1



Inequality Matters

Quarterly updates on inequality research, LIS micro data releases, and other developments at LIS



Dear readers,

We are thrilled to share exciting news about the release of our new 2024 LIS template! This updated version features significant enhancements, including improved variables and innovative additions designed to elevate the quality and usability of our data. A central motivation for this revision was to refine our classification of *Household Composition and Living Arrangements*, including the introduction of the 'dependent child' concept, a new household type variable emphasizing the family nucleus, and pointers to partners and parents in the data. as of today, all datasets in the LIS, LWS, and ERFLIS databases are available in the new 2024 LIS template and accessible through LISSY. For our curious microdata users, the LIS team prepared a comprehensive document outlining the key changes to the microdata variables available here.

We are also very excited about the update of Japanese data to the LIS and LWS databases. With the annual series of Japanese data from JP08 to JP20 in LIS and JP09 to JP21 in LWS researchers can now explore more recent economic and social trends in the Japanese society. In addition to various new datasets in LIS/LWS/ERFLIS from other countries, the LIS Database is now enriched through eight more Brazilian datasets going back to the year 1990. Please consult the *Data News* section for the full overview.

LIS is pleased to announce a collaboration with Our World in Data (OWID), integrating three inequality and poverty data explorers into the LIS website. This new partnership creates new additional easy access to indicators on poverty, inequality, and income distribution.

This issue's *Inequality Matters* section features three articles. Sylwia Radomska (Institute of Economics, Polish Academy of Sciences; FAME|GRAPE) and Eva Sierminska (Institute of Economics, Polish Academy of Sciences) analyze disparities in wealth across household types and education systems in 13 countries using LWS data, highlighting how private education financing deepens inequalities, particularly for single parents. Joe Hassell and Pablo Arriagada from Our World in Data (OWID) introduce the three interactive Data Explorers—Poverty, Inequality, and Incomes Across the Distribution mentioned above. Carmen Petrovici (LIS) presents the new household typology from LIS, exploring the predominant types of households in various welfare states and selected countries worldwide, focusing on data around 2021.

IN THIS ISSUE

Wealth and Education of Single-Parents Households in the Light of Different Education Policies

by Sylwia Radomska and Eva Sierminska

Bringing Our World in Data's Visualization Tools 5 to the Luxembourg Income Study

by Pablo Arriagada and Joe Hassell

Different Household Types Patterns and Living 8 Arrangements for Single Parents across Selected Countries

by Carmen Petrovici

Data News / Data Release Schedule	14
Working Papers & Publications	17
News, Events and Updates	18

Enjoy reading!

Jörg Neugschwender

View all the newsletter issues at: www.lisdatacenter.org/newsletter Subscribe <u>here</u> to our mailing list to receive the newsletter and news from LIS! Interested in contributing to the *Inequality Matters* policy/research briefs? Please contact us at : neugschwender@lisdatacenter.org



Wealth and Education of Single-Parents Households in the Light of Different Education Policies *

Sylwia Radomska 🖾 , (Institute of Economics, Polish Academy of Sciences; FAME|GRAPE) Eva Sierminska 🖾 , (LISER; Institute of Economics, Polish Academy of Sciences)

* This article is an outcome of a research visit carried out in the context of the (LIS)2ER initiative which received funding from the Luxembourg Ministry of Higher Education and Research.

Introduction

The share of single-parent households has been increasing in most countries since 1980 (Nieuwenhuis & Maldonado, 2018). Research indicates single-parent households have lower levels of disposable income and wealth in comparison to two-parent households (Sierminska, Smeeding, and Allegrezza 2013; Sierminska 2018; Morelli et al. 2022). Maldonado and Nieuwenheuis (2015) demonstrate that in 18 OECD countries, between 1978 and 2008 single-parent households were consistently more likely to experience poverty than two-parent households. Single-parent households also possess less than 50% of wealth compared to their coupled counterparts (Sierminska, 2018).

Earning a higher income makes saving easier, and saving is necessary to build wealth. It is a well-known fact that individuals with a high level of education earn more than those with a medium level of education (secondary/high school) and this phenomenon is referred to as the "college premium". In the majority of EU countries, the average wage is more than twice as high for those with a high level of education. A similar pattern is observed in the US: the more educated you are, the higher is your salary (Wolla & Sullivan, 2017). However, this positive impact of education on wealth may be disrupted in countries with a private education financing system due to high education costs (for US see Scott et al. 2022, 2023, Emmons et al. 2019).¹

The financing of education, whether public or private, not only affects access to education and social inequalities but also has broader socioeconomic implications. In this analysis, we investigate the differences in education of single parents across countries and the resulting variations in household wealth among single- and other household types, especially couple parent households. Our main hypothesis is that in countries with a prevalent private education finance system, households will possess less wealth due to the high costs of education. This could disproportionately affect single-parent households compared to their dual-parent counterparts given their lower flexibility in work schedules (among other factors), which potentially limits their ability to fully benefit from higher education and advance professionally while balancing personal responsibilities. Our analysis is not causal, yet brings to light additional disparities existing among households. We analyse this in more detail in our working paper.

The education and wealth of single parents across countries (with different education finance systems)

Using LWS data, we examine a unique set of thirteen countries with one wave of data for the 2016-2019 period. We focus on the following: Southern Europe (Greece 2018, Italy 2016 and Spain 2017), Western Europe (Germany 2017, Austria 2018, Luxembourg 2018), Nordic countries (Finland 2016, Denmark 2019, Norway 2019), and Anglo-Saxon countries (Australia 2018, Canada 2016, the UK 2019 and the US 2019). The distinction between countries with free and paid higher education finance systems is made according to the OECD classification (OECD, 2019). The countries that operate a *paid system of higher education* are all located in the Anglo-Saxon region, namely Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States. These countries have high tuition fees and well-developed student support systems. The countries with *free higher education* can be divided into two subgroups. The first subgroup comprises countries with *no or low tuition fees and generous student support systems*, including the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland and Norway) and Luxembourg.² The second subgroup includes countries with *no or low tuition fees and less-developed student support systems*, such as Austria, Italy, Spain, Germany and Greece.² For the purposes of this study, four distinct household types are defined:³

- (1) single households: one adult (1-person household);
- (2) single-parent households: one adult and at least one child (younger than 18);
- (3) couples with children: two adults (married or cohabiting) and at least one child (younger than 18);
- (4) couples without children: two adults (married or cohabiting).⁴

Our main variable of interest is net worth.⁵ Net worth is defined as the sum of financial and non-financial assets minus liabilities (secured and unsecured). Our measure of net worth also includes life insurance and voluntary individual pensions for all countries for which data are available.⁶ We top code wealth at the 99th percentiles and bottom code at the 1st percentile. The monetary values are converted to 2017 US dollars using the 2017 consumer price indices and 2017 USD PPP published on the LIS website.⁷

Figure 1 presents the educational attainment of single-parent households distinguishing between two levels of education: low and high.⁸ The countries are sorted according to two criteria. Initially, a distinction is made between countries with a paid and a free education system. Subsequently, the countries are ordered in ascending order according to the level of higher education attained by single parents. In countries with a paid higher education system, single parents are, on average, better educated than in countries with a free education finance system. In countries with paid higher education, the proportion of single parents with a high level of education is the lowest in the United Kingdom (28%) and the highest in the United States, Australia and Canada (42%, 44% and 63% respectively). In countries where higher education is provided free of charge we observe an interesting pattern. The lowest proportion of high-educated single parents is observed in countries with less-developed student support education system: Greece, Austria, Spain, Italy, Germany, Luxembourg (10%, 16%, 17%, 20%, 22% and 38% respectively) and the highest in Finland, Norway and Denmark (40%, 41 and 42% respectively).

