ECONOMIC RESEARCH FORUM
منتدى البحوث الاقتصادية
2015

working paper series

IS THERE FEMINIZATION OF POVERTY IN EGYPT?

Shireen AlAzzawi

Working Paper No. 926

IS THERE FEMINIZATION OF POVERTY IN EGYPT?

Shireen AlAzzawi

Working Paper 926

July 2015

I am grateful to Mahmut Tekce, Hassan Aly and participants at the Middle East Economics Association Annual Meeting in Boston, USA for helpful comments and suggestions. This research was funded by the Economic Research Forum in the context of its Women Economic Empowerment Research Competition.

Send correspondence to:
Shireen AlAzzawi
Santa Clara University, USA
salazzawi@scu.edu

First published in 2015 by
The Economic Research Forum (ERF)
21 Al-Sad Al-Aaly Street
Dokki, Giza
Egypt
www.erf.org.eg

Abstract

This paper uses five cross sections of newly released Household Income, Expenditure and Consumption Survey data to determine whether there has been feminization of poverty in Egypt during the last 15 years. The period of study is one during which poverty as a whole has been increasing, and major economic, social and political changes took place. Results suggest that poverty is more prevalent among female headed households when compared to male headed households, but that married couple households are in fact poorer than both for most of the years under study. The rural-urban divide is also a very important factor determining poverty.

JEL Classifications: I3, O1, J7

Keywords: Feminization of poverty, Egypt, Female-headed households

ملخص

تستخدم هذه الورقة خمسة مقاطع عرضية من بيانات المسح الصادر حديثا عن دخل الأسرة، الإنفاق والاستهلاك لتحديد ما إذا كان هناك تأنيث للفقر في مصر خلال السنوات الخمسة عشر الماضية. يظهر خلال فترة الدراسة أن الفقر ككل قد تزايد، وحدثت تغيرات اقتصادية واجتماعية وسياسية كبرى. وتشير النتائج إلى أن الفقر أكثر انتشارا بين الأسر التي ترأسها الإناث بالمقارنة مع الأسر التي يترأسها الذكور، إلا أن الأسر التي يترأسها الزوجين هي في الواقع أكثر فقرا من كل الأسر من لمعظم السنوات قيد الدراسة. الفجوة بين الريف والحضر هو أيضا عامل مهم جدا تحديد الفقر.

1. Introduction and Related Literature

Poverty in Egypt has been rising steadily over the last 15 years, from 16.7% in 1999/2000 to 26.2% in 2012/2013 (CAPMAS 2013). An important question is how female headed households have fared over this period of deteriorating social welfare. Feminization of poverty is said to exist when: (1) female headed households are over-represented among the poor and (2) there is a trend whereby the composition of the poor is changing to include more female-headed, or more generally, female-maintained, households over time. The term "feminization of poverty" was first coined by Sociologist Diana Pearce (1978) when she studied poverty in the United States in the post war period and made the then startling discovery that the incidence of poverty among female maintained households had doubled, rising from less than a quarter of the poor to more than half in a relatively short period of time. Pearce (2011) has argued that this phenomenon, which has now been confirmed for a large number of countries, and time periods, is more than just a "demographic shift." The stronger implication is that gender -being female- can now be considered a prime *cause* of poverty.

Women often have less access to income generating assets such as land, credit, physical and human capital, and technology. At the same time women typically face greater time constraints since they have to fulfill multiple roles within the household both in home production activities as well as domestic roles such as child care and housekeeping (Gammage 1998). They face a wide, and sometimes increasing earnings gap with respect to men, sometimes due to 'pure' discrimination in pay and in access to higher paying jobs[1], but often also due to their lower education levels, restricted access to land and to credit (Buvinic and Gupta 1997). The widespread support for the existence of gender inequalities in asset ownership and labor market rewards and the existence of these multiple challenges for women has often made it "deceptively easy" to assert that female headed households also form a greater proportion of those below an acceptable benchmark standard of living (Gammage 1998).

There is far less consensus on the *existence* of "feminization of poverty," however. Out of 65 studies covering Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean, Buvinic and Gupta (1997) found that in 38 of these studies Female headed households (FHHs) were overrepresented among the poor, while 15 others found that their poverty was associated with certain characteristics of the female heads, or for some, but not all poverty indicators.

Other authors have challenged this notion and argued that the evidence in favor is, at best, week. Chant (2003) surveys results from studies for Latin America, Asia and Africa that failed to find a consistently higher rate of FHHs in poverty(for example Menjívar and Trejos, 1992 on Central America; Fuwa, 2000 on Panama; Gafar, 1998 on Guyana; GOG, 2000 on The Gambia; Kusakabe, 2002 on Cambodia; Wartenburg, 1999 on Colombia). Chant argues that the nature of the "female headedness," (i.e., the particular route into this status, whether by widowhood, divorce or migration of the male spouse, for example), combined with the specific cultural, social and demographic contexts within any one country can have a big impact on the position of these women along the socio-economic ladder and hence closely affect their prospects for being poor. The age of the female head, the number of other income earners in the household compared to the non-earner dependents. the marital status and whether the household receives "remittances" from non-resident family members will all matter for the poverty designation and the change in that designation over time.

A few studies have investigated the gender dimension of poverty in Egypt in the 1990s (Nassar 1997, Datt et al. 1998, El-Laithy 2001).The most recent of these, El-Laithy (2001), used data from the

[1] See AlAzzawi (2013) for a survey of the literature on wage discrimination and an in depth analysis for Egypt.

1999/2000 Household Income, Expenditure and Consumption Survey, and primarily focused on the relative poverty of females compared to males. She found that there was a slightly higher incidence of poverty rate for females: being female raised the probability of being poor by 2.3 percent in urban areas and by 4.8 percent in rural areas, while *female headed households* actually fared slightly better than those headed by males. She finds that non-income indicators such as education, labor force participation and sector of employment differ more widely between males and females, and argues that these are the most important determinants of poverty.

