

Analysing Multidimensional Poverty in Guinea:

A Fuzzy Set Approach

By

Fatoumata Lamarana Diallo,
*Cheikh Anta Diop University of Dakar (UCAD), Senegal
Consortium for Social and Economic Research (CRES),
Dakar, Senegal*

AERC Research Paper 251
African Economic Research Consortium, Nairobi
December 2012

1. Introduction

The Republic of Guinea has a population of 9.3 million, according to estimates from the year 2005, and an average density of 38.6 inhabitants per square kilometre. It is divided into four natural regions (the Low Guinea, the Middle Guinea, the High Guinea and the Forest Guinea) and eight administrative regions (Conakry, Labé, Boké, Kankan, Faranah, N'Zérékoré, Kindia and Mamou). The country is essentially agricultural and pastoral, with huge mining and energy potential that has not been harnessed.

Poverty has become a multidimensional phenomenon, which is unevenly spread among the socio-economic groups and the different regions in Guinea. In spite of some improvements noticed in recent years, various poverty indicators raise some concern. The Questionnaire of Basic Welfare Indicators (QBWI–QUIBB) research undertaken in 2002 on the welfare of the population revealed that 37.6% of households in Guinea believe that the state of the economy was worse in 2002 in comparison to 2001. The 2004 Human Development Index (HDI) of UNDP–PNUD ranked Guinea 160th among 177 countries.

In 2002, the Government of Guinea, with the support of the World Bank, developed a Poverty Reduction Strategy Document (PRSD–DSRP), which gave the main aspects to be considered in improving the welfare of the population. While these broad guidelines are diverse, the analysis of poverty is often based on a monetary approach. However, the monetary approach of analyzing poverty is not always enough to describe the multiple phenomena that can prevent a decent and peaceful life, because poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon. The limits of the one-dimensional approach have contributed to the development of multidimensional concepts of poverty. According to the capabilities approach of Sen (1985; 1987), the study of poverty should identify and analyze other attributes, not necessarily monetary, which directly impact individual welfare.

In other respects, the study on the poverty profile in Guinea, which was carried out during the analysis of data from the Full Survey on Living conditions of Households (FSLH–EIBC 1994/1995) was the first attempt towards thorough countrywide evaluation of poverty. All previous studies had been affected in one way or another by either lack of data or restriction to a given region, especially the capital city. The Full Base Survey on Poverty Assessment (FBSPA–EIBEP 2002–2003) was the second attempt after the FSLH in Guinea. Between 1994 and 2003, the incidence of poverty fell from 62.6% to 49.2%, but this result contrasts with the perception of households EIBEP (2002/2003).³

The FBSPA–EIBEP of 2002 reveals that 49.2% of the Guinean population is poor, while according to another survey part of the FBSPA, 93.2% of Guinean households

consider themselves poor. Therefore, there appears to be a significant difference between the level of poverty as measured in Guinea and the way it is perceived by the households. The impact of poverty as measured in Guinea is limited to the monetary dimension, while the causes raised by the households are far more complex. In fact, households consider lack of adequate means to feed oneself, lack of revenue, lack of jobs, lack of access to treatment, and housing problems as the indicators of poverty.⁴

To take into account the limits of the monetary approach and the perception of households about poverty, this paper will consider the phenomenon of poverty from a multidimensional point of view⁵. The measures of poverty would thus have to include both monetary and non-monetary dimensions for a better distinction of the poor.

The specific objectives are various. First, we determined a composite indicator of poverty in Guinea by identifying the variables (correlated) that contribute to the composite indicator. We then identified the socio-economic groups that are mostly affected, precisely those that are highly affected by poverty and contributing to a great extent to the overall poverty indicator. Finally, we measured the deprivations of households according to the main attributes defined: religion, the administrative and natural regions, and the genre to determine the most vulnerable groups or geographical zones. To do this, the contribution of each attribute to the poverty indicator of each group and the overall poverty indicator was defined. We followed the methodological programme of Dagum and Costa (2004), based on fuzzy sets, to achieve the objectives of the study.

2. Literature review

Two main measures of poverty exist in literature as follows: a theoretical approach (monetary or non-monetary), or empirical (axiomatic or non-axiomatic) (Ki et al., 2005; Ben Hassine, 2006; Bibi and El Lahga, 2006; Bourguignon and Chakravarty, 2003; Ambapour, 2006). This last approach identifies qualitative and quantitative measures of poverty.

