

**UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE  
CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS**

Seminar "The way forward in poverty measurement"  
2-4 December 2013, Geneva, Switzerland

Item 4 of the provisional agenda

**Session 3: Interlinkages between poverty, inequality,  
vulnerability and social inclusion**

## **Child Poverty in Armenia**

Prepared by the National Statistical Service of the Republic of Armenia

**Based on the Results of the 2011 Integrated Living Conditions Survey of Households**

*Gagik Gevorgyan, Member of State Council on Statistics of the Republic of Armenia*

*Lilit Petrosyan, Member of State Council on Statistics of the Republic of Armenia*

In Armenia child poverty was assessed in terms of consumption aggregate, material and housing deprivation as well as role of social protection benefits in poverty mitigation.

### **1. Child poverty was assessed in terms of consumption aggregate**

Some 4.7% of children (under 18) live below the extreme poverty line and 41.9 % below the poverty line, while extreme poverty and poverty rates in Armenia are 3.7% and 35.0%, respectively (Table 1). Thus, children are exposed to a higher risk of poverty than the population as a whole.

Data for 2011 show also a difference in child poverty incidence by sex: 42.9% of girls were poor, vs. 41.1% of boys (all children 41.9%). There are differences in child poverty incidence by regions: 6.1% of children in urban areas were extreme poor, vs. 2.4% of children in rural areas, 41.6% of children in urban areas were poor, vs. 42.5% of children in rural areas.

**Table 1. Poverty Rates, 2011**

*(percent)*

	All children of age under 18 year	including		Total population
		girls	boys	
Extreme poverty	4.7	4.7	4.7	3.7
Total poverty	41.9	42.9	41.1	35.0

Source: *ILCS, 2011*

Table 2 shows dynamics of child poverty indicators in 2008-2011, reflecting the impact of 2009-2011 global economic crisis over child poverty growth.

**Table 2. Armenia: 2008-2011 Dynamics of Child Poverty Indicators**

*(percent)*

	Extremely poor	Poor	Non-poor
2008	1.6	29.8	70.2
2009	3.8	35.7	64.3
2010	3.7	41.4	58.6
2011	4.7	41.9	58.1

Source: *ILCS, 2008-2011*

Average poverty rates reflect the substantial dependence of poverty and adverse living conditions on various household characteristics. Child poverty rates significantly vary with the number of children in the household, the age group of the youngest child, the presence of disabled children, as well as the characteristics of the household head such as sex, educational level and employment status. There is also significant variation by the proportion of employed household members and by household domicile.

**Children in larger families are more likely to be poor.** Children with 2 or more siblings are exposed to a higher risk of poverty both in terms of extreme and total poverty. Thus, 56.8% of children in families with 3 or more children of the age 0-18 years are poor, compared to 41.9% total child poverty rate, while some 8.8% of children in large families are extremely poor, compared to 4.7% extreme child poverty rate (Table 3).

**Younger children are more likely to be poor.** Children in families where the youngest child is 5 years old or younger are exposed to a higher risk of poverty. Thus, 46.9% of children in such families are poor, while the child poverty rate in families where the youngest child is 15-18 years old is 35.8%. A similar pattern is observed using the extreme poverty threshold.

**Households with one or more disabled children are imposed to the highest risk of poverty.** Although only 1.2% of children are disabled or live with other disabled children, 64.8% of them are poor and 8.4% are extremely poor. Disabled children comprise 1.9% of poor children and the poverty gap for them comprise on average 14%.

**Children in female-headed households are substantially more likely to be poor.** Although one-quarter (24.1%) of all children live in female-headed households, 44.3% of them are poor and 5.9% are extremely poor. The child poverty and extreme poverty rates in male-headed households are, respectively, 42.1% and 4.7%.

**Marital status of the household head is an important predictor of child poverty.** Children in households with a single (never married), widowed or divorced head are more likely to be poor (46.0%) than those in households with married or cohabiting heads (41.2%). Besides, the likelihood for them to fall below the extreme poverty line is higher by 10%.

**Living in a household with a more educated head reduces the risk of poverty.** Children living in households where the household head has no education or has primary education (for whom poverty rate is 58.1%), incomplete secondary education (48.8%), complete secondary education (48.2%), specialized secondary or incomplete higher education (40.4%) are substantially more likely to be poor than those in households where the head is a university graduate (22.9%). Children in households where the head has incomplete secondary education are imposed to the highest risk of extreme poverty. However, 43.4% of all children live in households where the head has complete secondary education.