More recent studies have also found that females in Egypt are at an increasing disadvantage compared to their male counterparts. AlAzzawi (2010) and AlAzzawi and Said (2012), using panel data for 1998 and 2006 to analyze the degree of income and non-income mobility, found that females tend to be "stuck" in the lower end of the distribution more often than males, both by income and by job quality measures. Several labor market studies have also documented an increase in the gender pay gap (AlAzzawi 2014; El-Hamidi 2008; Kandil 2009), especially in manufacturing, as well as widespread occupational segregation (El-Hamidi and Said 2008). This is combined with a continuous decline in female labour force participation, both in the formal and informal sectors (Assaad 2002) over the last two decades. A recent World Economic Forum Report ranked Egypt at the bottom of the list of the 58 countries surveyed, receiving the lowest mark in all five areas of the analysis: economic participation, economic opportunity, political, health and well-being (Lopez-Claros and Zahidi 2005).

At the same time that this deterioration in the status of women in the economy was taking place, the Egyptian economy was going through a structural adjustment and economic reform program (ERSAP). ERSAP aimed at transforming the state led industrialization economic model that Egypt followed in the 1950s and 1960s, like many developing countries at that time, into a more market-based economy with greater openness. The program included three important elements that undoubtedly had an impact on workers in general, and on females in particular: increased openness to international trade, widespread privatization of State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) and reduction in government spending, which involved downsizing of employment in the government's civil service sector - the traditional employer of females in Egypt. Between 1991 and 2009 tariff rates were slashed by more than 50% on average, more than half of the 314 state owned enterprises (SOEs) had been privatized, while employment in the public sector (manufacturing) declined by more than 30% for all workers, but females were particularly hard hit, seeing their employment in that sector decline by 50% between 1998 and 2006.

Such market-based reforms may reduce discrimination against all workers, including women, as well as provide new job opportunities in export-oriented industries especially to low-skilled female workers. However, they may also bring about a deterioration of women's relative position in the labor market since women tend to be concentrated in a few sectors of economic activity, have limited geographic mobility and have both labor market and household responsibilities that limit their labor market experience and hence their ability to accept many demanding, high paying job opportunities. These economic developments make the investigation of the gender dimension of poverty and how it has changed over time all the more pertinent to guide policy making.

2. Data and Limitations

This paper relies on data from five rounds of the Household Income, Expenditure and Consumption Surveys (HIECS). Surveys are available for 1999/2000, 2004/2005, 2008/2009 2010/2011 and most recently 2012/2013. These surveys provide a rich source of information on household expenditure as well as income and will allow the possibility of making comparisons between poverty measures based

on income and those based on expenditure for the different household types. In analyzing poverty, each type of welfare measure has its advantages and disadvantages. Incomes are in some cases more accurately reported than expenditures since they are easier to recall. Consumption on the other hand may be a better indicator of permanent income when households exercise consumption smoothing, which is common among the poor (Deaton 1997). Consumption measures can however be subject to gender biases that results in more accurate reporting for FHH since females are both the main income earner as well as the one responsible for household purchases. Wives in larger, male headed households (MHH) households might report expenditures less accurately due to the larger household size, and incomplete information about income and expenditures of all members, especially the male's expenditures. This would incorrectly imply higher expenditures in the FHH, while underreporting in those maintained by males and could result in artificially lower rates of poverty of FHHs. I will therefore use both income and expenditure as welfare measures in this study, as each provides some insight into the extent of the feminization of poverty over this period.

2.1 Complications: female-headed versus maintained households, and remittances

An important issue in this line of analysis rests on the definition of a female headed household. This may not be as straight forward as the survey/field designation of 'head' (referred to as the "de jure" head). The term "head" carries strong connotations about decision making power within the household that has traditionally been given to the oldest male member whether or not they are the main breadwinners of the household. This is certainly problematic in the case of Egypt especially, where the traditional patriarchal system may preclude the designation of the female as head in the presence of a disabled adult male or a son (regardless of age) for example, even if the woman is the main income earner in the household. Gammage (1998) found that using the maintenance designation resulted in markedly higher percentage of Female maintained households (FMHs) in the sample, as well as higher incidence of poverty for them in El Salvador and Costa Rica.

One way to address this issue is to designate households where the share of total female income in the household total income/ expenditure is greater than 50% as female maintained. This is sometimes referred to as the "de facto" head designation since it is based on who is the real bread winner in the household. To be able to use this designation one would need data on the individual earnings of each household member. Unfortunately, this data is not available in the HIECS for Egypt at the individual level. The surveys only provide a total income/expenditure figure for the whole household. It is therefore not possible to infer female maintenance directly from this data. I explore other ways to estimate female maintenance in a companion paper in which I link these HIECSs to the Egypt Panel Labor Market Surveys (in progress).

Another complication arises from the presence of large numbers of households where one spouse might be working overseas and sending home remittances that are the main source of income for the household. If the overseas spouse is the male, it is not clear how the household head question might be answered: the remaining spouse might designate herself as the household head in the absence of the husband, but in other cases she might not. This can underestimate poverty among "true" female headed households (i.e,. where the female head does not rely on others for support, but is the main breadwinner of the family). In the surveys, remittances are in fact the major source of income for over 60% of FHH for all years.

However, the survey lumps together those who receive remittances from domestic and overseas sources. This complicates matters as such remittances might be alimony or payments to support an elderly mother who is living on her own. Unfortunately, the data does not allow any further breakdown of the income source category. Questions about the type of work of both the head and the

spouse are asked in the survey, and working overseas is one of the possible answers in the survey responses. However, none of the cases in the survey report this as the type of work, neither for the head nor the spouse(s), and hence once again it will not be useful. The data also does not provide any other information from which one can infer the amount of remittances from abroad and hence make an attempt to take this into consideration.

Household type, whether single headed or a married couple, can be used to refine our definition of FHH vs. MHH in the data, in the absence of better information. One would expect that households with married couples, whether MHH or FHH, face different challenges and constraints from single head families, regardless of the gender of the head. For example, a household with a married couple will be able to find work outside the house more easily, since one of the two spouses can take care of the children or elderly in the working spouse's absence. Ideally, I would have preferred to further split those Married Couple Households (MCHs) into those that are female maintained, and those that are male maintained. I handle this issue in a companion paper, currently in progress, that uses labor market in addition to the HIECS data, as mentioned above.

3. Empirical Methodology

3.1 Developing the poverty benchmark: updating the poverty lines

The first step in any poverty study is to determine the poverty line(s) that will be used to identify the poor. I use poverty lines from World Bank (2007) for 2004/2005 deflated or inflated to the prices of each survey year (deflated to 1999/2000, or inflated to 2008/2009, 2010/2011, 2012/2013)[2]. The CPI for food and non-food items is used for rural and urban regions, separately, to make the poverty line updates. These poverty lines are calculated based on the cost-of-basic-needs methodology, and account for differences in consumption patterns and prices across regions. The cost of the actual diet consumed by Egyptians of different ages and classes, not a hypothetical one based on caloric requirements, is used to calculate these poverty lines. Following the World Bank (2007) study, I will also use three different poverty lines: the food poverty line (FPL), poverty line (PL) and upper poverty line (UPL).

