PhD,U.Vosikov
Kimyo International University in Tashkent

Methods of Estimating Poverty in Developing Countries

Abstract:

This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of various methods used to estimate poverty in developing countries. The comparison of different approaches, including the income method, consumption method, and multidimensional poverty index, underscores the significance of nuanced poverty measurement for effective policy development and poverty reduction strategies.

Keywords: Poverty Estimation, Developing Countries, Income Method, Consumption Method, Multidimensional Poverty Index.

Introduction:

Understanding and estimating poverty is essential for designing effective policies aimed at reducing poverty and promoting sustainable development. This is particularly critical in developing countries, where poverty is a pervasive issue. However, accurately measuring poverty is a complex process that involves various methodologies, each with its own strengths and limitations.

Income Method and Consumption Method:

Traditionally, poverty has been estimated using income-based or consumption-based measures. These measures are derived by comparing individuals' or households' income or consumption levels with a defined poverty line. If the income or consumption level falls below this threshold, the individual or household is deemed to be in poverty.

Literature review

Understanding and accurately measuring poverty is an essential process in devising effective poverty reduction strategies, especially in developing countries. Various methodologies have been employed to estimate poverty, each bearing its strengths and limitations.

Ravallion (1995) provides an analysis of the income and consumption-based measures of poverty. His work focuses on comparing an individual's or household's income or consumption levels with a pre-defined poverty line. The study emphasizes that if the

income or consumption level falls below this line, the individual or household is considered in poverty. However, the paper notes the limitations of these measures in capturing non-monetary aspects of poverty and the challenges of accurately collecting data in developing countries, particularly due to informal economies and underreporting.

Deaton (1997) further explores the comparison between income and consumption as measures of wellbeing in developing countries. He argues that consumption is usually a better indicator of living standards, being less subject to short-term fluctuations and more accurately reflecting the household's ability to meet its needs. Nevertheless, he acknowledges that this method, like the income approach, fails to capture critical dimensions of poverty such as education, health, and vulnerability to shocks.

Thorbecke (2000) elaborates on the use of income and consumption measures and discusses the importance of selecting an appropriate poverty line. His work underscores the subjective nature of this selection process and its implications for poverty estimates, highlighting that variations in the poverty line could significantly alter the poverty incidence and depth.

Moving away from traditional measures, Alkire and Foster (2011) introduce the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI). The MPI assesses poverty by considering multiple deprivations at the household level across various dimensions such as health, education, and living standards. Their paper contends that the MPI provides a more comprehensive view of poverty by capturing its incidence and intensity across these multiple dimensions.

Bourguignon and Chakravarty (2003) delve into a more nuanced method of poverty estimation, the axiomatic approach, which extends the understanding of poverty beyond income deprivation. This method incorporates aspects like inequality and social exclusion, thus providing a broader perspective of poverty.

In summary, while traditional income and consumption-based methods continue to be useful tools for poverty estimation, the literature increasingly underscores the need for more holistic and multidimensional approaches. These multi-faceted measures, like the MPI and axiomatic approach, provide a more comprehensive view of poverty, thereby leading to more effective poverty reduction strategies.

The income method focuses on income as a measure of economic wellbeing. This includes wages from employment, earnings from self-employment, rental income, income from investments, and transfers like pensions or remittances.

Conversely, the consumption method considers the consumption expenditure of the household as a measure of economic wellbeing. This includes spending on food, housing, education, health, and other essential items.

Although these methods are widely used due to their relative simplicity and ease of interpretation, they have limitations. Notably, they don't capture non-monetary dimensions of poverty such as education, health, access to services, or vulnerability to shocks. Additionally, they rely on accurate data on income or consumption, which can be challenging to obtain in developing countries due to informal economies and underreporting.

Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI):

Recognizing these limitations, there has been a shift towards more holistic measures like the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI). The MPI assesses poverty by considering multiple deprivations at the household level across various dimensions such as health, education, and living standards.

This approach provides a more comprehensive view of poverty, capturing the incidence and intensity of poverty across multiple dimensions. It can also be adapted to specific country contexts, making it a valuable tool for policy planning and monitoring.

Conclusion:

While income-based and consumption-based measures continue to be valuable tools for poverty estimation, the use of multidimensional measures like the MPI provides a more comprehensive picture of poverty. To effectively address poverty in developing countries, it's essential to consider a range of poverty measures. Each method provides unique insights, and together they can guide the development of nuanced, effective poverty reduction strategies.

References

1. Alkire, S., & Foster, J. (2011). Counting and multidimensional poverty measurement. Journal of Public Economics, 95(7-8), 476-487.

2. Bourguignon, F., & Chakravarty, S. R. (2003). The measurement of multidimensional poverty. The Journal of Economic Inequality, 1(1), 25-49.
3. Deaton, A. (1997). The analysis of household surveys: a microeconometric approach to development policy. Baltimore: Published for the World Bank [by] the Johns Hopkins University Press.
4. Ravallion, M. (1995). Poverty comparisons (Vol. 56). Harwood Academic Publishers.
5. Thorbecke, E. (2000). The use of social accounting matrices in modeling. 26th General Conference of The International Association for Research in Income and Wealth.