**Employment status of the household head is another crucial predictor of child poverty.** Children in households where the head did any profitable work within the past 7 days are at the lowest risk of poverty in terms of both total and extreme poverty. Thus, 36.7% of children whose head of household is working are poor, compared to 48.2% of children with non-working heads. However, 45.9% of all children live in households where the head does not work.

**The number of adult household members in employment also appears to affect child poverty rates.** Children in households where no adults of the age 19-60 years are employed are exposed to the highest risk of poverty, while children in households where not only working age adults are employed are

exposed to the lowest risk of extreme poverty (0.8%). However, about half of all the children (49.7%) live in households where not all adults (19-60 years) are working.

**Table 3. Poverty Rates, Gaps and Composition, by Type of Household, 2011**  
(percent)

	Child poverty rate (extreme)	Child poverty rate	Poverty gap	%- in poor population	Composition of all children
<b>Number of children (of the age 0-18 years)</b>					
One	3.0	32.8	7	18.8	24.0
Two	3.6	39.2	9	48.2	51.6
Three or more	8.8	56.8	14	33.0	24.4
<b>Sex</b>					
Girl	4.7	42.9	10	46.6	47.7
Boy	4.7	41.1	10	53.4	52.3
<b>Age of the youngest child</b>					
0-5	4.7	46.9	11	49.6	44.3
6-14	5.1	38.5	9	42.2	46.1
15-18	3.1	35.8	8	8.2	9.6
<b>Number of adults (of the age 19 - 60 years)</b>					
None/ one	3.7	35.5	8	8.9	10.5
Two	3.1	37.7	8	43.2	48.2
Three	4.2	42.3	10	20.5	20.3
Four or more	9.5	54.5	13	27.4	21.0
<b>Number of retired household members</b>					
None	4.6	40.9	10	65.7	67.4
One	5.1	43.8	10	24.2	23.1
Two or more	4.7	44.8	10	10.1	9.5
<b>Number or disabled adults</b>					
None	4.5	40.3	9	79.9	83.1
One or more	5.6	50.0	11	20.1	16.9
<b>Number of disabled children</b>					
None	4.7	41.7	10	98.1	98.8
One or more	8.4	64.8	14	1.9	1.2
<b>Gender of household head</b>					
Male	4.7	42.1	10	74.9	75.9
Female	5.9	44.3	11	25.1	24.1
<b>Marital status of head</b>					
Married/ cohabiting	4.9	41.2	10	69.2	71.5
Single/ widowed/ divorced	5.4	46.0	11	30.8	28.5
<b>Educational level of household head</b>					
Elementary and primary	6.6	58.1	16	7.9	5.8
Incomplete secondary	5.3	48.8	12	12.1	10.5
Complete secondary	6.3	48.2	12	49.0	43.4
Specialized secondary	4.2	40.4	9	21.5	22.7
Higher	2.2	22.9	4	9.5	17.6
<b>Employment of household head</b>					
Not worked in the past 7 days	7.3	48.2	12	52.7	45.9
Worked in the past 7 days	2.5	36.7	8	47.3	54.1
<b>Employment of adults (of the age 19-60 years)</b>					
No adult works	10.2	57.9	15	16.2	11.7
Not all adults work	6.0	45.5	11	53.7	49.7
All adults work	1.7	30.7	6	22.3	30.4
Not only adults work	0.8	39.8	8	7.8	8.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: ILCS, 2011

**Child poverty rates substantially vary across regions.** Table 4 shows a descriptive analysis of child poverty across 10 regions and Yerevan City. The differences by regions are significant both in terms of extreme and total poverty. Extreme child poverty rates range from the lowest 1.5% in Aragatsotn to the highest 8% in Shirak and Kotaik. There were no extremely poor children recorded in the sampled households of Syunik marz. A similar pattern is observed for total poverty rates. Poverty rates are the lowest below average in Aragatsotn (18.0%) and the highest are in Shirak marz (56.0%).

