

Distr.: General
08 April 2019

English

United Nations

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of European Statisticians

Work Session on Gender Statistics

Neuchâtel, Switzerland

15 – 17 May 2019

Item 2 of the provisional agenda

Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development from the gender perspective

Measuring gender differences in multidimensional child poverty to track progress toward SDG 1

Note by UNICEF*

Abstract

There is international consensus that poverty is multidimensional, as reflected in SDG Indicator 1.2.2, which measures the proportion of men, women and children of all ages, living in poverty in all its dimensions. As such, there has been growing interest in indices of multidimensional poverty, resulting in many advances in the empirical analysis of multidimensional child poverty at the individual level. However, quantitative differences between girls and boys tend to be small in these measures, both at the aggregate level and for most dimensions and domains. In this paper, we propose that these results are driven by a gap in adequately conceptualizing and measuring multidimensional child poverty from a gender perspective, and present the methodological work that UNICEF is undertaking to construct gender-and-age sensitive measures of multidimensional child poverty, using existing household survey data. Results from Haiti, Guyana, Laos, and Sierra Leone suggest that gender differences in estimates of multi-dimensional child poverty are largely driven by the indicators selected to construct the measures. We discuss the implications that this analysis presents for ensuring that girls are not left behind in the monitoring of the SDG poverty targets, including the need for more and better gender data to inform policy decisions and the development of programmes.

*Prepared by Mr. Enrique Delamonica, Ms. Lauren Pandolfelli and Mr. José Espinoza-Delgado

NOTE: The designations employed in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

I. Introduction

1. For almost 20 years, UNICEF, regional United Nations Economic Commissions, academics, NGOs, and governments have been estimating child poverty. All actors have consistently used a multidimensional approach and (most of them) have centred their analysis on individual child-level estimates -rather than the disaggregation of the proportion of children in poor households¹. However, an interesting but surprising finding comes across in all the studies. There is no difference between boys and girls in terms of child poverty, both at the aggregate level and for most dimensions and domains. This result is counter-intuitive and puzzling, given the empirical literature documenting gender disparities in key domains, particularly in the second decade of life. It is why, this paper explores the issue further.
2. First, we review the methodology used to estimate child poverty that leads to this puzzling result. Second, we address the reasons why we should expect gender differences and consider two explanations for their absence. The core of the paper deals with alternative ways (including their advantages and disadvantages) to modify the standard child poverty measurement so that differences between boys and girls may be observed. We then present the results of one of these approaches before highlighting some remaining challenges and ways to overcome them.

II. Child poverty measurement: the experience thus far

3. Children experience poverty differently from adults. For example, the way they perceive their lack of dignity and of belonging in the rest of society due to their material shortcomings is different from adults. Moreover, the lasting effects these elements have on their self-esteem and future behaviour is different from adults.
4. This is the case whether poverty is measured as a lack of monetary resources (income/consumption) or using a multidimensional approach. However, it is important to highlight that precisely because child poverty is different from adults', different indicators are needed when applying multidimensional approaches to children and adults. For instance, the nutritional needs of growing bodies, access to school, avoiding work, etc. which define childhood are almost the opposite of adults' lives.
5. This also explains the reasons for adopting a multidimensional approach. While under ideal circumstances adults should be gainfully employed (and well paid), children are not supposed to work. Even if they did (during late adolescence) it would be mainly to earn experience and pocket money -not to earn a living (and avoid monetary poverty). Consequently, for child poverty, it is important to assess the situation of children, independent of the parents' income. Multidimensional child poverty is not a marker, a proxy, or an indicator of monetary poverty. It is poverty as actually experienced by children.
6. Moreover, this explains why merely disaggregating the percentage of children in poor households (whichever way household poverty is defined and measured) is a fundamental first step but certainly

¹ E.g. Gordon et al. (2003) Child poverty in the developing world and ESCWA, League of Arab States, UNICEF, and OPHI (2017) Arab Multidimensional Poverty Report

not sufficient to capture child poverty. First of all, it is likely that the elements to assess household poverty will be focused on adult needs. Thus, disaggregating children does not allow to understand what is happening to children. Secondly, given public provision of social services, it is theoretically possible that children in poor households are doing relatively alright. Also, for other reasons, there may be children that would ought to be considered poor in households that are not classified as such.

