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Research objective
- Measure the extent to which income poverty and multidimensional deprivation overlap in the United States and how this overlap has changed over time (the last decade)

Research strategy
- Data from the American Community Survey; one of the largest household surveys in the United States
- Estimate multidimensional deprivation in the United States for six indicators and compare and contrast deprivation with estimates of income poverty.
- Estimate poverty and deprivation and their overlap over the last decade (between 2008 and 2017), which includes the Great Recession and the subsequent recovery.
- Use alternate poverty thresholds in addition to the official threshold for robustness
MULTIDIMENSIONAL POVERTY MEASUREMENT

- Basis of selection of indicators and dimensions
- Some of the indicators are proxies and as such it would be good to understand the reasoning behind their selection, e.g. disability.
- Was it possible to obtain more detailed information on children deprivation in education?
- Deprivation threshold of 2 (2 or more) retained for a particular reason?
- Did you think of using intensity measures in addition to incidence ones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Average % of pop. below threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Living</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Severe housing burden: monthly owner costs or gross rent in excess of 50% of household income</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Two or more out of six disabilities: hearing, vision, cognition, ambulation, serious difficulty with self-care, or performing independent tasks</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Not having received at least a high school diploma</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Overcrowding: unit has more than one occupant per room</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Security</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Lack of any type of health insurance; public or private</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Connections</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Live in a household where no person, 14 and over, speaks English only or speaks a language other than English at home and speaks English very well</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Average percentage is calculated as the average over 10 years.
LESSONS LEARNT FROM ANALYSIS IN THE US

Well-balanced arguments around the pros and cons for using the United States Census data

- Ease of access
- Geographic coverage and survey design
- Continuously improved coverage and accuracy of data collection
- Population typically not covered in poverty and deprivation estimates (individuals living in group quarter such as college dormitories, nursing facilities, military barracks and correctional facilities) was included
- No large scale survey with the exclusive purpose of gathering data on the quality of life indicators
- Data is severely limited even on a basic dimension such as individual's health

Suggestions

- Could be used to motivate use of the ACS dataset directly in the Data section.
- Do you intend to perform particular analysis on the not typically covered populations?
FINDINGS

Main findings

- Over a period of 10 years, about 14 percent of the population was multidimensional deprived but only about 6 percent of the population was both poor and multidimensional deprived.
- Around 8 percent of individuals with incomes above poverty threshold experienced two or more deprivations.

Suggestions

- It could also be interesting to focus on the non deprived/ poor and non deprived/ non poor.
- Further analyses to better understand the causes
  - Determinants of the relationship between two measures? Do these change over time?
  - Does the intensity of deprivation evolve when different income categories are considered (extreme, less extreme, moderate, close to the line, non poor, etc)?
Main findings

- Deprivation was highest (4.4 percent on average) among population with incomes just above the poverty threshold.
- Deprivation was slightly lower among the extreme and less extreme poor (1.2 percent on average) compared with deprivation among moderately poor and those poor who are close to poverty line (1.7 percent on average).

Suggestions

- Further analyses to better understand the causes
  - The nature of deprivations below and above the poverty line differ or not?
  - Does the intensity of deprivation evolve when populations below and above the poverty line are considered?
CONCLUSIONS

- Interesting analysis of overlap between income poverty and multidimensional deprivation over time.
- Novel perspectives brought by studying incidence of multidimensional deprivation at different levels of income, below and above the poverty line.

Suggestions

- Analyse the causes of the different overlaps.
- Explore dimensions for which there is a division (economic security, standards of living and education) as well as for others.
- Explore the different dimensions deprivation mix observed when income poverty overlaps (or not) with multidimensional deprivation.
- Adopt an intensity lens when analysing overlaps at different points in the income distribution.