Theoretical approaches to poverty

There are two main trends in the theoretical approaches to poverty: the monetary approach (utilitarian) and the non-monetary approach (non-utilitarian). The monetary approach, which is also called the one-dimensional approach, has been developed by Rowntree (1901) and Both (1969). This approach compares the concept of welfare with the notion of utility (Ravallion, 1994) which, once satisfied, can define the level of welfare. However, it is not always enough to render an account of multiple phenomena that can prevent any decent and peaceful life because poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon involving all the living conditions of households. The non-monetary approach considers welfare from the point of view of freedoms and fulfillments. This approach proposes and facilitates targeted politics. It prefers an assessment of the situation according to certain elementary faculties, such as the possibility of feeding or dressing oneself in an adequate way, and can only lend limited or even no attention to the information on the utility.

The non-utilitarian approaches are more diverse; there is the approach by basic needs (Rowntree, 1901) and the approach by capacities (Sen, 1985; 1987). The school of basic needs considers the things missing in the lives of the poor a small subset of goods and services, specifically identified and perceived as meeting the basic property of all human beings.⁶

The school of capacities considers poor a person who lacks the capacity to achieve a certain subset of functions. This approach indicates that if income is instrumentally important, other measures of welfare, such as nutritional status, are intrinsically important (Martinetti, 2000; Balamoune, 2004; and Ben Hassine, 2006).

Empirical approaches to multidimensional poverty measures

Measuring poverty still raises ethical problems (Bibi and El Lahga, 2006), and researchers are faced with a multitude of questions. Should a measure of poverty reflect the situation of poor people according to all attributes simultaneously, or must it

also take into account the deprivation of those who do not meet the minimum required for a single attribute?

How is the information relating to the many facets of individual deprivation aggregated to produce an overall measure of poverty? Should we build, as a first step, several one-dimensional measures then, secondly, put them together? Should we, instead, begin by measuring multidimensional deprivation at the individual level and then aggregate across all individuals? Could we consider the attributes that are included in the pursuit of poverty assessments as complementary or substitutable (Bibi, 2002; Bibi and El Lahga, 2006)?

The empirical literature has two main approaches to measuring multidimensional poverty. The first, described as axiomatic, is to measure, as a first step, the individual deprivation in terms of different attributes to build a composite indicator of poverty for each individual. The aggregation of these indicators across individuals provides a multidimensional index of poverty for the entire population (Bibi and El Lahga, 2006).

The second approach, described as non-axiomatic, is to measure the total deprivation of society in terms of each attribute separately and then aggregate the different indices for a one-dimensional index of multidimensional poverty.⁷ Although the ethical foundations of this second approach have not been explored, the indices obtained are not without axiomatic foundation.

The two approaches can be considered complementary ways of analyzing multidimensional poverty. (Bibi and El Lahga, 2006).

Poverty indicators based on an axiomatic approach

Bourguignon and Chakravarty (2002; 2003), Chakravarty et al. (1998), and Tsui (2002) are among the principal founders of this approach. In this approach, the process of aggregation is determined explicitly in terms of desirable properties (axioms) that the multidimensional measure of poverty must comply with.⁸

The multidimensional poverty indices of Bourguignon and Chakravarty (2002; 2003), Chakravarty et al. (1998) and Tsui (2002) are adapted to the multidimensional context of certain classes of poverty indices proposed in the context of one-dimensional poverty (Bibi and El Lahga, 2006). This is based on an axiomatic approach of the required properties of the composite index of poverty and a composite measure of poverty with reference to a poverty threshold for each primary indicator (Asselin, 2002). Chakravarty et al. (1998) use measures of poverty based on the union of the various attributes of poverty.

Poverty indicators from a non-axiomatic point of view

In this approach, we identify the non-axiomatic measures based on aggregate indicators of wellbeing (Human Poverty Index [HPI] developed by Anand and Sen, 1997 on behalf of UNDP; see also Dutta, I. et al., 2009) and those based on individual data, the most currently used in developing countries being the fuzzy sets and approaches of entropy and inertia (Ambapour, 2006).

Human Poverty Index

The Human Development Report published by UNDP (1997) argues that lack of income provides only a partial picture of the many factors that impact on the level of wellbeing of individuals (to have a long life and be healthy, well-fed, well-educated,

well-integrated into society, etc). UNDP proposes a new poverty measure that takes into account other indicators of wellbeing, including access to education, health, drinking water, lifespan, and child nutrition (Bibi and El Lahga, 2006). The Human Poverty Index (HPI) proposes an intermediate solution that is neither the union nor the intersection of different dimensions (Bibi and El Lahga, 2006).

The approach used in developing this index is not unfounded axiomatic because the index follows a number of axioms as principles of symmetry and concentration (Bibi and El Lahga, 2006). However, although the index makes it possible to synthesize several indicators of wellbeing into a single measure, the monetary dimension of poverty is not taken into account yet the monetary dimension is at least as important as the dimensions captured by the HPI (Bibi, 2002). For a measure of privation and standard living in a multidimensional framework based on aggregate data, see also Dutta, I. et al. (2009).