**Table 4. Poverty Rates, Gaps and Composition, by Regions, 2011**  
(percent)

	Child poverty rate (extreme)	Child poverty rate	Poverty gap	%- in poor population	Composition of all children
Yerevan	3.8	33.1	7	24.4	30.8
Aragatsotn	1.5	18.0	3	1.5	3.5
Ararat	3.8	49.2	10	10.0	8.5
Armavir	5.6	47.0	12	10.1	9.0
Gegharkunik	1.8	43.5	8	6.1	5.9
Lori	6.8	52.1	13	12.4	10.0
Kotayk	8.1	51.3	16	14.3	11.7
Shirak	8.2	56.0	13	13.0	9.8
Syunik	-	31.7	6	3.1	4.1
Vayotz Dzor	2.4	33.6	5	1.5	1.9
Tavush	2.0	31.5	6	3.6	4.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: *ILCS 2011*

## 2. Material Deprivation

**To complement the consumption poverty analysis, this section analyses the problems related to material deprivation of children in Armenia.** The latter is measured as households' lack of durable goods. The following 9 durable goods have been included in the analysis: refrigerator, washing machine, mobile telephone, vacuum cleaner, video recorder, photo camera, audio system, car and personal computer. These items are chosen because at least 10% of all households in the 2009-2011 Integrated Living Conditions Survey owned them. However, it is not clear whether the households that lack these items cannot afford them or choose not to have them.

**As compared to all children, poor children are substantially more likely to live in households lacking any one of the above-mentioned durable goods.** Children in extremely poor households are the most likely to lack all of these items. For example, while 4.9% of all children live in households without a refrigerator, 7.6% of poor and 19.2% of extremely poor children live in households lacking this item. While 73.4% of children live in households without a car, the same indicator for the poor and extremely poor children is 85.3% and 90.8%, respectively.

**Table 5. Durable Goods Lacked, 2011**  
(percent)

	All children	Poor children	Extremely poor children
Refrigerator	4.9	7.6	19.2
Washing machine	9.2	15.6	34.0
Mobile phone	1.7	3.4	11.7
Vacuum cleaner	33.1	43.8	68.1
Video recorder	46.2	55.8	76.1
Photo camera	60.9	73.1	88.1

Audio system	58.8	66.3	78.2
Car	73.4	85.3	94.1
Personal computer	67.5	82.3	90.8

Source: *ILCS 2011*

**There are noticeable differences in deprivation rates between all children and poor children.** Poor children are more likely to live in households lacking durable goods than children overall. Around 3.7% of all children live in households not lacking any of these durable goods, for households with poor children 0.7 %, while no such households of poor and extremely poor children were identified (Table 6). Extremely poor children are more likely to lack all 9 items (2.5%) than poor children (0.4%). However, since the extreme (food) poverty measure picks up only 4.7% of all children and may not be a sufficiently reliable indicator of extreme poverty, to achieve a deprivation rate that is comparable with the estimated consumption child poverty rate of 41.9% the deprivation threshold is drawn at lacking 5 or more items. This results in 32.2% of all children experiencing material deprivation<sup>1</sup>. The corresponding rates for poor and extremely poor children are higher, at 48.8 and 74.8%, respectively.

**Table 6. Number of Durable Goods Lacking, 2011**  
(percent)

	All children	Poor children	Extremely poor children
0 (all 9 are present)	3.7	0.7	-
1	10.7	4.8	.4
2	17.2	12.0	3.3
3	18.5	16.2	9.8
4	17.7	17.6	11.7
5	16.1	21.0	16.4
6	10.1	17.0	27.1
7	4.6	8.2	20.3
8	1.2	2.2	8.5
9	0.2	0.4	2.5

Source: *ILCS 2011*

An obvious problem with this methodology is that the items included in the simple count index may not be of equal importance to the households' welfare, whereas ILCS 2011 provides no information about the desirability or importance of these durable goods. Furthermore, there is no information on whether the item is lacking because the household cannot afford or choose not to have it. Using the prevalence weighted deprivation index helps to overcome this drawback at least in part because it is based on the assumption that households are relatively more deprived if they lack an item that most other household have. For example, lacking a refrigerator carries more weight than lacking a personal computer because more households have a refrigerator than a personal computer. Each score of 1 given for a lacked item is multiplied by the proportion of children in the weighted sample who live in households having this item. The scores are then summed across all items and divided by the total number of items - that is 9 - for each household. The resulting score is multiplied by 100 to create a continuous variable that ranges from 0 (not lacking any items) to 100 (lacking all items that everybody else owns). Unfortunately, the resulting index does not comprise certain values for those households, which have missing information on any of the 9 durable goods.