7. This is important due to the fact that children represent between a third and a half of the population of developing countries. Measuring poverty without taking into account the specific plight of child poverty could give a false impression about its magnitude and its trends. Consequently, a measure of child poverty at the level of the individual child is needed. This is what studies for almost two decades have been doing, thanks to the expansion and availability of data increasingly covering a larger share of the world's population.
8. However, a question arises here. How is child poverty actually measured? First, the dimensions to be included in the measure ought to be selected. There are several conceptual frameworks that could be used (Capabilities Approach, Unsatisfied Basic Needs, Human Rights, etc). Fortunately, they all converge on roughly the same dimensions. There are also practical issues related to the availability of data to consider. Again, fortunately, as these issues have been debated (and efforts to measure them have been attempted for a long time), most household surveys include most of the required indicators.
9. Nevertheless, a couple of caveats are needed, as they are important in the ensuing discussion. Although, most surveys provide information on variables pertaining to the different dimensions, it does not mean that all the required information is available for all age groups. For instance, nutritional shortcomings could be measured with anthropometric indicators, food diversity, or Body Mass Index. However, not all surveys provide all this information. Usually we have one or the other – and not even for all relevant age groups.
10. Moreover, the convergence on dimensions does not mean there is complete agreement. In particular, there is scope for inclusion/exclusion of dimensions depending on the approach. Most of the studies focusing on children have explicitly taken a human rights approach. This means that only rights constitutive of poverty (i.e. critically linked to material shortcomings) are included. In practice this entails the presence of dimensions like the right to education, nutrition, and housing but not the right to privacy, religion, or assembly. While the latter (like many other ones) are important to children, their violation cannot be considered to constitute poverty in any sense of the word “poverty”.
11. Secondly, as most of these analyses rely on a Human Rights approach, all dimensions (which by construction are rights) are equally valued. In other words, all dimensions have the same weights. Many authors (e.g. in the Quality of Life literature or the Human Development Index) also apply equal weighting for other good reasons like transparency and clarity, parsimony, and statistical analyses showing differential weights tend not to add much information.
12. Thirdly, all these studies combine child-specific indicators (e.g. nutritional status or school attendance) with household level indicators (e.g. overcrowding or access to sanitation). While the inclusion of the former is obvious, the latter could be considered problematic as they are not necessarily reflecting the status of children. The standard practice is to assume that whatever the quality of the housing is, it is the same for all children in it. This is clearly correct in a way that would not be when dealing with monetary poverty (in which case it is known that monetary resources are not equally shared by all household members).