Interestingly, in countries with a generous student support system (regardless of the higher education finance system) we observe a similar fraction of single parents with high education – around 30% - 40%, with the distinction of Canada, where more than 60% of single parents are highly educated. It is worth noting that in Spain more than half of single parents have the lowest level of education, which is almost twice as many as in other countries.

Turning to wealth levels, Table 1 presents the median wealth ratios for all household types (All), singles (S), single parents (SP), couples (C) and couple parents (CP). A number of noteworthy observations





Figure 1. The educational attainment of single parents for selected countries

Table 1. Median wealth levels (in USD)

		SP	СР	S	С	ALL	SP/CP	SP/ALL
paid education	United Kingdom	33 634	272 855	110 621	440 144	227 075	0,12	0,15
	United States	10 067	128 573	35 475	179 906	83 040	0,08	0,12
	Australia	51 007	387 395	163 234	392 110	303 532	0,13	0,17
	Canada	30 711	185 126	35 288	261 336	123 510	0,17	0,25
free education	Greece	22 874	108 516	45 763	107 421	84 309	0,21	0,27
	Austria	17 864	178 901	23 017	210 035	88 671	0,10	0,20
	Spain	48 256	185 868	84 495	218 239	142 409	0,26	0,34
	Italy	135 377	222 692	64 044	225 127	163 914	0,61	0,83
	Germany	4 755	181 124	20 646	211 843	71 323	0,03	0,07
	Luxembourg	163 650	466 988	185 572	768 899	383 002	0,35	0,43
	Finland	21 473	159 924	30 491	236 990	97 961	0,13	0,22
	Norway	57 787	148 595	31 095	264 104	88 332	0,39	0,65
	Denmark	52 859	199 709	51 500	403 796	118 445	0,26	0,45

Notes: Own calculation based on the LWS.

emerge from the data. Firstly, in most countries, apart from Italy, Finland and Norway, single parents consistently exhibit the lowest median net wealth compared to other household types. In Italy, Finland and Norway singles have the lowest median wealth. Secondly, the highest median wealth for all household types is observed in Luxembourg, Australia and the United Kingdom, whereas the lowest median net wealth is observed in the US, Greece, Austria, Germany, Finland and Denmark (below 100,000 USD). Thirdly, in almost all countries, the wealthiest household type are couples (apart from Greece). Couples have at least 1.7 times more net wealth (for Italy) and even 10 times more (UK, US, Austria, Germany and Finland) than single parents. Couples with children have higher median wealth than singles and single-parents but not more than couples (with the distinction of Greece, where couples with children poses the highest amount of net wealth).

We examine whether a similar disparity in median net wealth is observed between households with high levels of education and whether there is any pattern characteristic of countries with paid and free education systems. Figure 2 presents the ratio of median net wealth between highly educated single parents and couples with children and all households. The green bars represent the wealth ratios between single parents and all household types, while the blue bars represent the wealth ratios between single and couple parents.

Figure 2 illustrates discernible patterns. Primarily, single parents exhibit a lower median net wealth than couples with children and all other household types in countries with paid education finance systems. This is also the case in countries with a free education finance system, with the exception of Greece and Italy. In Greece, single parents demonstrate a comparatively higher median net wealth than couples with children and all other households. Conversely, in Italy, single parents exhibit a median net wealth that is equivalent to 110% that of all other households and 84% of couple households.

Second, countries with high tuition fees (light green and light blue) exhibit a lower wealth ratio between single and couple parents and single parents and all household types in comparison to countries with no or low education fees (intense blue and intense green, with the exception of Germany and Finland). In other words, in countries where tertiary education is remunerated, single parents with a high level of





Figure 2. The median ratio of wealth for highly educated single parents

education possess approximately 33% of the total wealth of all household types. This ratio doubles to 67% in countries with a free tertiary education system (with no or low tuition fees).

It is important to note that there is considerable heterogeneity in the ratios of median wealth in countries with free education finance systems. In countries with free education and less-developed student support systems (Austria, Italy, Spain), highly educated single parents possess approximately 56% of the wealth of dual-parent households and 81% of all households. A contrasting pattern is evident among countries with free education and well-developed student support systems. In Finland and Denmark, the ratio of wealth held by single parents is comparable to that observed in countries with a paid education system, at 32% of the wealth of dual-parent households and 45% of all households, respectively. The net wealth ratios in Luxembourg and Norway are higher and comparable to those observed in countries with less developed student support systems (57% of the wealth of dual-parent households and 83% of all households). The cases of Greece and Germany merit particular attention. In the former, highly educated single parents are the wealthiest household type. In the latter, there is a marked disparity in median net wealth between single parents and couples with children and single parents and all households, despite the country's relatively low tuition fees and less-developed student support system. This ratio is comparable to that observed in countries with a paid education system.

Thus, to summarize, the discrepancy in median net wealth is less pronounced among households with higher levels of education. In countries with a paid education system, single parents account for an average of 8% (in the United States) to 17% (in Canada) of the net median wealth of couples with children (Table 1). When only highereducated single parents are considered, the ratio increases to approximately 18% (in the US) to 36% (in Australia). Similarly, the ratio of median net wealth between single parents and all households almost doubles if only higher-educated households are taken into acco unt. A similar pattern is observed in countrie s with free education systems, where the wealth disparity in median net wealth is lower among higher-educated households.

Discussion

Single parents are on average better educated in countries with a paid education finance system. The lowest proportion of single parents

with a high level of education can be observed in countries where tuition fees are either absent or low, and where the student support system is less developed. Examples of such countries include Austria, Italy, Spain, Germany and Greece. In all countries with a paid education system (Anglo-Saxon countries), single parents have the lowest median wealth. This is also the case in Southern Europe and the Nordic countries, where the lowest median net wealth is observed among single parents. In all countries except Greece, couples exhibit the highest wealth. In countries with well-developed education support systems and free education finance systems, higher disparities in wealth between single and couple parents are observed, as well as a higher share of individuals with higher education.

The data reveal that in countries with a less-developed student support system, such as Austria, Luxembourg, Norway and Southern European countries (Greece, Italy and Spain), there is the lowest disparity in median net wealth between high-educated single and couple parents and all households. In Greece, households with at least one member who has completed higher education have a higher median net wealth than couples with children and all other households. Conversely, in Germany, Finland, Denmark and countries in the Anglo-Saxon tradition, the highest disparities in median net wealth are observed.

A number of factors contribute to the shape and trajectory of wealth in each country. These include economic factors such as social benefits, the education system, the tax system, institutions, as well as private factors such as race, migration history and family/marital history. In the United States, for instance, the expense of education is considerable, while social benefits are subject to asset testing. Consequently, single parents at the lowest end of the socioeconomic spectrum are required to liquidate their assets before becoming eligible for benefits. The European Union, on the other hand, offers a more generous approach. However, it is evident that there is a considerable degree of disparity in wealth between single and couple parents in countries with free education finance systems. In countries with a well-developed student support system, disparities in wealth are more pronounced than in countries with less-developed student support systems. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first analysis to focus on the education and wealth inequalities between single parents and other household types in countries with free and paid education finance systems, which shows a complex relationship between the two depending on the institutions. As our analysis is not



causal, further analysis on the education finance system and its impact on wealth and education inequalities is required.