The FPL reflects the cost of the food bundle using the relative quantities observed in the diet of the poor (as proxied by the second quintile), and the prices they actually faced. Individuals and households whose consumption was below the FPL will be referred to as "extreme poor" (World Bank 2007). The PL was constructed by allowing for expenditure on essential non-food items in addition to the FPL. Specifically, the share of non-food expenditure was set to equal that of households whose *total* expenditure is at the food poverty line. This is designed to capture the extent of "non-food essentials" since households would have to *give up* some of their basic food needs to afford these non-food items. The UPL was calculated by setting the non-food share to equal that of households whose *food* expenditure is equal to the food poverty line[3].

[2] The World Bank published an updated version of the poverty assessment for Egypt in 2011, however the report does not provide details of the poverty lines calculated by region, only for all Egypt. The method followed here is very similar to their chosen method of updating the 2004/2005 poverty lines. When similar methodology is applied on the stated all Egypt 2008/2009 poverty line (in 2008/2009 prices) to update it to the respective survey year prices, the obtained poverty lines are almost identical to the poverty lines calculated for all Egypt using the methodology followed in this paper.

[3] There is an important discussion in the World Bank's (2011) most recent poverty assessment update for Egypt about the complexity and representativeness of this system of poverty lines and the methodology used to update it. The authors argue that the PL represents "the minimal defensible threshold of total consumption" since the FPL is just too low to sustain a person given that it does not allow for any non-food requirements. They also argue that the UPL is a much more consistent concept of basic needs since it reflects a subsistence minimum level of both food and non-food items, taking a more realistic view of human needs. The UPL is also barely at

Table 1 lists the values for the all items CPI and the Food and Beverages subcomponent for the years of interest. Inflation was relatively low in Egypt between 1999/2000 and 2004/2005, with the CPI for all items rising by about 32.5 % over the 5 year period, on average for urban and rural areas. This amounts to an average annual rate of about 6.5%. The change in the Food CPI was also very similar, and prices rose less in rural areas.

By contrast, between 2004/2005 and 2008/2009 the CPI for all items rose 52.5 % (urban and rural average) over the 4-year period. This amounts to an average annual rate of about 13.5%. Food prices rose much faster over this period, and have continued to rise until the most recent year 2012/2013 at a faster rate than the all items CPI. Food prices had become very volatile during the 2007-2008 period. World food prices were rising dramatically due to sharp declines in supply after a series of droughts around the world, and the simultaneous rising demand from biofuels in the face of rising oil prices. World food prices fell in 2009 and 2010 but rose again in 2011 to even higher levels than 2007/2008 (FAO 2014). As a result, the CPI index for all items more than doubled between 2004/2005 and 2012/2013 with prices rising slightly faster in rural areas, while that for Food and Beverages rose by a multiple of 2.9.

Given these changes in price levels, it was important to update the poverty lines provided in the World Bank's Poverty Assessment Update (2007) after carefully accounting for these price differentials both between urban and rural and especially between food and non-food items, given that the poor spend most of their income on food. I have updated the poverty lines by using the Food CPI for the FPL, and using the non-food CPI for the non-food components of the other two poverty lines (as measured by the difference between the PL and FPL and that between the UPL and FPL). This gave more justifiable poverty lines than would have resulted by simply using the all items CPI for all poverty lines. I chose to update the poverty lines rather than the income/ expenditure variables, but either method should give equivalent results. Table 2 summarizes the three poverty lines by region for the first and last survey years. Other years' poverty lines are not shown for brevity, and are available from the author upon request.

3.2 Identifying the state and structure of female poverty

Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT), or the P_α class of poverty measures, will then be calculated both for the population as a whole as well as for FHHs, MHHs (male headed households) and or MCH separately.

$$P_\alpha = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{H}\left(\frac{Y_p - Y_i}{Y_p}\right)^\alpha \qquad (1)$$

where N is the population, H, is the number of poor, Y_p is the poverty line, Y_i is the individual income of those who are poor, and $\alpha \geq 0$ is a parameter. If $\alpha=0$, the index simplifies to the headcount index, if $\alpha=1$, it simplifies to the normalized poverty gap, if $\alpha=2$ it gives the severity of poverty measure. Each of these measures provides an important dimension into poverty's state and structure, and 7calculating the difference between these measures for FHHs and MHHS over time will provide insight into whether there is feminization of poverty in Egypt, and whether this is changing over time.

In particular, the difference in poverty between FHH and MHH (or MCH) is given by

---

the $2 a day measure which is more justifiable for a country like Egypt. In this study I will rely mainly on the PL and UPL as benchmarks, while still occasionally referring to the "destitute" as represented by the FPL.

$$\Delta P_\alpha(Y_i, Y_p) = P_\alpha^{FHH}(Y_p) - P_\alpha^{MHH}(Y_p) \quad (2)$$

and a feminization of poverty problem is said to exist if this is increasing over time:

$$P_{\alpha,t}^{FHH}(Y_p) - P_{\alpha,t}^{MHH}(Y_p) > P_{\alpha,t-1}^{FHH}(Y_p) - P_{\alpha,t-1}^{MHH}(Y_p) \quad (3)$$

4. Results

4.1 Descriptive statistics

Tables 3a and 3b provide sample statistics comparing between the characteristics of the household head in FHH, MHH and MCH households by year. The share of FHHs has been increasing as a share of all households over time rising from 14.7% in 1999/2000 to 17.7% in 2012/2013. While the educational level of household heads has been increasing over time, female heads are still overrepresented among the illiterate and underrepresented at all other education levels, compared to the average for the population as a whole. The majority of heads of FHHs are skilled agricultural and fishery workers, even though this share has fallen slightly over time. In contrast, the share of FHHs with Professional female heads has been rising over time and was the second largest category in 2012/2013.