III. Conceptualizing child poverty from a gender perspective

13. By definition, a multidimensional child poverty measure that uses individual-level indicators should reveal differences in boys' and girls' poverty but as noted above, existing measures yield negligible differences. We consider two possible explanations for these results. First, as children's lives today are better in many respects than preceding generations', and gender gaps have narrowed across many domains, it is plausible that there are few differences in the incidence and severity of girls' and boys' poverty. Indeed, available data suggest that in the first decade of life (0-9 years of age), gender disparities are relatively small, particularly in early childhood. Overall, children are equally likely to be registered at birth and immunized, irrespective of sex. In about half of countries with available data, girls and boys are equally likely to be developmentally on track at 3 and 4 years of age while in the remaining countries the gender gap in developmental status is relatively small and to the advantage of girls. Considerable progress has also been made in closing the gender gap in primary school enrolment, with most countries have reached gender parity in enrolment in primary education.²
14. However, while girls and boys face similar challenges in early childhood, gender disparities become more pronounced in adolescence (10-19 years of age), a crucial period when boys' and girls' attitudes about gender develop and gender norms consolidate. In many places, the onset of puberty is a signal for constraining girls' movement, schooling, friendships, sexuality and life exposure. Adolescent girls, due to expected gender roles, may also face a disproportionate burden of domestic work, expectations to be married, risks of early pregnancy, as well as sexual and gender-based violence. Thus, while we might expect to see no, or few, gender differences in poverty among younger children, we hypothesize that gender gaps will be manifest among older adolescents.
15. Second, the absence of gender differences in existing child poverty measures may be due to the construction of existing multidimensional poverty measures. While ascribing the household level indicators used in the measures to each of the children in the household does not appear to be problematic (i.e. if the quality of housing is above the threshold to consider the household deprived in the right to housing, then all children in the household enjoy the right to housing), the characteristics of the children in the household – in this case, the sex of the child - may render girls and boys differently affected by the material deprivation. For example, while this difference may not be important for the materials used to construct walls and roofs, it may matter for overcrowding. Also, it is certainly not the case with access to water (as who actually fetches the water is a crucial consideration). In particular, this is a clear case where gender stereotypical roles lead to discrimination against girls.
16. Further, the selection of individual-level indicators used in existing measures of children's multidimensional poverty were likely not informed by a gender perspective and thus, may not be the "right" ones to capture gender disparities. Below, we consider four alternative approaches to construct a child poverty measure that better yields gender differentials.

² UNICEF. 2016. *Harnessing the Power of Data for Girls: Taking Stock and Looking Ahead to 2030*.

A. Approaches for integrating a gender perspective into measures of child poverty using existing data

17. We consider four options to measure multidimensional child poverty from a gender perspective. The first approach is to estimate separately (i.e. with different indicators) child poverty for boys and for girls. Then the average gender gaps can be compared. By using different indicators for boys and girls, it is expected that gender differentials would be observed. The problem with this approach is that the same number of indicators have to be used for boys and girls. If, in order to “better capture” poverty and deprivation among girls, more indicators are added in the estimate of girl poverty than boy poverty, then, by construction, girls’ poverty will likely be higher than boys’ poverty.
18. Second, is to include girl-specific indicators, such as access to essential maternal health care (conditional on pregnant adolescent girls) and to appropriate menstrual hygiene products, in the estimate of child poverty. Again, unless there are also boy-specific indicators (and they are hard to find in the literature), this approach would also “stack the deck” towards finding higher levels of poverty among girls than boys.
19. A third approach is to assign different thresholds or ladders for boys and girls for some indicators under the rationale that girls are differentially affected. For instance, girls who fetch water are more likely than boys to be both prone to injury from carrying heavy loads and at risk of sexual violence. Likewise, girls are likely to experience greater deprivation than boys if the household lacks basic sanitation facilities since the use of sanitation facilities that are shared with other households and open defecation impeded girls’ abilities to safely manage their menstrual cycles in privacy and with dignity and further, expose them to greater risk of sexual assault. However, in assigning different ladders of deprivation to girls and boys, the approach would also, by construction, tend to result in higher levels of deprivation for girls than for boys.
20. A fourth approach is to include indicators in the child poverty measure that could potentially show a gender differential with the same thresholds assigned for girls and boys. In other words, indicators that may better reveal gender biases (in either direction) in material deprivation but that would not, by their very nature, favour the conclusion that girls suffer more poverty than boys (or vice versa). It is this approach that we follow in this paper by adding indicators to the domains of water, health and information. While all of these approaches are limited by data availability, it is the fourth approach that we follow in this paper. In the next section, we specify the indicators we have selected and discuss the rationale for including them.

IV. Methodology

A. Data sources

21. The data used in this paper are drawn from the most recent Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey carried out in Sierra Leone (Sierra Leone-MICS6) and Laos (Laos-MICS6), and the Haiti Demographic and Health Survey (Haiti-DHS-VI), and the Guyana Demographic Health Survey (Guyana-DHS-V). In our analyses, we include the household members that completed a full interview.
22. As methodological strategy, and partly due to data constraints, the child population is divided into three age cohorts: children aged 0-4 years (G1), children aged 5-14 years (G2), and children aged 15-

17 years (G3); however, we also provide overall estimates, employing the corresponding sample weights of the surveys.