- ¹ The cost of education in the US has risen more than inflation since the 1990s, indicating that education costs are exceptionally high. Currently, 43 million Americans rely on loans to finance their education. The student loan debt has surpassed \$1.77 trillion, undoubtedly impacting wealth accumulation.
- ² In the OECD report, "Education at Glance 2019," Luxembourg, Germany, and Greece are not assigned to specific country groups. The 2024 edition of "Education at Glance" indicates that 79% of students in Germany do not benefit from the student support system, which includes scholarships and loans. In Greece, only one in eight secondary school graduates with good grades apply for scholarships. Consequently, we have classified these countries as having less-developed student support systems.
- ³ The aforementioned household types are defined using the variables describing the household composition (hhtype) and marital status (marital). The term 'single parent' is used to denote a person whose household composition is one adult and at least one child, and who is not currently married or in a union. We focus on the working age population till age 65.
- It should be noted that the focus of this study is on households with children under the age of 18. Consequently, the analysis excludes any expenditure on tertiary tuition by parents. This is a crucial assumption, as parents do contribute to their children's higher education spending. Report "How Americans pay for college" conducted by Sallie Mae shows that in 2019 parent's income and savings cover on average 44% pays for college and extra 8% was covered by parent borrowing, what translates in yearly spending equal to approx. \$15,600 (\$13,072 + \$2,538). Furthermore, this article does not address the differences in net worth between different household types with children due to parent education spending.⁵ One of the limitations of our study is the fact that we do not know the period of limitations for wealth accumulation of most singles, as compared to the couple households. In other words, the length of time they could have been jointly accumulation with a previous partner preceding their single status. We also do not know the varying role of inherited/gifted wealth reeived from others.
- ⁵ One of the limitations of our study is the fact that we do not know the period of limitations for wealth accumulation of most singles, as compared to the couple households. In other words, the length of time they could have been jointly accumulation with a previous partner preceding their single status. We also do not know the varying role of inherited/gifted wealth reeived from others.

- ⁶ We use the variable from LWS Database: anw (adjusted disposable net worth) for all countries apart from Denmark, Australia and Norway. For Australia and Denmark, we use inw (integrated net worth). For Norway we take dnw (disposable net worth). For majority of countries: Austria, Canada, Finland, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Spain, the UK, the US, net worth includes life insurance and voluntary individual pensions. For Denmark and Australia net worth includes pension assets and other long-term savings.
- ⁷ LIS PPP deflators, http://www.lisdatacenter.org (July 26, 2024).
 Luxembourg: LIS.
- ⁸ We use the definition from the LWS database: low (less than upper secondary education completed (never attended, no completed education or education completed at the ISCED 2011 levels 0, 1 or 2), medium (upper secondary education completed or post-secondary non-tertiary education, completed ISCED 2011 levels 3 or 4), high (tertiary education completed, completed ISCED 2011 levels 5 to 8).

References

Emmons, W. R., Kent, A. H., & Ricketts, L. (2019). Is college still worth it? The new calculus of falling returns. *The New Calculus of Falling Returns*, 297-329.

Maldonado, L. C., & Nieuwenhuis, R. (2015). Family policies and single parent poverty in 18 OECD countries, 1978–2008. *Community, Work & Family, 18*(4), 395-415.

Morelli, S., Nolan, B., Palomino, J. C., & Van Kerm, P. (2022). The Wealth (Disadvantage) of Single-Parent Households. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 702(1), 188-204.

Nieuwenhuis, R., & Maldonado, L. (2018). The triple bind of single-parent families: Resources, employment and policies to improve well-being. Policy Press.

OECD (2019), Education at a Glance 2019: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/f8d7880d-en.

Scott III, R. H., Mitchell, K., & Patten, J. (2022). Intergroup disparity among student loan borrowers. *Review of Evolutionary Political Economy*, *3*(3), 515-538.

Scott III, R. H., Patten, J. N., & Mitchell, K. (2023). Bait and Switch: How Student Loan Debt Stifles Social Mobility. Springer Nature.

Sierminska, E. (2018). The 'wealth-being' of single parents. The triple bind of singleparent families, 51.

Sierminska, E., Smeeding, T., & Allegrezza, S. (2013). The distribution of assets and debt. *Income inequality: Economic disparities and the middle class in affluent countries*, 285-311.

Wolla, S. A., & Sullivan, J. (2017). Education, income, and wealth. Page One Economics®.



Bringing Our World in Data's Visualization Tools to the Luxembourg Income Study

Pablo Arriagada ⊠, (Our World in Data)

Joe Hassell 🖾 , (Our World in Data)

Our World in Data is an online scientific publication that focuses on global problems such as poverty, disease, hunger, climate change, war, and inequality. We empower policymakers, journalists, educators, campaigners, and the public by making data and research on these issues accessible and understandable.

At the heart of our work is data visualization. We design and build interactive tools that allow people to explore a wide range of indicators sourced from leading data providers and research organizations.

Data from the *Luxembourg Income Study* has long been featured on our website, given the crucial comparative perspective it offers on incomes across the distribution. More recently, we have been able to give something back by providing data visualization tools that are now embedded within the *LIS* website itself.

There are now three *Our World in Data* Data Explorers available via the 'Data Access' section of the LIS website: www.lisdatacenter.org/data-access:

- Poverty
- Inequality
- Incomes across the distribution

In each case, these provide users a quick way to navigate the most important summary indicators, calculated from LIS microdata and consistent with the definitions and methods adopted in the *LIS Key Figures* and *DART* data dashboard.

Our visualization tools

Key features of our Data Explorers include:

- Controls to switch between related measures and select countries and periods (fig. 1)
- Line chart, map, and table views of the data (fig. 2)
- Quick downloads of both the data and chart image files (fig. 3)

Indicators

The international harmonized microdata prepared by the *Luxembourg Income Study* offers researchers a unique resource. Through a remote execution system (LISSY) it allows researchers from all over the world to analyse and compare in detail household income and wealth and its components, factoring in household composition, socio-demographic characteristics, and employment status.

To extend its audience, *LIS* provides a range of summary indicators through the *LIS Key Figures* and the *DART* data dashboard. The *Our World in Data* Explorers add to these efforts but with a more generalist audience in mind. We have prioritized more concrete, intuitive metrics (e.g., average income by decile) over some of the more abstract metrics used in research (e.g., Atkinson index). We simplify the range of options by only including measures for the total population, leaving out sub-group breakdowns. The titles and notes annotating the charts try to avoid technical jargon wherever possible without sacrificing accuracy.

The three Data Explorers include the following indicators:

- Poverty:
 - Number and share of people in poverty (using a range of absolute and relative poverty lines)
 - Shortfall of incomes from the poverty line (summed across the whole population in poverty, and on average)
 - Poverty gap (the share of the population in poverty multiplied by the average shortfall from the poverty line, expressed as a percentage of the poverty line)
- Inequality:
 - Gini coefficient
 - Top 10% share of income
 - o Bottom 50% share of income
 - o Palma ratio
 - Share in relative poverty (defined here as incomes below 50% of the median)

Inequality - Luxembourg	INDICATOR INCOME MEASURE						
Explorer Explore Luxembourg Income Study data on inequality.	Share of the richest 10% V After tax Adjust for cost sharing within households (equivalized income)						
Q Type to add a country							
Sort by Relevance V							
Srazil							
Chile							
China							
France							
South Africa							
United States							
	▶ 1963 ●	2022					

Fig. 1. Controls to switch between related measures and select countries and periods