**On average, poor children have a higher prevalence weighted deprivation score.** While the average score for all children is 10.8, it is 13.7 and 20.4 for poor and extremely poor children, respectively (Table

<sup>1</sup> If the threshold is drawn at 4 items or more, then material deprivation rate will be substantially higher at 50%.

7). This suggests that poor children live in households lacking more of the items that other households usually own.

**Table 7. Average Prevalence Weighted Deprivation Score and Deprivation Rates, 2011**  
(percent)

	All children	Poor children	Extremely poor children
Average	10.8	13.7	20.4
Standard deviation	7.7	8.5	10

Source: ILCS 2011

### 3. Housing Deprivation

Housing problems can have an adverse impact on children's health, safety, education and social development. ILCS 2011 included questions about housing, such as the number of amenities and rooms in use as well as questions about housing problems and perceived quality of living conditions.

**Poor children often live in accommodation lacking important amenities.** Children in poor households are consistently more likely to live in dwellings without essential housing amenities<sup>2</sup>, such as kitchen, centralized gas supply, landline telephone, flush toilet, bathtub or shower, cold and hot running water (Table 8). Extremely poor children are more likely to live in households without hot running water, centralized gas supply and landline telephone than poor children. On the other hand, extremely poor children are more likely to live in dwellings without any of the amenities specified in Table 8 than all children, except for a flush toilet.

**Table 8. Housing Amenities Lacking or not in Working Order, 2011**  
(percent)

	All children	Poor children	Extremely poor children
Centralized water supply	4.7	5.6	1.7
Hot running water	45.9	58.0	75.4
Flush toilet	32.6	34.6	16.6
Centralized gas supply	19.5	22.6	22.7
Bathtub or shower	21.9	29.9	35.1
Kitchen	4.7	6.8	3.2
Landline telephone	30.2	36.1	45.7

Source: ILCS 2011

**Poor children are more likely to lack more of the housing amenities than all children.** More than one-third (38%) of all children live in houses not lacking any of these amenities, while 28% and 18% of poor children and extremely poor children, respectively, live in such households (Table 9). Children in extremely poor households are the most likely to lack 2 amenities out of the 7 (25.5%), but they are the least likely to live in households lacking 5 amenities (6.9%). To achieve a housing deprivation rate that is comparable with the consumption child poverty rate for 2011 (41.9%), the deprivation threshold is drawn at lacking 2 or more amenities. This definition results in 43% of all children experiencing housing

<sup>2</sup> The amenity is either not available or not in working order.

deprivation. The corresponding rates for poor and extremely poor children are substantially higher at 52% and 60%, respectively.

**Table 9. Household Amenities Lacked or Not in Working Order, 2011**

	<i>(percent)</i>		
	All children	Poor children	Extremely poor children
0	38.1	28.0	17.5
1	19.1	20.5	22.3
2	14.1	15.6	25.5
3	12.5	15.6	19.0
4	8.6	10.0	8.8
5	5.2	6.9	6.9
6	2.0	2.9	0.0
7	0.4	0.5	-

Source: *ILCS 2011*.

**Poor children are more likely to live in worse housing conditions.** Children in consumption poor households are generally more likely to live in dwellings with reported housing problems than all children (Table 10). For example, 33% of poor children and 50% of extremely poor children live in households that report rot in window frames and doors, compared to 25% of all children. Some housing problems are almost equally prevalent amongst all households, such as poor garbage disposal. 55 percent of poor children and 66 percent of extremely poor children live in households that report heating problems, compared to 45% of all children.

**Table 10. Housing Problems Reported, 2011**

	<i>(percent)</i>		
	All children	Poor children	Extremely poor children
1. Not enough space	36.2	41.3	57.8
2. Noise from neighbors or outside	4.8	4.8	3.8
3. Insufficient day light	13.7	16.4	22.9
4. Insufficient heating	44.7	54.5	65.8
5. Dampness	35.6	39.7	40.6
6. Leaking roof	20.5	26.0	28.7
7. Rotten walls and floors	27.2	34.3	45.4
8. Rot in window frames and doors	25.2	33.3	49.8
9. Heavy traffic	1.9	1.7	0.2
10. Industrial pollution	3.1	3.2	2.5
11. Frequent breakdowns of the elevator	19.4	21.6	42.5
12. Poor water supply	25.4	30.3	22.5
13. Poor garbage disposal	20.2	20.3	13.2
14. Problems with using public space and yards in multifamily housing	22.1	25.7	24.5
15. Other problems	5.0	4.9	5.4

Source: *ILCS 2011*.