B. Dimensions, indicators and deprivation thresholds

23. To test the main hypothesis of the paper, that gender differences in child poverty should be observed among older adolescents if a gender-informed set of indicators are used, we estimate two multidimensional child poverty measures and compare the results from both of them. The first measure, which is called “base measure”, comprises seven dimensions: education, nutrition, health, water, sanitation, housing, and information, which are constitutive rights of poverty (as explained above the fulfilment of these rights is crucially dependent on material resources, unlike for instance, the right to identity or nationality). This base measure is estimated for all the four countries under scrutiny. The second measure is an “enhanced” version of the base measure; given the purpose of the paper, we improve the base measure by incorporating individual-level indicators into the domains of water, information and nutrition. We choose these indicators based on both data availability and under the premise that they are likely to reveal gender disparities in domains of key importance to children, as detailed below.
24. In the domain of water, while inadequate drinking water poses critical health risks to all children, a lack of water on a household’s premises has additional implications for the persons primarily responsible for fetching the water. In sub-Saharan Africa, one round trip to travel to a water source, collect water, and return home takes an average of 33 minutes in rural areas and 25 minutes in urban areas – and often, more than one trip per day is necessary to meet the needs of the household. This is time that could be spent on children’s educational attainment or leisure activities. In a WHO/UNICEF JMP analysis of 61 countries with available data, girls under 15 years of age were more than twice as likely as boys of the same age to be the person primarily responsible for water collection in households with water off premises.³
25. In the domain of information, the importance of mobile phone ownership for the empowerment of women and girls is recognized under Goal 5 of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. Mobile phone ownership provides individuals access to information, financial services, employment opportunities and social networks. Yet, existing evidence suggests a sizeable gender gap in phone ownership.⁴
26. In the domain of nutrition, a critical public health concern with major consequences for human health as well as socioeconomic development, anaemia affects both girls’ and boys’ abilities to learn but poses additional risks to pregnant adolescent girls and their children.
27. Table 1 below shows the dimensions, their indicators and the corresponding deprivation thresholds applied, which define severe deprivations.

³ UNSD. 2015. The World’s Women.

⁴ GSM Association. 2018. Connected Women: The Mobile Gender Gap Report 2018.

Table 1. Dimensions, indicators and deprivation thresholds used

Base multidimensional poverty measure	
Dimension	Thresholds for "severe deprivation"
Education (Individual level indicators)	Children (3-17 years) who have never been to school and/or who are not currently attending school.
Nutrition (Individual level indicators)	Children (under five) who are more than three standard deviations below the international reference population for stunting (height for age) and/or wasting (weight for height) and/or underweight (weight for age).
Health (Individual level indicators)	Children (under five) who did not receive immunization against any diseases and/or who did not receive treatment for recent illness (diarrhea, fever, cough, or difficulty breathing).
Water (Household level indicators)	Children using surface water as main source of drinking water, and/or where it takes 30 minutes or longer to collect water.
Sanitation (Household level indicators)	Children with no access to a toilet facility of any kind.
Shelter (Household level indicators)	Children living in a dwelling with 5 or more people per room and/or with no floor material.
Information (Household level indicators)	Children with no access to radio and/or TV.
Enhanced multidimensional poverty measure: it includes the previous dimensions plus the following indicators, respectively:	
Haiti and Guyana	
Anemia prevalence (under Nutrition dimension)	Children (aged 15-17 years) who suffer from severe, moderate, or mild anemia
Sierra Leone, Laos, and Haiti	
Water collection (under Water dimension)	(Sierra Leone and Laos) Children (randomly selected children, aged 5-17 years) who spent time on fetching water for the household use. (Haiti) Children (aged 5-14 years) who spent time on fetching water and/or collecting firewood for the household use.
Sierra Leone and Laos	
Mobile phone ownership (under Information dimension)	Children (aged 15-17 years) who do not own a mobile phone.