Fig. 2. Line chart, map, and table views of the data



Fig. 3. Quick downloads of both the data and chart image files

Inequality - Luxembourg	INDICATOR		INCOME MEASURE			
Income Study Data	Share of the richest 10%	\sim	After tax	✓ (e	Adjust for cost sharin quivalized income)	g within households
Explore Luxembourg Income Study data on inequality.						
Q Type to add a country or res						
	Income share	DOWNLOAD			×	Our World in Data
Sort by Relevance V	The share of meome re					
✓ Brazil	III Table 🚳 Ma		Visualization	Data		🏚 Settings
Chile		-				
China	50%		Image (PNG) Suitable for most uses, wide	ly compatible.	*	South Africa
Z France	40%					
South Africa			Vector graphic (SVG)			Chile Brazil
United States	30%		For high quality prints, or fu software.	rther editing the chart in gra	phics 📥	China
	-	Include termin	along definitions at hottom of c	1.1.1.F		France
Australia	20% minude terminology definitions at bottom of chart					
Austria						
Belgium	10%					
Canada						
Colombia	0% 1963 1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2022
Cote d'Ivoire	Play time-lapse	1963				2022
Czechia	Data source: Luxembourg Note: Income has been equiv	Income Study (2024) valized – adjusted to ac	- Learn more about this data	same household can share costs	like rent and heating.	
× Clear selection	CC BY					<u>a</u> < ::

- Incomes across the distribution:
 - o Mean and median income across the whole population
 - Mean and share of income received by each decile
 - Decile thresholds (P10, P20... P90)

Welfare measure

For each indicator, figures can be viewed for both before- and aftertax income, using the welfare aggregates adopted within the *LIS Key Figures* and *DART* (www.lisdatacenter.org/dataaccess/dart/methodology).

As a measure of after-tax income, we use the *LIS* measure of 'disposable household income'. This refers to "cash and non-cash income from labor, income from capital, income from pensions

(including private and public pensions) and non-pension public social benefits stemming from insurance, universal or assistance schemes (including in-kind social assistance transfers), as well as cash and noncash private transfers, after deduction of the amount of income taxes and social contributions paid".

As a measure of before-tax income, we use the *LIS* measure of 'market income'. This refers to "income received by the households before public redistribution takes place; it includes cash and non-cash income from labor, income from capital, income from private pensions, as well as cash and non-cash private transfers, before deduction of income taxes and social contributions paid".

Before-tax ('market') income is calculated as the sum of income from labor and capital (LIS variable: 'hifactor'), private cash transfers and inkind goods and services provided ('hiprivate'), and private pensions



('hi33'). The before-tax income is only calculated for surveys in which the required data on tax and contributions are fully captured (including where it has been imputed).

In order to make absolute comparisons of standards of living across countries and over time, the data — measured in local currencies at current prices — is converted into constant international dollars. The *LIS* data shown in the Explorers is all currently measured in 2017 international dollars.

Within research on household incomes, it is standard practice to *equivalize* incomes to help compare welfare across households of different sizes and compositions. Equivalence scales try to take into account economies of scale in consumption and, in some cases, the different needs of children and adults. At the same time, by weakening the link to the more familiar numbers seen on one's paycheck, equivalization can make it harder for users to orient themselves in the data based on personal experience. While measures may gain in terms of validity, there is some loss in interpretability.

To address this dilemma, our explorers provide the option of switching between two adjustments for household size.

The first option uses a 'square root' equivalence scale: each household member (both adults and children) is attributed an income equal to the total household income divided by the square root of the number of household members. This is the same scale as applied in the *LIS Key Figures* and *DART* dashboard, ensuring alignment with the summary indicators they contain.

The Data Explorers then allow the option to 'opt out' of equivalization and instead use *per capita* values - total household income divided by the number of members, without any adjustment to account for economies of scale in household consumption. This has the additional benefit of making it easier to compare figures with other data providers, including the World Bank's Poverty and Inequality Platform.

Built for re-use

While our visualization tools are designed for a generalist audience, we hope they will also benefit the *LIS* research community.

Our Data Explorers provide quick access to a wide range of indicators drawn from the *LIS* data. In addition to being viewed in situ, these can be downloaded at the click of a button for further analysis in your own statistical software.

After selecting the metric, countries, and period, the chart image can be downloaded and either directly included in lecture slides, teaching materials, social media, etc., or further adapted using image editing software.

When reusing this work, please remember to cite the *Luxembourg Income Study* as the original source of the data.

Gaining from collaboration

An important and very old idea in economics is that the division of labour between workers specializing in different tasks can increase their collective productivity.

It is perhaps surprising then to see how limited a degree of specialization there often is within the production of research, including within the field of economics. Individual researchers are often responsible for the whole 'production line' from beginning to end: understanding the literature, finding and handling the data, conducting analyses and building models, writing papers, and making tables and figures.

Our Data Explorers aim to support researchers with some of these steps, making it quicker to access and browse the data and to produce clear, readable figures.

Likewise, having long been users of *LIS* data, we hope that *LIS* itself will benefit from this collaboration. In developing these visualization tools, our goal has been to add value to *LIS* data while allowing the *LIS* team to focus on the unique and crucial contribution they make to the study of poverty and inequality through the provision of harmonized microdata.

More about Our World in Data

Our World in Data is produced as a collaborative effort between researchers at the University of Oxford, who are the scientific contributors of the website content; and the non-profit organization Global Change Data Lab, who owns, publishes and maintains the website and the data tools.

At the University of Oxford, the research team is affiliated with the Oxford Martin Programme on Global Development, where the mission is to produce academic research on the world's largest problems based on the empirical analysis of global data.

Find more at www.ourworldindata.org/about.



Different Household Types Patterns and Living Arrangements for Single Parents

across Selected Countries

Carmen Petrovici 🖂 , (LIS)

Household structures vary significantly across countries and cultures. This article introduces a new household typology from the Luxembourg Income Study (LIS), based on which we look at the predominant types of household in different welfare states in Europe and in selected countries in different parts of the world, with a focus on data around 2021.

The new LIS typology distinguishes first, when a family nucleus can be identified, between several types of households: individuals living alone, nucleus family (couples with or without children, or lone parents with dependent or only with non-dependent children), multigenerational (typically involving three or more generations, although two generations may include grandparents living with their grandchildren), and other extended families. A dependent child is defined as someone aged 18 or younger, or between 18 and 24 if they are still in continuous education. When a family nucleus cannot be identified, there are two other types of households: relatives living together (e.g., siblings) or non-relatives living together. Any other type of household, particularly when it is unknown if the members are relatives or not, is classified under the 'other household type' category. In countries where polygamous unions are legally recognized or persist due to cultural practices, polygamous families are categorized separately, as illustrated in the cases of India and Mali.

This article will first highlight the most common household types in each of the selected countries, and second, it will examine the proportion of lone parents or other single parents among parents with at least one dependent child, along with their living arrangements at the individual level.

A lone parent is a parent living solely with their own children (biologically or adopted). The nucleus household type "lone parent with at least one dependent child" is further broken down at the individual level into two groups: "lone parent living with only own dependent child/ren" (where all children meet the criteria to be consider dependent), and "lone parent living with own children of which at least 1 dependent". The final category at the individual level: "one parent living with at least 1 own dependent child and others" refers to parents who live with at least one dependent child and at least one other person who is neither their child nor their partner. Since these parents reside with others, they are not strictly considered lone parents, therefore the term 'single parents' will be used to designate all three categories. It is important to note that this last category cannot be specifically identified at the household level and will be included within one of the non-nuclear household types (e.g., multigenerational, extended family, relatives living together, or even non-relatives living together). The reference category at the individual level "not one parent" is restricted for this analysis to parents of at least one dependent child living in a couple.

Please note that the household type "lone parent with non-dependent children only" is excluded from the individual-level analysis of single parents, as these households contain only non-dependent children (adult children living with their parents, who, in many cases, are the ones supporting their elderly parents).