Most female heads were in the private sector until 2004/2005. After that, the majority is in the 'other' category, which includes workers in national NGOs and in private households. Only about 1 in 5 of every FHH has an employed head, the majority are pensioners/retired/disabled, followed by homemakers as the second most important category. The proportion of FHH also differs vastly by region. In most years lower rural Egypt was where the majority of FHH resided. However, the share of FHH in Upper Rural Egypt increased over time. Interestingly, rural areas had more FHH than Metropolitan regions in most years.

Tables 4a and 4b presents some household characteristics by year for FHH, MHH and MCH households separately, and for the full population. FHHs tend to be smaller in size, have fewer children and about the same number of elderly as married couples, but more than MHH. MHH have the lowest dependency ratios in all years and slightly higher number of earners.

In all years, net wages and salaries, total disposable income and total expenditure were all lower for FHH than MHH and MCH households. However, because these households were typically smaller in size, when per capita income/expenditure is calculated, these figures are always higher for FHH than MCH on average. MHH have the highest per capita income and expenditure in all years, and the gap between MHH and both FHH and MCH is rising over time. (Note that these figures are in current year prices and are not directly comparable over time).

4.2 Foster-Greer-Thorbecke poverty indices

4.2.1 Consumption poverty

Table 5 reports the FGT poverty measures for all Egypt using per capita expenditure with the three poverty lines. By all poverty lines, poverty incidence started rising in 2004/2005 and reached a peak in 2008/2009 with the height of the international food price crisis, before it started falling again. However, it is still higher in 2012/2013 than it was in 1999/2000 or 2004/2005. Most disturbing is the more than doubling in the percentage of the extreme poor between 04/05 and 12/13, after falling from a peak of more than 10% of the population in 08/09 and 10/11. The extreme poor, however, seem to have relatively shallow poverty, with poverty gaps in the range of 0.5% to 2 % of the poverty line. This implies that these people are right below the food poverty line and a small increase in income can allow then to satisfy their basic food needs.

Poverty incidence is of course much higher by the Poverty line (PL) or the Upper Poverty line (UPL), the latter reaching a peak of 52.8% of the population being poor in 2008/2009. Poverty is also much deeper by the PL and UPL, implying the need for longer term interventions to lift these poor out of poverty. Severity of poverty is also quite high, especially by the UPL, implying a high and rising degree of inequality among the poor especially since 2008/2009.

In Tables 6 and 7, I present the FGT poverty measures based on per capita expenditure, for FHH, MHH and MCH households separately, for rural and urban regions respectively. The differences in prices and consumption patterns between urban and rural areas in Egypt are substantial (see discussion above about CPI for example) and it is therefore important to differentiate between rural and urban regions for a more comprehensive description of poverty. Starting with rural households in Table 6, poverty incidence, poverty depth and poverty severity are higher among FHH when compared to MHH over this period. However, MCH have higher poverty than FHH. While not poorer than MCH, FHH are still very poor, 30% or more being poor in the last 5 years of data by the PL and 50%, or more, poor by the UPL. Poverty is also quite deep and severe by both PL and UPL for MCH as well as FHH households. Poverty rose between 1999/2000 and 2008/2009 in rural areas, affecting more than a third of the households in each group (by the PL) by that year, when international food prices skyrocketed. It later fell slightly, but was still higher than 1999/2000 for FHH and MCH, by all poverty lines.

Results for Urban households are reported in Table 7. The most striking fact is how much higher rural poverty is for all households, compared to urban. Rural households are three times more likely to be poor than urban households by the FPL and the PL, and about twice more likely to be poor by the UPL. This represents a very large rural-urban welfare divide for Egypt. Like Rural households, married couple households in urban areas have the highest poverty, followed closely by FHH and MMHs are the least poor. Poverty trends over time are also very similar, with poverty rates for all family types reaching a peak in 2008/2009, and then falling slightly thereafter.

4.3 Income poverty

Tables 8, 9 and 10 present the poverty indices based on per capita income, where income is defined as total disposable income that includes net wages and salaries, self-employment income, rental net income, property income and transfers received. Poverty incidence, depth and severity for all households increased between 1999/2000 and 2010/2011 and then fell slightly in 2010/2011 or 2012/2013. Income poverty is lower than consumption poverty by all measures and for all years, which is unexpected, since it is often argued that income will over-estimate poverty as it does not take consumption smoothing into consideration.

Comparing households types, MHH households have the lowest poverty overall, and in some cases it is zero. In rural areas in Table 9, married couples are again more likely to be poor, except for 2010/2011 and 2012/2013 when using the poverty line, and in 2012/2013 when using the food poverty line. For these cases FHH had the highest poverty rates. In Urban regions, MCH were more likely to be poor by all poverty lines, measures and in all years.

5. Conclusions

Poverty has been on the rise in Egypt over the last few years. Clearly, poverty in Egypt is a severe problem, with more than one in every three Egyptians being poor by either the expenditure or income welfare indicators. The poor were especially hard hit by the Food Price crisis in 2007 and 2008, and by the financial crisis starting in 2008.

Splitting the sample by household type, married couples have the highest poverty rates, depth and severity. However, they are very closely followed by FHH, and in a few cases FHH had the highest poverty indicators. Male headed households, on the other hand, face the least threat of poverty in the sample over this period. These results point to the importance of taking household type into consideration when designing any policy to alleviate poverty. While FHH were not the poorest, they were still very poor and their poverty indicators were always close to those of MCH, the group with the highest poverty rates. The challenge remains, however, to properly split the MCH into those maintained by females, and those maintained by males, to gain greater insight into the causes of poverty for each group.

References

AlAzzawi, Shireen (2010). "The Dynamics of Poverty and Inequality in an Era of Economic Liberalization: The Case of Egypt." ERF Working Paper # 590.

AlAzzawi, Shireen and Mona Said (2012). "Dynamics of Multidimensional Poverty and Trade Liberalization: Evidence from Panel Data for Egypt." in Beranger, Valerie; Cresson, Floret (Eds.) "Poverty and Social Exclusion around the Mediterranean Sea." Part of the Springer book series: "Economic Studies in Inequality, Social Exclusion and Well-Being", Vol. 9 (2013), New York: Springer.

AlAzzawi, Shireen (2014). ""Trade liberalization, industry concentration and female workers: the case of Egypt." *IZA Journal of Labor Policy*, 3 (20) September (2014).

Bibi, Sami and Rim Chatti (2010). "Gender Poverty in Tunisia: Is there a Feminization Issue?" ERF Working Paper# 512.