C. Multidimensional poverty measures

28. Overall, we follow the "counting approach" proposed by Atkinson (2003) and used by basically all estimates of multidimensional poverty. After identifying the deprived children in each of the dimensions (rights), we count the deprivations (unfulfilled rights) suffered by each of the children in our sample. This value is bounded between 0 and 7 (the number of dimensions used); it takes a value of 0 if a child does not suffer from deprivation in any of the dimensions considered in the analysis and a value of 7 if the child faces deprivation in all the seven dimensions. Then, we consider that a child is multidimensional poor if he/she suffers from deprivation in at least one dimension, in line with the Human Rights approach.

29. After the identification of the multidimensionally poor children, we compute two aggregate measures based on the information of these children. We estimate the multidimensional headcount ratio (the proportion of poor in the child population of the countries under study), which accounts for the incidence of multidimensional poverty. We also calculate the average number of deprivations suffered by the poor, which accounts for the intensity of multidimensional poverty.
30. To evaluate the gender gaps in the incidence and the intensity of multidimensional poverty, we use “the sex/poverty ratio” introduced by Mc Lanahan, Sørensen, and Watson (1989, p. 105), which is simply the ratio of the female children’s rate (either the headcount ratio or the average of deprivations) to the male children’s one, so it is a relative measure of the status of female children and male children.

V. Results

31. Tables 2 and 3 (see Annex 1) display the estimates of the incidence and the intensity of multidimensional poverty, respectively, among children from Sierra Leone, Laos, Haiti, and Guyana, by age groups and sex, as well as the gender differences in absolute and relative terms. The tables also include the corresponding confidence intervals at 95%, which were derived by the bootstrap percentile method using the bootstrap technique proposed by Efron (1981).
32. Considering the overall estimates, Tables 2 and 3 suggest that the sizes of the gender gaps in the incidence and the intensity of multidimensional child poverty in Sierra Leone, Laos, Haiti, and Guyana are not substantial. These are estimated to be lower than 3%, considering both the base measure and the enhanced measure. For example, in Sierra Leone, the overall child poverty rate (i.e. for all children) is 82.4 for boys and 81.6 for girls. However, as it can be seen in Table 2, this difference is not statistically different.
33. The results also reveal that the deprivations in the additional indicators incorporated into the enhanced measure affect more female children than male children, which can be seen by comparing the size and the direction of the estimated gender gaps of both measures. However, as we explain below, this result is modified when specific age cohorts are analyzed. As it was mentioned above, the inclusion of additional indicators affects mainly adolescent girls given this is the age during which gender discrimination starts to have a large impact.
34. It is worthy of note, then, that the results by age groups confirm the main hypothesis of the paper. The second half of Tables 2 and 3 show that multidimensional child poverty is (slightly) higher for girls than boys when the enhanced measure is applied, particularly among children aged between 15 and 17 years. Exempting the case of the gender difference in the intensity of multidimensional poverty among this age group in Haiti, when the base measure is improved by the incorporation of more individual-level information, we find that the size of the gender gap in the incidence and the intensity of multidimensional poverty is statistically significant. Adolescent girls are estimated to be at least by 3 percentage points poorer than adolescent boys.
35. Overall, the results offer empirical evidence in support of searching for a more disaggregated multidimensional poverty analysis among children. Introducing indicators at the individual child level allows for a more detailed understanding how girls and boys may experience multidimensional poverty differently.

36. Moreover, the results are not constant across all countries (vide the case of Haiti), suggesting that the observed differences are related to the differential experience of boys and girls and not, artificially, due to the construction of the measure or the choice of indicators.