Besides, poor children are also more likely to live in households reporting more housing problems than all children. Only 15% of extremely poor children live in households that do not report any of the 15 housing problems, while 17% of all children and 13% of poor children live in such households (Table 11).

Children in poor and extremely poor households are less likely to live in houses with only 1, 2 or 3 reported housing problems than all children, while they are more likely to live in households reporting 4 or more problems. However, almost no child lives in households reporting 10 or 15 problems, while 0.9-1.2% of all children lives in households reporting 9 or more problems. In order to reach a housing deprivation rate comparable with the consumption child poverty rate for 2011 (41.9%), the deprivation threshold is drawn at households reporting 3 or more problems (46%). This definition results in the deprivation rates of 54% for poor children and 65% for extremely poor children. When housing deprivation is defined based on the number of reported problems, the resulting indicator is closer to the consumption poverty indicator than the one defined based on the number of housing amenities lacking.

**Table 11. Number of Housing Problems Reported, 2011**  
(percent)

	All children	Poor children	Extremely poor children
0	17.3	12.6	14.8
1	19.3	17.2	10.4
2	17.0	15.9	10.2
3	13.8	13.6	8.1
4	11.1	12.4	14.8
5	7.5	9.1	13.1
6	5.5	6.9	13.1
7	5.0	6.5	8.1
8	2.6	4.6	6.2
9	0.8	1.2	1.2
10	0.0	-	-
11	0.1	0.0	-

Source: *ILCS 2011*

**Poor children are more likely to live in perceived worse housing conditions.** While about 25% of all children live in households that describe their dwelling conditions as bad or very bad, 31% of poor children and 43% of extremely poor children live in such households. At the same time, 64% of all children live in households with “satisfactory” housing conditions, but only 63% of poor children and 55% of extremely poor children live in such households. Conversely, the percentage of poor children likely to live in households with housing conditions described as good or very good is half the percentage of all children and the percentage of extremely poor children is 5 times lower.

**Table 12. Perceived Quality of Housing Conditions, 2011**  
(percent)

	All children	Poor children	Extremely poor children
Good or very good	11.7	5.3	2.2
Satisfactory	63.6	63.3	54.8
Bad or very bad	24.7	31.4	43.0

Source: *ILCS 2011*

**Poor children are more likely to live in overcrowded accommodation.** The average number of rooms (excluding kitchens, bathtubs and toilets) per person in the primary dwelling is higher for all children (0.61) than for poor children (0.55) or extremely poor children (0.44). If the threshold is drawn at 0.43 or fewer rooms per person, the overcrowding rate for all children is 27%, as compared to 35% for poor children and 56% for extremely poor children (Table 13).

**Table 13. Average Number of Rooms per Person and Overcrowding Rates, 2011**

	All children	Poor children	Extremely poor children
Mean (SD)	0.61 (0.25)	0.55 (0.22)	0.44(0.19)
Overcrowding rate (percent)	26.5	34.5	55.9

Source: ILCS 2011

Some 21% of non-poor children live in overcrowded accommodation. The rate is the highest (56%) for children in households below the extreme poverty line (Table 14).

**Table 14. Overcrowding Indicators, by Poverty Status, 2011**

(percent)

	Non-poor children	Poor (without extremely poor children)	Extremely poor children
Not overcrowded	79.4	68.2	44.1
Overcrowded	20.6	31.8	55.9

Source: ILCS 2011

**Note:** The correlation between overcrowding and poverty status is statistically significant at  $p < 0.001$

#### 4. Children Needs

**Further to consumption poverty and material deprivation analysis, this section reviews children needs.** This is another way to measure child poverty, which focuses more on the social and cultural dimensions of poverty, likely to affect children's development more than the deprivation of objects or facilities.

ILCS 2011 questionnaire provides a new section "Children Needs" where responses received from 6-17 years old children are presented. The analysis includes 13 types of children needs presented in Tables 15 and 16.

There is a significant difference between some of children needs by characteristics of the household head, while in terms of some other ones, there is almost no difference. Thus, children in families where household head has elementary or primary education, 31% of children lack books, which they could read at their leisure, which is 2.4 times higher than in families where household head has higher education (13%): The difference is also high in terms of lack of shoes for different occupational purposes, totaling to 41% and 18% respectively (2.3 times lower). 60% of children in families where household head has elementary or primary education does not receive "pocket money", while in families where household head has higher education this figure is equal to 37% (1.6 times less). About half (52%) of children in families where household head has elementary or primary education lack entertainment items, such as bicycle, games, etc., while in families where household head has higher education, only 31% of children lack them (1.7 times less).