To explore the diversity of countries across Europe, one country was selected from each welfare state model: Luxembourg for the conservative model, Denmark for the Nordic model, the United Kingdom (UK) for the liberal model, Spain for the Southern model, and Romania for the Eastern European model.

As shown in Figure 1.a, in Luxembourg the single-person households, are preponderant among the household types with 38.5%, followed by far, with more than 15 percentage points difference, by couples with at least one dependent child and couples without children.

In Figure 1.b, when focusing on parents with dependent children, 7.5% are lone parents living only with their dependent children. Less than 2% of single parents live with others and even less live with non-dependent children as well. This can be explained by the fact that, on average, parents in Luxembourg have less than 2 children, therefore the cases of both dependent and non-dependent ones do not occur often.

Figure 2.a reveals that in Denmark nearly half of all households are single-person households, the highest proportion among the countries featured in this article. A quarter of households consist of couples without children, followed at 7 percentage points difference by couples with at least one dependent child. As shown in Figure 2.b, Denmark has a higher percentage of single parents with dependent children compared to Luxembourg, with over 13% overall. The vast majority of them are lone parents living solely with their dependent children.



Fig.1a Different types of household Luxembourg 2021

[10]one person household [20] couple without children [31]lone parent with at least one dependent child [32]lone parent with non-dependent children 1.57 [33] couple with at least one dependent child [34] couple with non-dependent children 4.41 [41]multigenerational family 1.36 [42]other extended family 0.19 [51] relatives living together | 0.37 [52]non-relatives living together 0.65

4.66

23.2







Inequality Matters

UK is the only European country in our selection where single-person households are not the most common household type. Instead, couples without children occupy the largest share, though the difference between these two categories is small, as shown in Figure 3.a. Couples with at least one dependent child follow, with an 8 percentage point gap. When examining single parents, Figure 3.b shows that the UK has the highest proportion of single parents among the selected European countries. Most of them are lone parents living only with dependent children, but compared to the other countries, nearly 2% live with both dependent and non-dependent children, and a small number live with others.

Spain, representing the Southern model, displays a distinct pattern of household types. While single-person households remain the most common, as shown in Figure 4.a, couples with at least one dependent child come in second, with a small difference of less than 2 percentage points. Couples without children follow, with a gap of around 3 percentage points. When examining parents with dependent children, Figure 4.b reveals that 5.3% are lone parents living only with dependent children. About 1% live with both dependent and non-dependent children, while nearly 2.5% live with others. Notably, as seen in Figure 4.a, the proportion of multigenerational families in Spain is higher than in the other countries previously discussed.

Romania, representing Eastern European countries, exhibits a distinct household typology pattern. Approximately a third of households are single-person households, followed by couples with at least one dependent child, which are about 9 percentage points less common. Couples without children are only slightly less prevalent than the ones with children, with a difference of less than 4 percentage points, as shown in Figure 5.a. A particularity in Romania is its highest proportion of multigenerational families compared to all other European countries presented, accounting for almost 12% of households. Romania also has the lowest share of single parents among the European countries discussed, representing only about 6.5% of parents with dependent children, as seen in Figure 5.b. Just over half of them are lone parents living only with dependent children, while the second largest group lives with others, a trend that is also reflected in the higher proportion of multigenerational families.

Looking at the household patterns around the world, the example from North America, the United States, presents a different scenario, as shown in Figure 6.a. Single-person households are the largest category, followed closely by couples without children, with a difference of less than 3 percentage points. Couples with at least one dependent child are about 5 percentage points less common than couples without children in the household. Lone parents rank fourth among household types with over 6%. This is supported by the individual level analysis: as shown in Figure 6.b, single parents represent over 15% of parents with dependent children. Most of them are lone parents living only with dependent children, while about 28% of single parents live with others.

Mexico, representing Central America, presents a distinctly different household pattern compared to the previously discussed countries, as shown in Figure 7.a. The largest household type, making up over 30%, consists of couples with at least one dependent child, followed by multigenerational households, which account for over 19%, reflecting different cultural norms. Due to the underdeveloped pension system in Mexico, families rely heavily on intergenerational solidarity. Studies have shown that one in four adult children live with their elderly parents





1.76

[3]one parent & others

11.41





(Gomes, C., 2007). Single-person households rank third, with a gap of more than 3 percentage points, followed closely by couples without children. Lone parents represent the fifth largest household type, and as seen in Figure 7.b, the single parents account for about 18% of parents with dependent children. Notably, the majority of single parents, over 10%, live with others, showing a different pattern compared to the other countries discussed.

A similar pattern is observed in South America, in Colombia, as shown in Figure 8.b. The proportion of single parents among parents is even higher, at around 22.5%, with nearly half of them living with others in the household. This is supported by the fact that the multigenerational families represent the third largest household category, as is reflected in Figure 8.a. Single-person households rank second, with a difference of about 5.5 percentage points, while couples with at least one dependent child make up the largest household category, similar to the pattern in Mexico. Additionally, there is a significant proportion of households (nearly 8%) where relatives live together without a family nucleus.

Uruguay, another South American country, exhibits a slightly different household pattern. The largest category is still couples with at least one dependent child, but the second largest, with a difference of more than 10 percentage points, consists of couples without children. Singleperson households follow closely, as shown in Figure 9.a.

Multigenerational families represent the fourth largest category, accounting for over 9%. Unlike in Colombia, however, the majority of single parents in Uruguay are lone parents living only with their dependent children, while about 38% of single parents live with others and only a small percentage with dependent and non-dependent children.

Colombia 2021

9 31

Looking at Asia, Japan present yet a distinct household pattern, as shown in Figure 10.a. it is the only country among those selected in which the largest category is couples without children, followed closely by couples with at least one dependent child. In third place, with a 5.5 percentage point difference, are couples with only non-dependent children, making Japan the only country where this category ranks among the top three. Additionally, Japan has a notable proportion of lone parents with non-dependent children, accounting for over 7%. Single-person households are in fourth place, followed by multigenerational families, which make up nearly 12% of households.

Japan is the only country in this selection where parents pointers are not available in the data. As a result, the individual-level graph in Figure 10.b. is limited to reference persons (and partners of parents in couples), meaning that the category of single parents living with other is most likely underestimated. Overall, Japan shows a relatively low proportion of single parents, under 4%, and most of them are lone parents living with only dependent children.



Inequality Matters

Issue No. 32 (December 2024)



India is the only Asian country in the LIS database that provides pointers to parents and partner in the data, which is why it has been included in this analysis using the most recent wave available. Although the reference year is 10 years earlier than that for the other countries, which is around 2021, India remains an interesting case. As shown in Figure 11.a, couples with at least one dependent child make up the largest household category with over 35%, closely followed by multigenerational families, at less than one percentage point difference, reflecting strong intergenerational solidarity within Indian society. All other household types are much less common; couples without children rank third at just under 8%. Furthermore, India has the lowest proportion of single-person households among the selected countries, at just over 3%. For the first time, we also observe the presence of

polygamous families, though their occurrence is very low. This low percentage is largely explained by the fact that polygamy is only legal for the Muslim minority in India. Moreover, comparing with previous wave available, the trend shows a slight decline in polygamous unions since 2004.

As seen in Figure 11.b, the proportion of single parents in India is relatively small, making up just slightly over 7% of all parents with dependent children. The majority of these single parents live with others in the household, which aligns with the significant presence of multigenerational families.





