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Outline

• Time the missing dimension
  • Poverty does not last forever (for most)
  • Poverty dynamics
• Age, period and cohort effects
• Example: Moving in and out of in work poverty
• Longitudinal methods
  • Transition tables/matrix
  • Event history methods
  • Analysis of sequences and trajectories
• To consider
Narratives of poverty

Persistent

Passed through generations

Obwaavu obumu buba buzaale. Abaana babuyonka ku bazadde baabwe, ate nabo nebbugabira ku baana

Personal failure (West)

- Low education
- Poor decisions
- Poor ethics
Poverty does not last forever
Poverty a dynamic process the 1990s Panels

+ People leave poverty: the poor are not a static population
- More people experience poverty than previously thought

... The longer the observation period
  • The more people experience poverty at least once
  • The less people are persistently poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Jarvis and Jenkins)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Devicienti)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This study provides an introduction to this special issue of The Journal of Development Studies on economic mobility and poverty dynamics in developing countries. In addition to providing a conceptual framework, it outlines how the contributions fit into the extant literature. A series of regularities emerge across these studies. The poor consist of those who are always poor — poor at all dates — and those who move in and out of poverty, with the latter group tending to be strikingly large. Such movements in and out of poverty are apparent when looking at poverty in either absolute or relative terms. Changes in returns to endowments can be a potent source of increased incomes. Finally, seemingly transitory shocks can have long-term consequences. The study concludes by drawing out the policy implications of these regularities.
Longitudinal data

- Repeated observations for the same individuals/households over time
  - Panel data (full/rotational)
  - Cohort studies
  - Recall
- Useful to understand change over time
  - Short term change (entries/exports)
  - Individual patterns and trajectories
  - Inter and intra-generational mobility
  - Age, Period and Cohort effects
Dynamic or longitudinal approaches follow individuals and can record stories of change.

Figure 1: The chronically poor, transient poor and non-poor - a categorisation

Income poverty and deprivation (Berthoud and Bryan)

- People in underlying poverty (low income) are in underlying hardship (high deprivation). Association holds over time.
- People’s high-deprivation years over the period tended to coincide with their low-income years BUT weaker than for the averaged model
- Households’ underlying income averaged over a period is what matters for their standard of living,
- Short-term fluctuations do not matter much.
- Alternatively, some other, unobserved, characteristic of low-income/high-deprivation households is dominating the underlying relationships, but is removed in the dynamic analysis.
- In the long run, the mismatch between income-poverty and deprivation-poverty is smaller, less difficult to interpret.
Age, Period and Cohort

A: I can't seem to shake off this tired feeling. Guess I'm just getting old. [Age effect]

B: Do you think it's stress? Business is down this year, and you've let your fatigue build up. [Period effect]

A: Maybe. What about you?
B: Actually, I'm exhausted too! My body feels really heavy.

A: You're kidding. You're still young. I could work all day long when I was your age.
B: Oh, really?
A: Yeah, young people these days are quick to whine. We were not like that. [Cohort effect]
Age, Period and Cohort
Age, period and cohort effects

- A major problem in generational social change analysis is the intersection of three social times: age, period and cohort.
- In any given period, different age groups coexist (defined by age thresholds, age statuses and roles), but they also represent different generations who have been socialized in different historical contexts.
- When we compare different age groups at a given date (period), we cannot know a priori whether their differences result from age or from generation.
  - Even if you are only interested in “age” cohort and generation are implicit in your model.

APC identification problem
Age = Period – Cohort (year of birth)
Longitudinal data

- Repeated observations for the same individuals/households over time
  - Panel data (full/rotational)
  - Cohort studies
  - Recall
- Useful to understand change over time
  - Short term change (entries/exits)
  - Individual patterns and trajectories
  - Inter and intra-generational mobility
  - Age, Period and Cohort effects
Transition tables: Poverty entries and exits

- In work poverty in the UK
- Data: four waves from Understanding Society (2010-2014)
- 52,493 cases where complete data is available
- Pooled data

High mobility

There is even more mobility in terms of in-work poverty than in poverty in the working-age population generally.