Blinder, Alan S. (1973). "Wage Discrimination: Reduced Form and Structural Elements." *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 436-55.

Buvinic, Mayra and Geeta R. Gupta. (1997). "Female-Headed-Households and Female-Maintained Families: Are They Worth Targeting to Reduce Poverty in Developing Countries?" *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp.259-280.

CAPMAS (2013). "Poverty measures according to the Household Income, Expenditure and Consumption Survey 2012/2013." www.capmas.gov. Retrieved May 15, 2014.

Deaton, A. (1997) The Analysis of Household Surveys (Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press for the World Bank).

Gammage, Sarah. (1998). "The Gender Dimension of Poverty: Is Headship Still a Useful Concept?" Working Paper, International Center for Research on Women.

OAMDI, (2014). Harmonized Household Income and Expenditure Surveys (HHIES), http://www.erf.org.eg/cms.php?id=erfdataportal. Version 2.0 of Licensed Data Files; HIECS 2012/2013 - Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS). Egypt: Economic Research Forum (ERF).

OAMDI, (2014). Harmonized Household Income and Expenditure Surveys (HHIES), http://www.erf.org.eg/cms.php?id=erfdataportal. Version 2.0 of Licensed Data Files; HIECS 2010/2011 - Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS). Egypt: Economic Research Forum (ERF).

OAMDI, (2014). Harmonized Household Income and Expenditure Surveys (HHIES), http://www.erf.org.eg/cms.php?id=erfdataportal. Version 2.0 of Licensed Data Files; HIECS 2008/2009 - Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS). Egypt: Economic Research Forum (ERF).

OAMDI, (2014). Harmonized Household Income and Expenditure Surveys (HHIES), http://www.erf.org.eg/cms.php?id=erfdataportal. Version 2.0 of Licensed Data Files; HIECS 2004/2005 - Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS). Egypt: Economic Research Forum (ERF).

OAMDI, (2014). Harmonized Household Income and Expenditure Surveys (HHIES), http://www.erf.org.eg/cms.php?id=erfdataportal. Version 2.0 of Licensed Data Files; HIECS 1999/2000 - Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS). Egypt: Economic Research Forum (ERF).

El-Hamidi, Fatma. (2008). "Trade Liberalization, Gender Segmentation, and Wage Discrimination: Evidence from Egypt." Economic Research Forum Working Paper No. 414.

El-Hamidi, Fatma and Mona Said. (2008). "Have Economic Reforms Paid Off? Gender Occupational Inequality in the New Millennium in Egypt." Egyptian Center for Economic Studies Working Paper No. 128.

FAO, 2014. "World Food Situation: FAO Food Price Index", http://www.fao.org/worldfoodsituation/foodpricesindex/en/Accessed 9/15/2014.

Lopez-Claros, Augusto, and Saadia Zahidi (2005). "Women's Empowerment: Measuring the Global Gender Gap." Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum.

Marotta, Daniela and Ruslan Yemtsov (2010). "Determinants of Household's Income Mobility and Poverty Dynamics in Egypt." Unpublished manuscript.

Oaxaca, Ronald. (1973). "Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets." *International Economic Review*, Vol.14, No. 3, pp. 693-709.

Pearce, Diana. (1978). "The Feminization of Poverty: Women, Work, and Welfare." *Urban and Social Change Review* 11:28-36.

Pearce, Diana. (2011). "The Changing Faces of the Feminization of Poverty." Speech prepared for the Seminar on the Feminization of Poverty, Valparaiso, Chile, March 7, 2011.

Rodgers, Joan R. (1994). "Female-Headed Families: Why Are They So Poor?" *Review of Social Economy*, Vol. 52, No. 2, pp. 22-47.

World Bank (2007). Arab Republic of Egypt: A Poverty Assessment Update. Report No. 39885-EGT.

Table 1: CPI and Food and Beverages CPI for Urban and Rural Areas, 1999/2000 to 2012/2013 fiscal annual average. Jan 2010=100

	All Items CPI		Food CPI	
	Urban	**Rural**	**Urban**	**Rural**
1999/2000	44.7	43.95	34.2	35.15
2004/2005	59.2	58.55	50.1	50.15
2008/2009	89.4	90.3	84.3	87.2
2010/2011	110.9	111.8	120.3	118.9
2012/2013	128.8	132.1	145.4	144.6

Source: CAPMAS, CPI Bulletin, various issues

Table 2: Annual Per Capita Poverty Lines by Region, in Survey Year Prices

	1999/2000			2012/2013		
Region	**FPL**	**PL**	**UPL**	**FPL**	**PL**	**UPL**
Metropolitan	699.4	1023.2	1376.4	2973.3	3906.4	4924.2
Lower Egypt Urban	665.2	988.8	1325.5	2828.2	3760.5	4730.8
Lower Egypt Rural	692.8	1023.6	1319.9	2849.9	3844.4	4735.0
Upper Egypt Urban	671.4	998.2	1374.0	2854.6	3796.0	4879.1
Upper Egypt Rural	697.5	1007.6	1311.0	2869.2	3801.5	4713.4

Source: Author's calculations based on poverty lines in World Bank(2007), deflated/inflated to survey year prices using the CPI and Food CPI, for urban and rural separately (see text for details.)

Table 3a: Characteristics of Household Head, by Household Type, 1999/2000 to 2008/2009