At the same time, there is almost no difference in terms of some children needs by education of household head. Thus, 96-99% of all children have the basic school stationery.

Child needs by poverty level and by different social groups (such as disabled, children of single mothers, and households with three and more children) are different.

As Table 16 shows, among all children, the highest number of negative responses was provided regarding attending sport clubs or other similar clubs at least once a month (75%): This figure is higher among children from poor and extremely poor households, as well as households with three and more children (79-89%).

**Table 15. Armenia: Unsatisfied Needs of Children Aged Between 6-17 by Education Level of Household Head, 2011**  
(percent)

	All children	Education Level of the Household Head			
		Elementary and primary	Incomplete secondary	Complete secondary and specialized secondary	Higher
1. The child does not receive “pocket money” for daily expenses	47	60	56	47	37
2. The child does not regularly visit a dentist (at least once in a year)	67	80	71	68	52
3. There is no separate suitable place for the child to learn and make school assignments	39	42	44	42	28
4. There is no safe place outside the house where the child can play	35	21	35	35	38
5. The child does not have items for entertainment, e.g. bicycle, games, etc.	46	52	54	47	31
6. The child does not have items for his/her hobbies	72	83	77	73	62
7. The child does not attend sporting club or similar club at least once a month	75	74	79	76	67
8. The child does not have books that can be read in free time	24	31	37	23	13
9. Parents do not buy children's newspaper, magazine or similar periodicals	67	76	75	66	56
10. The child does not spend a week-long vacation away from home at least once in a year.	61	56	67	64	53
11. The child does not invite friends to his house for entertainment at least twice a month, and neither is invited by them	51	46	58	52	45
12. The child does not have the necessary school stationery	2	3	4	3	1
13. The child does not have shoes for different occupational purposes	32	41	39	35	18

Source: *ILCS 2011*

Lack of hobby items occupies the second place in responses about unsatisfied needs (72%). This figure is higher among children from poor and extremely poor households, as well as households with three and more children (82-95%). Lack of regular visits to dentist is on the third place (67%). Again, this figure is higher among children from poor and extremely poor households, respectively 76% and 96%.

The same proportion of responses (67%) was received regarding the fact that parents do not buy children's newspaper, magazine or similar periodicals. The proportion of negative responses to this question is higher among children from poor and extremely poor households, respectively 87% and 85%.

In terms of some needs, the unsatisfied demand almost does not differ by poverty level and different social groups. Thus, 96-98% of all children have the basic school stationery.

**Table 16. Armenia: Unsatisfied Needs of Children Aged Between 6-17 by Household Poverty Level and Social Groups, 2011**

(percent)

	All children	Poor	Extremely poor	Disabled	Children of single mothers	Children from households with three and more children
1. The child does not receive "pocket money" for daily expenses	47	59	41	66	45	53
2. The child does not regularly visit a dentist (at least once in a year)	67	76	96	62	72	77
3. There is no separate suitable place for the child to learn and make school assignments	39	58	88	46	39	55
4. There is no safe place outside the house where the child can play	35	36	44	42	36	37
5. The child does not have items for entertainment, e.g. bicycle, games, etc.	46	60	72	62	50	53
6. The child does not have items for his/her hobbies	72	88	95	75	74	82
7. The child does not attend sporting club or similar club at least once a month	75	80	89	77	74	79
8. The child does not have books that can be read in free time	24	28	32	44	26	27
9. Parents do not buy children's newspaper, magazine or similar periodicals	67	77	87	85	67	74
10. The child does not spend a week-long vacation away from home at least once in a year.	61	73	89	64	64	66
11. The child does not invite friends to his house for entertainment at least twice a month, and neither is invited by them	51	59	50	64	50	58
12. The child does not have the necessary school stationery	2	4	2	3	2	2
13. The child does not have shoes for different occupational purposes	32	49	70	46	32	43

Source: *ILCS 2011*

**Reference:**

“Social Snapshot and poverty in Armenia, 2012”, Statistical Analytical Report, Based on the Results of the 2011 Integrated Living Conditions Survey of Households, National Statistical Service of the Republic of Armenia, 2012, 200 pages, <http://armstat.am/en/?nid=82&id=1397>