A. Limitations

37. Due to the intersecting inequalities the most marginalized children face, disaggregating poverty measures by sex alone is arguably not sufficient for understanding how boys and girls experience poverty, differently. While this paper has advanced the literature by analysing gender-and-age-specific differences in child poverty, further gender analyses of child poverty should simultaneously stratify poverty estimates by the primary classification of sex and other key classification, such as location, ethnicity and migratory status. Indeed, preliminary analysis of 12 countries⁵ with available data finds that girls (aged 0-17) in rural areas are, on average, nearly twice as likely to be multidimensionally poor than boys of the same age in urban areas.
38. Another limitation is that the conceptualization and measurement of child poverty is circumscribed by material shortcomings. While this is very important, it does not, by definition, capture elements of a child's quality of life or well-being such as protection against violence, exercise of voice and participation, avoidance of child labour. It is likely that in these realms stronger gender differences are observed.

VI. Conclusion

39. The main conclusion of this paper is that it is possible to find estimates of child poverty where statistically significant differences between boys and girls are observed. However, as a second conclusion, it is not easy to find indicators that would allow to do this without tipping the scales against boys by construction (e.g. adding variables in which only girls are deprived, as in menstrual hygiene management or ante-natal care for pregnant adolescent girls).
40. Another possible explanation is that there are limits to how much gender difference can be "extracted" from the analysis of material deprivations. This should not be interpreted as a criticism of the work carried out so far measuring child poverty. It is a question of acknowledging the challenges and limitations and points to the possibilities for further work.
41. Finally, the challenges in finding indicators to undertake a gender-sensitive analysis of child poverty relates, in part, to the availability of data and information in standard surveys, pointing to important data gaps on the situations of girls and boys. If these surveys were to include anthropometric information for adolescents, for instance, there may be more observed differences in poverty estimates between boys and girls. Further efforts, globally, regionally and at the country level, are needed to collect sex-and-age-disaggregated data on key domains for girls and boys so that countries may better track progress toward ensuring that no child – girl or boy- is left behind in the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda.

⁵ The countries are Nigeria, Cameroon, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Vietnam, Thailand, Bangladesh, Nepal, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Algeria, and Kazakhstan.

VII. Annex: Tables 2 and 3

Table 2: The incidence of multidimensional child poverty (H%) by age groups and gender, as well as gender differences in absolute and relative terms. Confidence intervals at 95%. *Source:* Authors' estimates based on Sierra Leone-MICS6, Laos-MICS6, Haiti-DHS-VI, and Guyana-DHS-V