Unlike India, Mali, the only African country in our selection, permits polygamy under the Marriage Code, allowing men to have up to four wives. Polygamy is so common in Mali that by the age of 45–49, nearly half of married women are in polygamous marriages (Heath, R., Hidrobo, M., Roy, S., 2020). While the most prevalent household type in Mali is couples with at least one dependent child, the polygamous families come in second, representing 21.66% of households, as shown in Figure 12.a. Moreover, the prevalence of polygamous unions is on the rise, with a 2.33 percentage point increase since 2011. Multigenerational families rank third, followed closely by households where relatives live together. The proportion of single parents among all parents in Mali is relatively low, under 5%, as shown in Figure 12.b, with the majority living with other individuals in the household.

This article presents the diverse picture of different household types across selected countries, reflecting varying cultural patterns. Additionally, it examines the proportion of single parents among parents with minor children, which varies significantly across countries, ranging from 3.7% in Japan to 22.5% in Colombia and their different living

arrangements. However, when we extrapolate from the individual level to the family unit (where two parents living together as a couple are considered a single family unit), the overall proportion of single parents increases. As shown in Figure 1.c. below, taking the example of Luxembourg, the proportion rises from just under 10% at the individual level to over 18% when considering family as the unit of analysis.

Further paths of analysis could focus on the characteristics of lone parents living only with their children compare with those of single parents living with others and their economic wellbeing.

References

Gomes, C. (2007). Intergenerational Exchanges in Mexico: Types and Intensity of Support. *Current Sociology*, 55(4), 545-560. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392107077638;.

National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5) 2019-21 India Report, march 2022. Volume I, International Institute for Population Sciences, ,Mumbai-400088, available at: https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR375/FR375.pdf.

Heath, R., Hidrobo, M., Roy, S., (2020). Cash transfers, polygamy, and intimate partner violence: Experimental evidence from Mali, *Journal of Development Economics*, Volume 143, 2020, 102410, ISSN 0304-3878, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2019.102410.



Data News / Data Release Schedule



Exciting News: Enhanced LIS Template with Improved Identification of Family Structures and Other New Features

We are thrilled to announce the release of a new 2024 LIS template featuring improved variables and several exciting additions designed to enhance the quality and usability of our data. These updates reflect our ongoing commitment to delivering high-quality, harmonized datasets on income and wealth for the global research community.

A central motivation for this revision was to improve the section of *Household Composition and Living Arrangements*, a vital component of social and economic analysis. The classification of household composition has been revisited to address limitations in the previous version. The newly introduced concept of 'dependent child', whereby both age and enrollment in continuous education are considered, provides a clearer categorization for the family nucleus. Additionally, the new household type variable now emphasizes the family nucleus rather than relying on the *'reference person'* (formerly *'household head'*). This shift enables more accurate classification of household types, particularly single-parent households with dependent children, which is further supported by the addition of a new lone-parent variable at the individual level. In addition, LIS is now providing pointers to the partner and both parents, when available in the source data. Altogether, these enhancements enable researchers to more accurately capture complex family structures, including multigenerational households, extended families, and lone-parent families, thereby providing a clearer and more nuanced picture of living arrangements.

As part of this restructuring, the construction of the variables *relation* and *marital* also underwent minor revisions. These include adjustments in how certain categories are treated and the reorganization of detailed categories into broader groupings.

The *Labour Market* variables have also been improved. A new monthly wage variable has been introduced, and hourly wage has been streamlined to integrate both net and gross hourly wages. Additionally, a new occupation variable has been added to enable clear differentiation between data based on the ISCO-88 and ISCO-08 international standards.

The section *Geography and Housing* was extended by information on the number of rooms available for the household; the variable own no longer provides the sub-categories of free-housing.

In the LWS database, several new variables are added to the *Assets and Liabilities*. These will allow users to distinguish between transaction accounts and cash versus saving accounts, separate publicly traded stocks from other equity, and analyse money owed to the household more thoroughly.

Please note that as of today, all datasets in the LIS, LWS, and ERFLIS databases are available in the new 2024 LIS template and accessible through LISSY. For our curious microdata users, we have prepared a comprehensive document outlining the key changes to the LIS variables available here.

We invite you to explore these updates and take full advantage of the enhanced 2024 LIS template!

The LIS team



Inequality Matters



Brazil (8 new LIS datasets) – Addition of BR90, BR92, BR93, BR95-BR99 to the LIS Database Canada (1 new LIS dataset) – Addition of CA20 to the LIS Database Chile (1 new LWS dataset) – Addition of CL21 to the LWS Database Egypt (1 new ERFLIS datasets) – Addition of EG19 to the ERFLIS Database Estonia (1 new LWS datasets) – Addition of EE21 to the LWS Database Finland (1 new LWS datasets) – Addition of FI19 to the LWS Database Georgia (1 new LIS dataset) – Addition of GE22 to the LIS Database Greece (1 new LWS datasets) – Addition of GR21 to the LWS Database Japan (10 new LIS & LWS datasets) – Addition of GR21 to the LWS Database Lithuania (1 new LIS datasets) – Addition of LT21 to the LIS Database Russia (1 new LIS datasets) – Addition of RU22 to the LIS Database Spain (3 new LIS datasets) – Addition of ES20, ES21 and ES22 to the LIS Database United States (1 new LIS datasets) – Addition of US23 to the LIS Database

Data Releases and Revisions – Luxembourg Income Study (LIS)

Brazil

With the release of eight new datasets from Brazil (**BR90, BR92, BR93, BR95** to **BR99**), LIS has continued the harmonisation of the Brazilian LIS series backwards in time. The new datasets are based on the National Household Sample Survey (PNAD) carried out by the Brazilian Geographical and Statistical Institute. Minor consistency revisions have been carried out for the datasets **BR01** to **BR15** (*Ifs, emp, emp_ilo, enroll*).

Canada

LIS has added one more data point, **CA20**, to the *LIS Database*. The dataset is from the Canadian Income Survey (CIS) carried out by Statistics Canada.

Georgia

One new dataset from Georgia, **GE22**, has been added to the *LIS Database*. The data are based on the Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES) carried out by the National Statistics Office of Georgia.

Japan

LIS has annualised the Japanese data series from JP08 to JP20. All datasets are based on the integrated Japan Household Panel Survey (KHPS/JHPS) carried out by the Panel Data Research Center at Keio University. The previously available datasets JP08/JP10/JP13 have been completely reharmonised following the integration of the newly available Japan Household Panel Survey (JHPS) data with the previously available Keio Household Panel Survey (KHPS) data, hence providing a much larger sample, better aimed at capturing the totality of the population, and with revised weighting and imputations techniques carried out by the data provider.

Lithuania

One new dataset from Lithuania has been added to the *LIS Database*, **LT21**. The dataset is based on the Lithuanian Survey on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) carried out by Statistics Lithuania.

Russia

LIS has added one more data point for Russia, RU22, to the *LIS Database*. The dataset is based on the 2023 Survey of the Population Income and participation in Social programs (PIS) carried out by the Federal State Statistics Service (Rosstat).

Spain

Three new datasets from Spain have been added to the *LIS Database*, **ES20**, **ES21** and **ES22**. The data are based on the Spanish component of the European Union's Survey of Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC), and are from the Spanish National Statistics Institute (INE).

United States

LIS has updated the US series with the addition of the latest available data point, **US23**. The data comes from the March 2024 ASEC component of the Current Population Survey, carried out by the **Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)** / **U.S. Census Bureau**. In addition, all datasets starting from **US04** have been revised in order to correct a double count of the amount of the non-refundable portion of the Child Tax Credit, which had previously been placed both as a social benefit (in variable *hi41*) and as a tax credit (in variable *px11*). As a result, variable *hi41*, *hipubsoc*, *hitransfer*, *hitotal and dhi*, *as well as hpub_a and hpublic* were reduced consequently. This revision had a moderate impact on the LIS Key Figures.