	1999/2000				2004/2005				2008/2009			
	Female Headed	Male Headed	Married Couple	Total	Female Headed	Male Headed	Married Couple	Total	Female Headed	Male Headed	Married Couple	Total
Share	14.7	5	80.3	100	15.7	5	79.3	100	16.7	3.8	79.5	100
Education												
None	82.5	50.4	53.9	57.9	78.8	45.3	50.4	54.6	74.9	48.9	45.2	50.3
Primary/lower secondary	4.5	9.2	8.5	7.9	4.9	8.4	8.9	8.3	6.7	11.6	11.7	10.9
Secondary	7.6	21.1	19	17.4	9.8	22.1	22.8	20.7	11.5	21.3	24.4	22.1
Post secondary	1.6	4	4	3.6	1.3	5.1	4	3.6	1.8	3.3	4.4	3.9
University	3.6	14.6	13.9	12.4	4.9	18.3	13.3	12.2	5	13.5	13.6	12.2
Postgraduate	0.1	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.1	1.3	0.7	0.6
Occupation												
Legislators, senior officials and managers	11.6	12.2	15.1	14.7	8.5	11.2	11.6	11.3	11.3	11.9	12.9	12.8
Professionals	5.1	14.6	13.4	12.8	6.8	14	12.7	12.3	5.6	12	11.5	11.1
Technicians and associate professionals	4.7	9.7	10.1	9.7	6	9.6	9.2	9	5.9	5.2	9.4	9
Clerks	2.2	3.3	4.2	4	2.4	2.8	3.6	3.4	2.5	1.4	2.9	2.9
Service workers	6.4	9.4	10.8	10.5	8.7	12.3	12.2	11.9	4.8	6.9	7.1	6.9
Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	66.9	25.6	23.3	26.6	63.7	23.8	24	27.1	61.3	26.3	21.5	24.7
Craft and related trades workers	1.8	16.1	11.8	11.3	1.8	16.2	14.7	13.8	1.9	18.5	14.6	13.8
Plant & mach. operators; assemblers	0.3	6.4	8.2	7.6	1.2	6.1	9	8.3	1	7.6	9.4	8.7
Elementary occupations	0.8	2.5	2.7	2.6	0.9	4	2.8	2.7	5.7	10.2	10.4	10.1
Other/unspecified	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0	0	0.2	0.2	0	0	0.1	0.1
Sector												
Government	13.1	20.1	30.2	28.5	16.6	17.4	27.6	26.3	16.5	14.8	25.9	24.8
Public sector	0.6	5.2	8.1	7.4	0.9	4.3	6.3	5.8	1.1	3.6	5.1	4.8
Private sector	86.1	73.7	61.3	63.6	44.1	59.4	48.1	48.3	16.1	40	33	31.9
Other	0.2	1	0.4	0.5	38.5	18.9	17.9	19.6	66.3	41.5	36	38.5
Main activity status												
Employed	21.9	68.1	89.1	78.1	22.2	68.7	89.9	78.2	20.8	64.3	88.6	76.4
Unemployed	0.5	1.1	0.2	0.2	0.5	1.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.3
Homemaker	24.5	0	0	3.6	25	0	0.1	4	26.3	0	0	4.4
Student	0	0.9	0	0.1	0.1	2.1	0	0.2	0	2.6	0.1	0.2
Pensioners	NA	NA	NA	NA	51.5	27.7	9.7	17.2	36.8	26.5	9.5	14.7
Others	53.1	30	10.7	17.9	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.2	15.7	6.2	1.5	4.1
Region of residence												
Metropolitan	22.8	31.3	20	20.9	23.8	34.3	20	21.3	21.3	32	19.2	20
Lower Urban	13.7	11	13.1	13.1	12.4	12.8	13.2	13.1	12.5	12.7	13	12.9
Lower Rural	27.9	24.3	31.5	30.6	25.3	19.3	32	30.3	27.4	23.3	32.7	31.4
Upper Urban	10.3	13.5	11.6	11.5	12.1	15.6	12	12.2	11.2	13.4	12.2	12.1
Upper Rural	25.3	19.9	23.8	23.9	26.3	18	22.8	23.1	27.5	18.7	22.9	23.5
Sample Size	3,530	1,258	18,788	23,576	3,665	1,168	18,401	23,234	3,870	842	18,262	22,974

Table 3b: Characteristics of Household Head, by Household type, 2010/2011 to 2012/2013

	2010/2011				2012/2013			
	Female Headed	**Male Headed**	**Married Couple**	**Total**	**Female Headed**	**Male Headed**	**Married Couple**	**Total**
Share	16.4	4	79.6	100	17.7	4.2	78.1	100
Education								
None	73.2	42.1	40	45.5	69.1	43.5	39.7	45.1
Primary/lower secondary	7	15.7	13	12.1	9	12.3	12.8	12.1
Secondary	11.6	23.3	28.2	25.3	14.2	23.4	28.1	25.4
Post secondary	1.7	2.7	4.9	4.3	2.2	3.7	4.2	3.8
University	6	15.2	13	11.9	5.2	16.6	14.4	12.9
Postgraduate	0.4	1	0.9	0.9	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.6
Occupation								
Legislators, senior officials and managers	8.4	11.1	10.6	10.5	9	11.7	11.1	11
Professionals	7.8	7.8	10.8	10.5	12.5	8.5	11.3	11.3
Technicians and associate professionals	8.7	6.5	9.5	9.3	8.5	11.2	10.4	10.3
Clerks	1.7	1.3	2.6	2.5	4.1	2.7	2.3	2.4
Service workers	5.7	11.6	7.6	7.6	9.2	13.8	9.3	9.5
Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	55.1	17	20.1	22.4	44	14	20.7	21.8
Craft and related trades workers	3	23.8	17.7	16.8	2	18.4	14.7	14.1
Plant and machine operators, and assemblers	1.6	10.4	12.1	11.3	1.5	8	11.2	10.5
Elementary occupations	8	10.5	9.1	9	9.2	11.6	8.9	9
Other/unspecified	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
Sector								
Government	18.4	11.4	24.1	23.3	28	17.9	25.3	25.2
Public sector	0.2	3.7	4.8	4.5	0.6	1.2	4.9	4.5
Private sector	17.9	48.4	35	34.2	17.6	46.2	33	32.6
Other	63.6	36.4	36	38	53.8	34.6	36.8	37.7
Main activity status								
Employed	18.7	60.2	87.9	75.4	19.4	56.4	87.8	74.3
Unemployed	0.4	2.7	0.6	0.7	0.2	2.7	0.8	0.8
Homemaker	26.1	0	0.1	4.4	19.5	0	0.1	3.5
Student	0.2	4	0.1	0.3	0	2.3	0.1	0.2
Pensioners	46	27.4	9.3	16	51.4	32.5	9.7	18.1
Others	8.6	5.7	2	3.3	9.4	6.2	1.5	3.1
Region of residence								
Metropolitan	24.3	43.1	23.5	24.4	19.8	38.8	18.5	19.6
Lower Urban	12.9	11.2	12.4	12.5	12.9	13.5	12.6	12.7
Lower Rural	27.7	21.3	33.1	31.7	28.5	17.8	33.3	31.8
Upper Urban	11.9	15.6	10.7	11.1	12.2	14.8	11.9	12.1
Upper Rural	23.2	8.8	20.3	20.3	26.5	15.1	23.8	23.9
Sample Size	1,266	299	6,036	7,601	1,325	308	5,771	7,404