Country	Age group	Base measure							Enhanced measure								
		Male			Female			Gender difference		Male			Female			Gender difference	
		Lb	H	Ub	Lb	H	Ub	Abs.	Rel.	Lb	H	Ub	Lb	H	Ub	Abs.	Rel.
Sierra Leone	G1	87.3	88.2	89.1	87.2	88.1	89.0	-0.13*	1.00	87.4	88.3	89.1	87.2	88.1	89.0	-0.13*	1.00
	G2	79.7	80.5	81.3	78.4	79.3	80.1	-1.15*	0.99	83.7	84.5	85.2	83.0	83.8	84.6	-0.67*	0.99
	G3	74.7	76.4	78.1	74.0	75.7	77.5	-0.71*	0.99	86.7	88.2	89.6	93.4	94.5	95.4	6.30	1.07
	<i>Total</i>	<i>81.9</i>	<i>82.4</i>	<i>83.0</i>	<i>81.0</i>	<i>81.6</i>	<i>82.2</i>	<i>-0.84*</i>	<i>0.99</i>	<i>85.5</i>	<i>86.1</i>	<i>86.6</i>	<i>86.0</i>	<i>86.5</i>	<i>87.0</i>	<i>0.44*</i>	<i>1.01</i>
Laos	G1	91.9	92.6	93.3	93.3	93.8	94.4	1.21	1.01	92.0	92.7	93.3	93.3	93.9	94.4	1.20	1.01
	G2	90.3	90.8	91.3	90.1	90.6	91.1	-0.20*	1.00	90.6	91.1	91.6	90.3	90.9	91.4	-0.26*	1.00
	G3	88.0	88.9	89.9	91.1	91.9	92.7	2.98	1.03	89.5	90.3	91.2	92.3	93.1	93.9	2.78	1.03
	<i>Total</i>	<i>90.6</i>	<i>91.0</i>	<i>91.4</i>	<i>91.3</i>	<i>91.7</i>	<i>92.0</i>	<i>0.65*</i>	<i>1.01</i>	<i>91.1</i>	<i>91.4</i>	<i>91.8</i>	<i>91.7</i>	<i>92.0</i>	<i>92.3</i>	<i>0.57*</i>	<i>1.01</i>
Haiti	G1	94.3	95.1	95.8	94.2	95.1	96.0	0.02*	1.00	94.4	95.1	95.8	94.2	95.1	96.0	0.01*	1.00
	G2	87.9	88.7	89.5	86.4	87.3	88.1	-1.39*	0.98	93.1	93.7	94.4	92.1	92.7	93.4	-1.02*	0.99
	G3	85.3	86.6	87.9	80.3	81.8	83.5	-4.79	0.94	86.9	88.1	89.4	87.6	89.1	90.4	0.92*	1.01
	<i>Total</i>	<i>89.7</i>	<i>90.2</i>	<i>90.7</i>	<i>87.9</i>	<i>88.5</i>	<i>89.1</i>	<i>-1.67</i>	<i>0.98</i>	<i>92.8</i>	<i>93.2</i>	<i>93.7</i>	<i>92.2</i>	<i>92.7</i>	<i>93.2</i>	<i>-0.48*</i>	<i>0.99</i>
Guyana	G1	79.5	81.8	84.0	78.5	80.7	82.9	-1.12*	0.99	79.4	81.8	84.1	78.6	80.8	82.8	-1.05*	0.99
	G2	59.4	61.2	62.9	59.5	61.5	63.3	0.29*	1.00	59.1	61.1	63.0	59.3	61.4	63.4	0.23*	1.00
	G3	59.0	62.2	65.3	59.0	61.8	64.5	-0.37*	0.99	60.5	63.7	66.9	68.4	71.2	74.3	7.53	1.12
	<i>Total</i>	<i>65.1</i>	<i>66.4</i>	<i>67.7</i>	<i>65.0</i>	<i>66.3</i>	<i>67.6</i>	<i>-0.05*</i>	<i>1.00</i>	<i>65.2</i>	<i>66.6</i>	<i>68.0</i>	<i>66.4</i>	<i>67.8</i>	<i>69.1</i>	<i>1.19*</i>	<i>1.02</i>

Notes: Survey weights used; G1: Children aged 0-4 years; G2: children aged 5-14 years; G3: Children aged 15-17 years; the confidence intervals were computed using the bootstrap percentile method with 1,000 stratified bootstrap replications (Efron, 1981, p. 145); Lb: lower bound; Ub: upper bound. * As the corresponding confidence intervals at 95% overlap, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

Table 3: The intensity of multidimensional child poverty by age groups and gender, as well as gender differences in absolute and relative terms. Confidence intervals at 95%. *Source:* Authors' estimates based on Sierra Leone-MICS6, Laos-MICS6, Haiti-DHS-VI, and Guyana-DHS-V

