.2	10.6	1.150
Australia	16.7	14.6	18.8	1.284
United States	20.8	17.8	23.4	1.319

Notes: The estimates of P(0) have been multiplied by a factor of 100.

Source: *Luxembourg Income Study.*

Table 3
Male and Female Poverty Rates
Index is P(1)

Country	P(1)	$P(1)_m$	$P(1)_f$	$P(1)_f/P(1)_m$
Sweden	27.7	30.6	24.9	0.813
Italy	45.0	46.5	43.7	0.940
Great Britain	40.4	41.2	39.7	0.964
France	43.9	44.4	43.6	0.982
Netherlands	38.0	37.8	38.1	1.008
Poland	21.1	20.5	21.6	1.056
West Germany	20.7	19.9	21.4	1.075
Luxembourg	15.7	14.8	16.5	1.119
Canada	38.3	36.0	40.5	1.125
Australia	47.8	43.8	51.6	1.178
United States	74.4	63.2	84.2	1.331

Notes: The estimates of P(1) have been multiplied by a factor of 1,000.

Source: *Luxembourg Income Study*.

Table 4
Male and Female Poverty Rates
Index is P(2)

Country	P(2)	$P(2)_m$	$P(2)_f$	$P(2)_f/P(2)_m$
Sweden	17.0	19.1	14.8	0.774
Great Britain	25.9	27.0	24.9	0.925
Italy	19.2	19.8	18.7	0.946
West Germany	7.4	7.5	7.3	0.974
France	24.1	24.3	23.9	0.981
Poland	7.8	7.7	7.8	1.021
Netherlands	26.7	26.1	27.2	1.044
Canada	17.9	17.2	18.6	1.084
Luxembourg	6.2	5.9	6.6	1.112
Australia	29.4	27.5	31.3	1.137
United States	39.6	34.0	44.5	1.306

Notes: The estimates of P(2) have been multiplied by a factor of 1,000.

Source: *Luxembourg Income Study.*

Table 5
Ascending Relative Poverty Rankings

Country	P(0)	P(1)	P(2)
Sweden	1	4	4
Luxembourg	2	1	1
Poland	3	3	3
West Germany	4	2	2
Netherlands	5	5	9
Great Britain	6	7	8
Canada	7	6	5
France	8	8	7
Australia	9	10	10
Italy	10	9	6
United States	11	11	11

Source: *Luxembourg Income Study.*

Table 6
Male and Female Poverty Shares (%)
Index is P(0)

Country	n_f/n	$S(0)_m$	$S(0)_f$	$S(0)_f/(n_f/n)$
Sweden	50.8	52.1	47.9	0.944
Italy	51.9	49.1	50.9	0.980
France	52.5	48.5	51.5	0.982
Netherlands	51.7	49.2	50.8	0.983
Great Britain	52.2	46.5	53.5	1.024
Poland	55.1	42.4	57.6	1.046
Canada	51.1	46.0	54.0	1.056
Luxembourg	52.6	44.4	55.6	1.057
West Germany	52.5	44.0	56.0	1.066
Australia	50.8	43.0	57.0	1.122
United States	53.2	40.0	60.0	1.128

Source: *Luxembourg Income Study.*

Table 7
Male and Female Poverty Shares (%)
Index is P(1)

Country	n_f/n	$S(1)_m$	$S(1)_f$	$S(1)_f/(n_f/n)$
Sweden	50.8	54.4	45.6	0.899
Italy	51.9	49.7	50.3	0.970
Great Britain	52.2	48.7	51.3	0.982
France	52.5	48.0	52.0	0.991
Netherlands	51.7	48.1	51.9	1.004
Poland	55.1	43.6	56.4	1.025
West Germany	52.5	45.7	54.3	1.034
Luxembourg	52.6	44.6	55.4	1.053
Canada	51.1	45.9	54.1	1.057
Australia	50.8	45.1	54.9	1.080
United States	53.2	39.8	60.2	1.132

Source: *Luxembourg Income Study.*

Table 8
Male and Female Poverty Shares (%)
Index is P(2)

Country	n_f/n	$S(2)_m$	$S(2)_f$	$S(2)_f/(n_f/n)$
Sweden	50.8	55.6	44.4	0.875
Great Britain	52.2	49.7	50.3	0.962
Italy	51.9	49.5	50.5	0.973
West Germany	52.5	48.1	51.9	0.988
France	52.5	48.0	52.0	0.991
Poland	55.1	44.4	55.6	1.009
Netherlands	51.7	47.2	52.8	1.021
Canada	51.1	46.9	53.1	1.039
Luxembourg	52.6	44.8	55.2	1.050
Australia	50.8	46.0	54.0	1.063
United States	53.2	40.3	59.7	1.123

Source: *Luxembourg Income Study.*