Table 4a: Household Characteristics by Household Type, 1999/2000 to 2008/2009

	1999/2000				2004/2005				2008/2009			
	FHH	**MHH**	**MCH**	**Total**	**FHH**	**MHH**	**MCH**	**Total**	**FHH**	**MHH**	**MCH**	**Total**
Household Size	3.4	3.2	5.2	4.9	3	2.6	4.8	4.4	3.4	3.2	5	4.7
Number of children (under 14)	0.9	0.5	1.8	1.6	0.6	0.3	1.5	1.3	0.9	0.6	1.6	1.5
Number of adults over 64	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2
Dependency Ratio	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.7	0.7
Number of Earners	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
Net Wages and Salaries	5484.3	6871.9	7385.3	7189	7352.1	8617.7	9544.8	9302	9976	12581.6	13464.5	13052.8
Total Disposable Income	8403.6	10384.2	12057.7	11436.3	10170.8	12343.9	14255	13517.4	16095.9	19811.9	21491.2	20526.9
Total Expenditure	6918	8210.7	9895.2	9372.9	8724.7	9832.7	11909.1	11304.5	13755.5	15100.5	17827.9	17045
Per Capita Income	3001.3	4457.2	2616.7	2765	4184	6576.9	3299.2	3603.2	5997	8656.1	4784	5132.6
Per Capita Expenditure	2463	3520.8	2131.3	2249.4	3598.5	5199.4	2744.8	3002.5	5204.5	6447	3961.2	4262.6

Notes: All income and expenditure data are annual at current prices.
Source: Author's calculations from the HIECS 1999/2000 to 2012/2013

Table 4b: Household Characteristics by Household Type, 2010/2011 to 2012/2013

	2010/2011				2012/2013			
	FHH	**MHH**	**MCH**	**Total**	**FHH**	**MHH**	**MCH**	**Total**
Household Size	3.2	2.8	4.8	4.4	3	2.4	4.8	4.3
Number of children (under 14)	0.8	0.3	1.5	1.4	0.7	0.2	1.5	1.3
Number of adults over 64	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2
Dependency Ratio	0.7	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.7
Number of Earners	1.7	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.6
Net Wages and Salaries	13107.2	16015.4	17131.7	16682	16106.4	17857.7	22032.5	21263
Total Disposable Income	19786.6	26555.7	26194.2	25158	22640.3	28720.8	32145.9	30320
Total Expenditure	18033.3	21294.9	23174	22256.7	20006.2	22683.2	27756.2	26171
Per Capita Income	7466.1	13075.7	6098.9	6599.5	9442	16053.3	7460.7	8173
Per Capita Expenditure	6871.5	10677.5	5381.4	5835.5	8422.1	12196.2	6423.2	7020

Table 5: FGT Poverty Measures for All Households, Using Three Poverty Lines and Per Capita Expenditure

	FPL			PL			UPL		
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.03345	0.0041	0.00085	0.19008	0.03502	0.0096	0.40486	0.09709	0.0328
04/05	0.04161	0.00585	0.00133	0.19523	0.03676	0.01052	0.40796	0.09687	0.033
08/09	0.10334	0.0182	0.00504	0.30685	0.0672	0.02206	0.52813	0.14255	0.05373
10/11	0.10181	0.01676	0.00444	0.28471	0.06057	0.019	0.49103	0.12671	0.04606
12/13	0.08309	0.01463	0.00431	0.25123	0.05051	0.01587	0.46693	0.11198	0.03895

Table 6: FGT Poverty Measures for Rural Households, Female and Male Headed, using three Poverty Lines and Per Capita Expenditure

	Female Headed Households (Rural)								
	FPL			**PL**			**UPL**		
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0323	0.0031	0.0005	0.2518	0.0422	0.0104	0.5082	0.1187	0.0387
04/05	0.0533	0.0088	0.0022	0.2210	0.0425	0.0131	0.4412	0.1061	0.0370
08/09	0.1194	0.0233	0.0071	0.3541	0.0799	0.0270	0.5759	0.1603	0.0617
10/11	0.1083	0.0175	0.0057	0.3432	0.0690	0.0212	0.5425	0.1427	0.0515
12/13	0.1158	0.0224	0.0077	0.2849	0.0653	0.0229	0.4804	0.1277	0.0485
	Male Headed Households (Rural)								
	FPL			**PL**			**UPL**		
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0352	0.0037	0.0007	0.2111	0.0357	0.0093	0.4457	0.1028	0.0333
04/05	0.0056	0.0001	0.0000	0.1680	0.0255	0.0047	0.4015	0.0841	0.0238
08/09	0.1228	0.0196	0.0045	0.3868	0.0832	0.0262	0.6031	0.1689	0.0633
10/11	0.0159	0.0004	0.0000	0.1660	0.0146	0.0024	0.4807	0.0823	0.0181
12/13	0.1216	0.0071	0.0007	0.2594	0.0496	0.0123	0.4027	0.1046	0.0349
	Married Couple Households (Rural)								
	FPL			**PL**			**UPL**		
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0503	0.0062	0.0013	0.2731	0.0513	0.0141	0.5435	0.1336	0.0457
04/05	0.0604	0.0082	0.0018	0.2754	0.0521	0.0149	0.5336	0.1299	0.0446
08/09	0.1464	0.0257	0.0070	0.4101	0.0921	0.0305	0.6589	0.1842	0.0706
10/11	0.1418	0.0235	0.0062	0.3818	0.0828	0.0263	0.6141	0.1645	0.0608
12/13	0.1128	0.0207	0.0060	0.3301	0.0686	0.0220	0.5755	0.1430	0.0509

Table 7: FGT Poverty Measures for Urban Households, Female and Male Headed, Using Three Poverty Lines and Per Capita Expenditure