Country	Age group	Base measure							Enhanced measure								
		Male			Female			Gender difference		Male			Female			Gender difference	
		Lb	Intensity	Ub	Lb	Intensity	Ub	Abs.	Rel.	Lb	Intensity	Ub	Lb	Intensity	Ub	Abs.	Rel.
Sierra Leone	G1	2.33	2.36	2.39	2.33	2.36	2.38	-0.01*	1.00	2.34	2.36	2.39	2.33	2.36	2.38	-0.01*	1.00
	G2	2.16	2.18	2.20	2.08	2.10	2.12	-0.08	0.96	2.25	2.27	2.29	2.18	2.20	2.22	-0.07	0.97
	G3	1.99	2.03	2.07	1.91	1.94	1.98	-0.09	0.96	2.19	2.23	2.26	2.27	2.31	2.34	0.08	1.04
	<i>Total</i>	<i>2.21</i>	<i>2.23</i>	<i>2.24</i>	<i>2.15</i>	<i>2.17</i>	<i>2.18</i>	<i>-0.06</i>	<i>0.97</i>	<i>2.28</i>	<i>2.30</i>	<i>2.31</i>	<i>2.25</i>	<i>2.26</i>	<i>2.28</i>	<i>-0.03</i>	<i>0.99</i>
Laos	G1	2.26	2.28	2.30	2.19	2.21	2.24	-0.07	0.97	2.25	2.28	2.30	2.19	2.21	2.23	-0.07	0.97
	G2	1.89	1.90	1.92	1.89	1.91	1.92	0.01*	1.00	1.95	1.97	1.99	1.99	2.00	2.02	0.03	1.02
	G3	1.92	1.94	1.97	1.97	1.99	2.02	0.05	1.02	2.00	2.02	2.05	2.09	2.12	2.14	0.09	1.05
	<i>Total</i>	<i>2.00</i>	<i>2.01</i>	<i>2.03</i>	<i>1.99</i>	<i>2.00</i>	<i>2.02</i>	<i>-0.01*</i>	<i>1.00</i>	<i>2.05</i>	<i>2.06</i>	<i>2.08</i>	<i>2.07</i>	<i>2.08</i>	<i>2.09</i>	<i>0.01*</i>	<i>1.01</i>
Haiti	G1	3.03	3.07	3.11	3.03	3.07	3.12	0.00*	1.00	3.03	3.07	3.11	3.03	3.07	3.12	0.00*	1.00
	G2	2.59	2.62	2.64	2.52	2.55	2.57	-0.07	0.97	2.86	2.88	2.91	2.79	2.82	2.84	-0.06	0.98
	G3	2.32	2.35	2.39	2.28	2.32	2.36	-0.03	0.99	2.42	2.46	2.50	2.50	2.54	2.59	0.09	1.04
	<i>Total</i>	<i>2.69</i>	<i>2.71</i>	<i>2.73</i>	<i>2.65</i>	<i>2.67</i>	<i>2.69</i>	<i>-0.04</i>	<i>0.98</i>	<i>2.85</i>	<i>2.87</i>	<i>2.89</i>	<i>2.82</i>	<i>2.84</i>	<i>2.86</i>	<i>-0.03*</i>	<i>0.99</i>
Guyana	G1	1.76	1.81	1.86	1.74	1.79	1.84	-0.02*	0.99	1.75	1.81	1.86	1.74	1.79	1.84	-0.02*	0.99
	G2	1.45	1.49	1.52	1.43	1.46	1.48	-0.03*	0.98	1.46	1.49	1.52	1.43	1.46	1.48	-0.03*	0.98
	G3	1.46	1.50	1.53	1.47	1.51	1.56	0.02*	1.01	1.50	1.54	1.58	1.62	1.67	1.72	0.14	1.09
	<i>Total</i>	<i>1.56</i>	<i>1.59</i>	<i>1.61</i>	<i>1.54</i>	<i>1.57</i>	<i>1.59</i>	<i>-0.02*</i>	<i>0.99</i>	<i>1.57</i>	<i>1.59</i>	<i>1.61</i>	<i>1.57</i>	<i>1.59</i>	<i>1.62</i>	<i>0.00*</i>	<i>1.00</i>

Notes: Survey weights used; G1: Children aged 0-4 years; G2: children aged 5-14 years; G3: Children aged 15-17 years; the confidence intervals were computed using the bootstrap percentile method with 1,000 stratified bootstrap replications (Efron, 1981, p. 145); Lb: lower bound; Ub: upper bound; the intensity of multidimensional child poverty is measured as the average of deprivations suffered by the multidimensionally poor children. * As the corresponding confidence intervals at 95% overlap, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.