Data Releases and Revisions – Luxembourg Wealth Study (LWS)

Chile

One new dataset from Chile has been added to the LWS Database (CL21). The new dataset is based on the Household Financial Survey (EFH) carried out by the Central Bank of Chile. Please note that the previous datasets underwent some consistency revision. Contents of *ctrybrth* in CL17 have been moved to *citizen*, and *educlev* in CL14 and CL17 has been revised.

Estonia

One new dataset from Estonia has been added to the LWS Database (EE21). The new dataset is based on the Household Finance and Consumption Survey (HFCS) carried out by Eesti Pank (Bank of Estonia) and Statistics Estonia.



Finland

One new dataset from Finland has been added to the LWS Database (FI19). The new dataset is based on the Household Wealth Survey which is also entering the Household Finance and Consumption Survey (HFCS) carried out by Statistics Finland. Please note that in the entire Finnish LWS series LIS has appointed in many households the reference person to be the parent rather than the initially appointed reference person (living with siblings and parents). This allows for more robust information when users select the reference person for their analyses. This has been already the case for FI09 and FI13, and now has been also revised in the FI16 data. Therefore, information in *relation, partner, nchildren, ageyoch,* and *parents* and *hhtype* change considerably in FI16.

Greece

One new dataset from Greece has been added to the LWS Database (**GR21**). The new dataset is based on the Household Finance and Consumption Survey (HFCS) carried out by the Bank of Greece.

Japan

LIS has annualised the Japanese data series from JP09 to JP21. All datasets are based on the integrated Japan Household Panel Survey (KHPS/JHPS) carried out by the Panel Data Research Center at Keio University. The previously available datasets JP04/JP09/JP11/JP14 have been completely reharmonised following the integration of the newly available Japan Household Panel Survey (JHPS) data with the previously available Keio Household Panel Survey (KHPS) data, hence providing a much larger sample, better aimed at capturing the totality of the population, and with revised weighting and imputations techniques carried out by the data provider.

Data Releases and Revisions – ERF-LIS Database (ERFLIS)

One new dataset from Egypt has been added to the ERFLIS Database (EG19). The dataset is based on the ERF Harmonised Household Income and Expenditure Surveys (HHIES) version of the Household Income, Expenditure and Consumption Survey (HIECS) carried out by the Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS).

Other Generic Reviews Applied during the Implementation of the 2024 Template in the LIS, LWS, ERFLIS Databases

Country of birth and citizen: When only three codes were available, notably e.g., 1 born in the country, 2 born in EU, 3 other, previously assigned cases 'other' have been recoded from 2405 to 2000, as the partly previously assigned code 2405 'Non-EU countries' would indicate still part of the continent Europe (24xx), whereas 'other' refers to all other countries than European Union. The label 2405 in *ctrybrth* and *citizen* was adjusted to 'Non-EU European countries'.

Country-specific information about administrative regions: the coding has been standardised in various countries over time to reflect a better consistency with the *Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics (NUTS)* region codes over time. This classification refers mostly to the territory of the European Union.

Attitudes Toward Household Finance: As the content is frequently collected for the whole household, in these cases, the information is now repeated for all household members. A note in METIS clarifies when the

information was collected for the household. This mostly is the case for datasets originating from the HFCS, but also in the United States, whereas the information is collected at the individual level for example in the United Kingdom.

Other minor adjustments in the LWS Database concern the variables *educlev*, *edyrs*, and *ptime1*, as well as a systematic inclusion of additional amount of financial assistance from relatives and friends (HFCS source data) to *hi521*, which are also included in *hi52*, *hiprivate*, *hitransfer*, *hitotal*.

Other dataset-specific revisions were carried out. When needed we encourage users to reach out to us, when there earlier sent LISSY programs create unexpected results. The revised variables aim to provide more consistent and comparable results, and we apologise for the inconvenience.

LIS/LWS Data Release Schedule

	Spring 2025	Summer 2025				
LIS Database						
Australia		AU20				
Austria	AT22					
Bulgaria	BG06-BG22					
Brazil	BR76-BR89					
Greece	GR03-GR21					
Norway	NO22					
Panama		PA96-PA22				
LWS Database						
Australia		AU20				
France	FR03, FR09, FR14, FR17, FR20					
Mexico	MX19					
Norway	NO22					



Working Papers & Publications



Focus on Material and Social Deprivation Associated with Public Health Actual Causes of Death among Older People in Europe: Longitudinal and Multilevel Results from the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in

Europe (SHARE)^{CP} LIS WP No. 890 by Matthias Hans Belau (University Medical Centre Hamburg-Eppendorf, Institute of Medical Biometry and Epidemiology)

Background: Adverse socioeconomic conditions at the individual and regional levels are associated with an increased risk of mortality. However, few studies have examined this relationship using multilevel analysis and, if so, only within a single country. This study aimed to examine this relationship using data from several European countries. *Methods*: Individual-level data were obtained from Waves 5 to 9 of the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe, while regional-level data were obtained from the Luxembourg Income Study Database. Cox regression analysis with gamma-shared frailty and a random intercept for country of residence was used to examine the association between individual mortality from all causes, cancer, heart attack, and stroke and measures of socioeconomic deprivation at the individual level, including material and social deprivation indices, and at the area level, including the Gini index. Results: The risk of mortality from all causes was increased for respondents with material deprivation (hazard ratio (HR) = 1.77, 95% CI = [1.60, 1.96]) and social deprivation (HR = 7.63, 95% CI = [6.42, 9.07]) compared with those without. A similar association was observed between individual deprivation and the risk of mortality from cancer, heart attack, or stroke. Regional deprivation had a modest contextual effect on the individual risk of death from all causes and cancer. However, when individual-level deprivation was included in the models, no contextual effects were found. Conclusions: The results indicate that individual socioeconomic conditions significantly predict causes of death in older European adults, with those with material deprivation and social deprivation having a higher risk of death from all causes, including cancer, heart attack, and stroke, while the Gini index has a minimal effect, although the Gini index reflects regional disparities across Europe.

LIS working papers series

LIS working papers series - No. 888 $^{\mathscr{O}}$

A Comparison of the Socioeconomic and Gendered Organization of Social Reproduction in the United States and United Kingdom, 1973– 2013

by Katherine A. Moos, Pilar Gonalons

LIS working papers series - No. 889 $^{\mathscr{O}}$

A Theory of Perverse Redistribution in Higher Education and Income Tax Progressivity in Europe by Michele Gubello, Nora Strecker

LIS working papers series - No. 890 $^{\mathscr{O}}$

Material and Social Deprivation Associated with Public Health Actual Causes of Death among Older People in Europe: Longitudinal and Multilevel Results from the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) *by Matthias Hans Belau* Published in *Frontiers in Public Health, 12, (2024). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1469203*

LIS working papers series - No. 891 $^{\mathscr{O}}$

Old Age Incomes, Wealth, and Poverty across the Globe by Kenneth Nelson, Johan Fritzell

LWS working papers series

LWS working papers series - No. 47 Single Parents, Marital Status and "Wealth-Being" by Eva Sierminska, Sylwia Radomska



News, Events and Updates

Registration for the 2nd III/LIS Comparative Economic Inequality Conference 2025 is now open

We are excited to announce that registration is now open for the **2nd III/LIS Comparative Economic Inequality Conference**, taking place in Luxembourg on **27–28 February 2025**. This event will be hosted at the Coque and Helix venues, featuring an array of distinguished speakers, thought-provoking keynote lectures, and engaging parallel sessions.