	Female Headed Households (Urban)								
	FPL			PL			UPL		
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0110	0.0013	0.0003	0.0707	0.0128	0.0035	0.1952	0.0438	0.0144
04/05	0.0166	0.0025	0.0005	0.0873	0.0176	0.0050	0.2133	0.0487	0.0170
08/09	0.0467	0.0093	0.0030	0.1630	0.0335	0.0114	0.3177	0.0819	0.0307
10/11	0.0472	0.0077	0.0017	0.1547	0.0307	0.0090	0.3026	0.0743	0.0258
12/13	0.0331	0.0044	0.0014	0.1248	0.0220	0.0061	0.2762	0.0596	0.0191
	Male Headed Households (Urban)								
	FPL			PL			UPL		
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0081	0.0006	0.0001	0.0476	0.0076	0.0018	0.1427	0.0309	0.0095
04/05	0.0077	0.0010	0.0002	0.0246	0.0046	0.0015	0.1469	0.0252	0.0067
08/09	0.0225	0.0035	0.0007	0.1098	0.0189	0.0052	0.2458	0.0532	0.0179
10/11	0.0564	0.0059	0.0010	0.1063	0.0219	0.0066	0.2697	0.0561	0.0189
12/13	0.0155	0.0018	0.0002	0.0272	0.0059	0.0018	0.1335	0.0203	0.0055
	Married Couple Households (Urban)								
	FPL			PL			UPL		
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0127	0.0017	0.0004	0.0779	0.0138	0.0039	0.2196	0.0492	0.0162
04/05	0.0203	0.0030	0.0008	0.1050	0.0193	0.0056	0.2696	0.0605	0.0203
08/09	0.0472	0.0079	0.0022	0.1703	0.0340	0.0106	0.3640	0.0888	0.0316
10/11	0.0552	0.0091	0.0024	0.1637	0.0342	0.0105	0.3417	0.0812	0.0286
12/13	0.0414	0.0063	0.0018	0.1552	0.0267	0.0075	0.3472	0.0745	0.0237

Table 8: FGT Poverty Measures for All Households, Using Three Poverty Lines and Per Capita Income

	FPL			PL			UPL		
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.01511	0.00206	0.00045	0.11282	0.01903	0.00498	0.27677	0.05988	0.01895
04/05	0.02787	0.00415	0.001	0.13402	0.02495	0.00723	0.2956	0.06764	0.02279
08/09	0.05778	0.0098	0.00263	0.20444	0.04111	0.01272	0.39348	0.0965	0.03397
10/11	0.07309	0.01286	0.0035	0.22064	0.0452	0.01421	0.39475	0.09738	0.03485
12/13	0.05803	0.01006	0.003	0.18115	0.03561	0.01109	0.35531	0.08163	0.02777

Table 9: FGT Poverty Measures for Rural Households, Female and Male Headed, Using Three Poverty Lines and Per Capita Income

	Female Headed Households (Rural)								
	FPL			PL			UPL		
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0126	0.0011	0.0002	0.1392	0.0206	0.0045	0.3210	0.0705	0.0209
04/05	0.0347	0.0059	0.0015	0.1441	0.0284	0.0088	0.3331	0.0741	0.0251
08/09	0.0788	0.0141	0.0041	0.2492	0.0531	0.0173	0.4484	0.1146	0.0420
10/11	0.0825	0.0159	0.0046	0.2912	0.0538	0.0168	0.4540	0.1162	0.0412
12/13	0.0905	0.0161	0.0066	0.2448	0.0507	0.0178	0.3790	0.1008	0.0380
	Male Headed Households (Rural)								
	FPL			PL			UPL		
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0166	0.0022	0.0003	0.1027	0.0198	0.0053	0.2415	0.0527	0.0175
04/05	0.0036	0.0004	0.0000	0.0969	0.0134	0.0026	0.2319	0.0479	0.0133
08/09	0.0504	0.0096	0.0027	0.2090	0.0372	0.0116	0.3905	0.0928	0.0313
10/11	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0623	0.0042	0.0005	0.3507	0.0438	0.0078
12/13	0.0330	0.0030	0.0004	0.1684	0.0282	0.0066	0.2617	0.0624	0.0201
	Married Couple Households (Rural)								
	FPL			PL			UPL		
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0226	0.0031	0.0007	0.1640	0.0278	0.0073	0.3795	0.0829	0.0264
04/05	0.0393	0.0055	0.0012	0.1862	0.0347	0.0099	0.3845	0.0894	0.0301
08/09	0.0802	0.0134	0.0035	0.2760	0.0560	0.0173	0.4923	0.1242	0.0442
10/11	0.1003	0.0166	0.0042	0.2887	0.0602	0.0187	0.4950	0.1246	0.0447
12/13	0.0760	0.0130	0.0036	0.2359	0.0470	0.0144	0.4403	0.1027	0.0352

Table 10: FGT Poverty Measures for Urban Households, Female and Male Headed, using three Poverty Lines and Per Capita Income

Female Headed Households (Urban)									
		FPL			**PL**			**UPL**	
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0052	0.0004	0.0001	0.0478	0.0079	0.0019	0.1256	0.0280	0.0090
04/05	0.0136	0.0030	0.0009	0.0735	0.0148	0.0046	0.1501	0.0382	0.0142
08/09	0.0222	0.0050	0.0017	0.1009	0.0204	0.0065	0.2452	0.0559	0.0194
10/11	0.0399	0.0105	0.0042	0.1294	0.0279	0.0103	0.2500	0.0651	0.0243
12/13	0.0167	0.0036	0.0014	0.0946	0.0148	0.0044	0.2146	0.0440	0.0139
Male Headed Households (Urban)									
		FPL			**PL**			**UPL**	
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0051	0.0004	0.0000	0.0139	0.0023	0.0008	0.0791	0.0134	0.0036
04/05	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0230	0.0018	0.0002	0.1099	0.0174	0.0038
08/09	0.0084	0.0005	0.0002	0.0394	0.0059	0.0015	0.1541	0.0271	0.0072
10/11	0.0175	0.0031	0.0005	0.0851	0.0159	0.0039	0.1655	0.0379	0.0126
12/13	0.0155	0.0011	0.0001	0.0155	0.0047	0.0014	0.0707	0.0112	0.0035
Married Couple Households (Urban)									
		FPL			**PL**			**UPL**	
	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2	P_0	P_1	P_2
99/00	0.0061	0.0010	0.0002	0.0462	0.0079	0.0022	0.1477	0.0307	0.0097
04/05	0.0152	0.0026	0.0007	0.0758	0.0140	0.0042	0.1987	0.0439	0.0147
08/09	0.0277	0.0047	0.0013	0.1109	0.0211	0.0064	0.2672	0.0605	0.0205
10/11	0.0412	0.0080	0.0023	0.1326	0.0268	0.0086	0.2715	0.0632	0.0226
12/13	0.0331	0.0059	0.0017	0.1069	0.0202	0.0062	0.2598	0.0554	0.0179