Table 1. Comparison of ‘total’ poverty and in-work poverty transitions, working-age respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total poverty</th>
<th>as % of ever poor</th>
<th>In-work poverty</th>
<th>as % of ever poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remain poor</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-poor in either year</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USoc waves 2-5, weighted
Less mobility with deprivation but consistent results

In-work deprivation is more transient than total deprivation
Deprivation is more persistent than income poverty

Table 2. Comparison of ‘total’ poverty and in-work poverty transitions, working-age respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total deprivation</th>
<th>as % of ever deprived</th>
<th>In-work deprivation</th>
<th>as % of ever deprived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remain deprived</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>43.12</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>29.88</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-poor in either year</td>
<td>79.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USoc waves 2 & 4, weighted
Transition matrix: Where do they go…

Four way in-work poverty transition matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>neither poor nor working</th>
<th>poor but not working</th>
<th>working but not poor</th>
<th>working poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t-1</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-1</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>53.71</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>93.21</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>55.13</td>
<td>40.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Grounds for optimism: Most exits are ‘positive’ ones
- However,
  - In work poverty is associated with increased risk of worklessness
  - One in four respondents living in workless households who find work remain poor
  - Lone parents and those with 3+ children are over-represented in this group
What events trigger in-work poverty?

• Analysis of poverty triggers using approach pioneered by Jenkins (2011)
  • Considers employment, demographic and non employment income events
  • Events are non-exclusive
• Three key measures for each event
  • Incidence of the event
  • Probability of entering/exiting poverty for those who experience the event
  • Share of the entries/exits explained by the event

• Strong association between incidence and share
Poverty exits: events

More than 50% of working poor families experience a significant increase in earnings. Compared to one in five for non-poor families who receive equivalent increases.
Poverty exits: main triggers

- Seven out of ten households exiting iwp experience an increase in earnings.
- About half of the cases increase the number of workers.
- The other half increases hours or earnings.
Poverty entries: events

- The majority of poverty entries are associated with labour market events
- No demographic event affects more than 10% of the population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labour market events</th>
<th>Panel 1 From working but not poor</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in N workers</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change hours worked</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change hours same N workers</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in labour earnings</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in labour earnings same N workers</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in labour earnings same n workers same hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household events</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in hh size</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in N adults in the hh</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in N children</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non labour</td>
<td>Decrease in social security</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total entry rate for sub-group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Panel 1: Prev. = 6.3, Rate = 18.1, Share = 21.1
## Poverty entries: main triggers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labour market events</th>
<th>Panel 1</th>
<th>From working but not poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in N workers</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change hours worked</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change hours same N workers</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in labour earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in labour earnings same N workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in labour earnings same N workers same hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household events</th>
<th>Panel 1</th>
<th>From working but not poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in hh size</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in N adults in the hh</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in N children</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Non labour       | Decrease in social security | 20.6 | 7.3 | 35.3 |

| Total entry rate for sub-group | 4.3 |

- A reduction in earnings provides for the greatest increase in the entry rate of the triggers considered, accounting for 6 in 10 entries
  - About half of these cases households lose a worker
  - 35% of households who enter in work poverty experience a decrease in social security income
Who enters and exits?

- Key findings from two Markov models of the determinants of working poverty entries and exits
  - Regression model
  - Matrix based – restricts analysis to those who experienced working poverty in the previous year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased probability of entering in work poverty (origin: in work non-poor)</th>
<th>Increased probability of exiting in work poverty (destination: in work non-poor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young (16 to 29) or middle aged (45-59)</td>
<td>No significant age or education differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low educational qualifications</td>
<td>Male headed households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>Renters and mortgage owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One worker in the household</td>
<td>2 or more workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland (also less likely to exit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In sum…

1. In work poverty is dynamic
   • A majority of individuals leaves in work poverty within a year

2. Triggers
   • Labour market events explain the majority of poverty entries

3. Destinations
   • Most exit IWP by exiting poverty (not work)

4. Who enters and exits
You want to…

• Identify the probability of an event happening at time T given a number of factors → Survival Analysis/Event History Methods
  • Does x happen? (Event or events)
  • When?
  • Why?

• Multilevel Modelling
  • Time as a level 2 category

• Prepare!
You want to…

• Study trajectories
  • Duration
  • Timing
  • Order

• Approaches
  • Create categorical variables (Always poor / Never Poor)
  • Sequence Analysis
    Large number of time points
    Combinations of events e.g. labour market and family trajectories
Before designing a longitudinal study

- Length of observation
- Unbalanced panels (missingness)
- Regularity of data collection
- Period effects
- Static and varying factors
- Reliability over time
Thank you!!
Key references