The conference will cover critical topics, including:

- Earnings, gender, and global inequality
- Intergenerational mobility and wealth distribution
- The role of policies in addressing inequality and poverty
- Innovations in inequality measurement and methods

Over **80 research papers** covering these topics will be presented across seven parallel sessions during the conference. In addition, the conference is highlighted by **two keynote lectures** by leading experts: Prof. Nora Lustig (Tulane University) and Prof. Fabian Pfeffer (LMU Munich).

The conference will feature a special evening event ,a book presentation on *Visions of Inequality: From the French Revolution to the End of the Cold War*, the highly praised recent new work by Prof. Branko Milanovic of the Stone Center on Socio-Economic Inequality at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. Professor Milanovic will present highlights from his most recent book.

This event will be moderated by Prof. Francisco Ferreira from the International Inequalities Institute at the London School of Economics and Prof. Janet Gornick of the Stone Center. A cocktail reception will follow, offering attendees the opportunity to network and discuss insights from the evening.

Please find the Conference Program here.

Attendance is for free but **registration** is mandatory.

Kindly register from this link [Deadline: Wednesday 15th January]. Please note that this is an in-person event and virtual attendance is not possible.

LIS in Our World in Data (OWID)

LIS is pleased to announce a collaboration with **Our World in Data (OWID)**, integrating comprehensive inequality and poverty indicators into the LIS website. This partnership enhances access to detailed data on poverty, inequality, and income distribution, facilitating in-depth analysis and cross-national comparisons.

Over the last years, OWID has developed three interactive Data Explorers—*Poverty* Data Explorer, *Inequality* Data Explorer, and *Incomes Across the Distribution* Data Explorer—which are now accessible through the LIS platform from here. These tools utilize harmonized datasets from the LIS Databases, providing users with a seamless experience to explore after-tax ('disposable household income') and before-tax ('market income') measures across various countries and time periods. The data is standardized in constant 2017 international dollars, ensuring accurate comparisons of living standards globally.

This integration underscores LIS's commitment to advancing research on socio-economic outcomes by offering robust, user-

friendly resources that support policymakers, researchers, and the public in understanding and addressing economic disparities. More information about the tool and its features can be found here.

LIS would like to extend its acknowledgment to the entire OWID team, particularly Joe Hasell and Pablo Arriagada, for their invaluable efforts in incorporating indicators derived from LIS microdata into the OWID platform.

5th (LIS)²ER workshop on Policies to Fight Inequality "Fighting poverty: measurement and policy challenges"- 11-13 December 2024

From 11 to 13 December, LIS Cross-National Data Center hosted the (LIS)²ER Workshop 2024: "Fighting poverty: measurement and policy challenges" jointly with the Luxembourg Institute of Socio-Economic Research (LISER) to commemorate the five years of the (LIS)²ER Initiative. The workshop brought together inequality scholars and policy experts from around the world to delve into the role of policy evaluation to tackle poverty and economic inequality in both developed and low/middle-income countries.

The three-day workshop commenced with the presentation by Christoph Lakner of the World Bank's flagship report *Poverty*. Prosperity, and Planet: Pathways out of the Polycrisis, at Abbaye de Neumünster, which provided a global perspective on tackling poverty amidst interconnected crises of poverty and climate change. It was followed by another presentation on the evolution of poverty in Luxembourg over the past 40 years by Philippe Van Kerm, the Research Director of LIS. Over the next two days in Belval, the workshop featured 12 academic presentations addressing a varieties of relevant topics, including poverty estimation methods, child poverty, inequality and populism, the evaluation of cash and in-kind transfers, and the role of minimum income schemes. The workshop was concluded with a policy roundtable discussion titled "Bridging Evidence and Action: How to Evaluate What Works in the Fight Against Poverty?". Experts including academics and policymakers as well as those from international organizations discussed the role of rigorous policy evaluation, in particular innovative methodologies, robust data, and the exchange of insights across various country contexts. The workshop overall highlighted insights from mutual learning and the critical role of evidence-based interventions in making effective policies.

LIS Team Participation in Conferences/Workshops

- LIS was invited by the Political Science Department in Bologna University to deliver a mini workshop on the usage of the LIS Database. Carmen Petrovici gave the workshop that was held on October 16-17. During the workshop, the students were introduced to the LIS Database, the variable structure, the usage of the LISSY system, and potential research areas.
- On November 6th, Teresa Munzi and Piotr Paradowski gave a presentation on "Luxembourg Wealth Data: an international database of wealth microdata" at the Household Finance and Consumption Network (HFCN) Meeting.
- On November 5th, LIS has given a one-day workshop on the usage of the LIS Databases; as part of the 13th International Francophone Colloque on Sample Surveys organised by STATEC,



the University of Luxembourg and the Luxembourg Statistical Society. The workshop named "Research methods on poverty and inequality: classic approaches and innovations through the use of comparative data from the Luxembourg Income Study (LIS)" was given by Profs. Louis Chauvel and Philippe Van Kerm (University of Luxembourg), and Carmen Petrovici from LIS. The training consisted of three main parts 1) introduction to LIS/LWS data, income and wealth concepts and definitions, 2) Theoretical session on measuring inequalities and poverty, 3) Practical session (data exercises – with replication of existing research papers).

On November 13th, LIS was invited by the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile to give a mini virtual workshop on the usage of the LIS data as part of the TRIADA Conference. The workshop given by Piotr Paradowski, Gonçalo Marques, and Heba Omar aimed at introducing the basic use of the LIS and LWS databases for analyzing income and wealth inequality. Key topics included:

- Overview of the databases, including geographic and temporal coverage and variable content
- Selection of welfare measures in LIS/LWS databases
- Accessing LIS/LWS data via the LIS Remote-Execution System, "LISSY"
- Hands-on exercises using STATA with LISSY to conduct basic statistical analysis
- On November 25th, Teresa Munzi participated to the UN ESCWA Expert Group Meeting in London, she commented and advised on the UN ESCWA Report: *World Poverty Higher than We Thought What can be done?*
- On November 29, Peter Lanjouw attended the UNECE Expert Group Meeting on Measuring Poverty and Inequality, Geneva, Switzerland, where participated in the panel discussion – *Drivers for change in poverty statistics.* During the meeting, Thesia I. Garner (BLS) presented the latest work of LIS on Luxembourg Consumption Database (LCS).

(LIS)²ER Visitors Programme 2024

During this quarter, LIS and LISER have hosted the last cohort of visitors in the framework of the (LIS)²ER 2024 Visitors Programme. Since late September, the initiative hosted one long-term 1-month visitor (Chiara Mussida, Università Cattolica des Sacro Cuore). During her stay, she explored together with Anne-Catherine Guio (LISER) the LIS data on alimonies paid and received. During her stay she gave a seminar where she presented her work on "A wider look at female employment and childbirth in Italy (and other European countries)".

LIS Congratulates Daron Acemoglu on Nobel Prize for Research on Institutions and Economic Development

LIS is delighted to congratulate Professor Daron Acemoglu, alongside Professors Simon Johnson and James Robinson, for being awarded this year's Nobel Prize in Economics. This prestigious recognition was given for their research on the role of societal institutions in fostering a country's prosperity— specifically how European colonization led to some nations being rich while others are poor.

At LIS, we are proud to have contributed to Professor Acemoglu's past research, as he utilized the LIS data in his studies on crosscountry inequality trends (see here). His research, which has made significant contributions to understanding inequality, reflects the value of high -quality data in economic analysis.

For more research utilizing LIS data on inequality, poverty, social policy, and other related topics, explore the LIS Working Papers series available here.



Editor: Jörg Neugschwender *Layout and Design:* Heba Omar & Jörg Neugschwender Photo credit: Cover @ ibreakstock/fotolia.com The views and opinions set out in this newsletter are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of LIS and its Boards.