Composite indicators of entropy and inertia

In the case of the composite indicator of poverty among the methodological approaches of aggregation revealed by the literature, we have the approaches of entropy and inertia. The main limitations of this approach lie in the choice of parameters and weights used in the functional form of the composite indicator. If this approach is important because of the optimization criterion, the problem of determining the weight in a non-arbitrary way remains to be solved.

The approach of inertia is mainly based on multidimensional analysis techniques, also called factor analysis. A full description of these techniques is provided in Meulman (1992), Bry (1996) and Volle (1993). Among the major factor analysis techniques are the principal component analysis (PCA), the generalized canonical analysis (GCA), and multiple correspondence analysis (MCA).

The fuzzy set approach

The fuzzy approach of multidimensional poverty is based on the theory of fuzzy subsets for the construction of an index, including the different dimensions (attributes) of poverty (Cerioli and Zani, 1990; Cheli et al., 1994; Martinetti, 1994; Cheli and Lemmi, 1995; Miceli, 1998; Dagum, 2002). In this approach, the poverty of a person is identified by its degree of belonging to the fuzzy sets and, respectively, to each of the attributes of poverty (Costa, 2002). The degree of belonging is determined by the degree of possession of the attribute, which may take the value one, zero or values belonging to the interval $[0, 1]$. This approach allows us to identify the dominant dimensions of poverty, and provides the necessary elements for the development of socio-economic policies aimed at reducing this situation.

Cerioli and Zani (1990) proposed a first multidimensional approach based on the theory of fuzzy sets, which allows the elaboration of an index comprising the attributes of poverty. This method was further developed by Dagum (2002) in his "Program of Methodological Research". Dagum and Costa (2004) then introduced the one-dimensional indicators to measure the state of deprivation of each attribute for the whole population, which would help to measure the contribution of each dimension to

overall poverty. Mussard and Pi Alperin (2005) later proposed a synthetic decomposition that combined the role of groups of a population and the dimensions of poverty in the explanation of overall poverty.

Chakravarty (2006) made a careful analysis of the axioms that a fuzzy multidimensional poverty index must meet. He showed that the multidimensional poverty indices recently proposed by Chakravarty et al. (1998), Bourguignon and Chakravarty (2003) and Tsui (2002) could be reformulated in a fuzzy environment. Chakravarty (2006) also showed that fuzzy indices of multidimensional poverty derived from the decomposability into a sub-group that meets a number of axioms such as continuity, symmetry or anonymity, principle of population, monotonicity and, in some cases, the axioms of invariance of scale and the principles of transfer.

Fuzzy indices of poverty are in accordance with the decomposability by attribute, contrary to the indices of Tsui (2002). However, the two kinds of measurement are both based on the union of the different dimensions of poverty. The process of aggregation indices (Chakravarty et al., 1998; Bourguignon and Chakravarty, 2003; Tsui, 2002) requires the specification of a threshold for each dimension of poverty, but it is important to note that with the tests of stochastic dominance (Atkinson, 1987; Bourguignon and Chakravarty, 2002; Duclos et al., 2006), it is possible to make robust comparisons of multidimensional poverty that do not depend on arbitrary choices of poverty lines. Here, we adopt the methodology developed by Dagum and Costa (2004), supplemented with the decomposition methods of Mussard and Pi Alperin (2005), which is an alternative for measuring poverty in Guinea for the years 2002–2003.

3. Methodological approach

The theoretical base of the fuzzy sets

By summarizing the main concepts related to the multidimensional analysis of poverty based on the theory of fuzzy sets, and especially as per the work of Dagum and Costa (2004), we find that the method requires the definition of two concepts: i) economic entities or all households (a_i) in an economic area $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_1, \dots, a_n\}$; and (ii) a vector of order m of socio-economic attributes $X = \{X_1, \dots, X_j, \dots, X_m\}$, including economic, social, cultural or family attributes represented by qualitative or quantitative variables.

The choice of the set of socio-economic attributes compared with the state of poverty, for each gender and each area, will consist of a selection of socio-economic groups whose absence or partial ownership contributes to the state of poverty of households. For the choice of socio-economic attributes, we take into account the concern of households regarding their state of poverty; that is to say, we will include some dimensions that households name as the causes of their poverty (lack of income, housing problems, etc).

Let us call B a subset of A , such that each $a_i \in B$ provides a degree of deprivation in at least one of m attributes included in X . The function of belonging to the fuzzy subset B of the i -th household ($i = 1, \dots, n$) in comparison to the j -th attribute ($j = 1, \dots, m$) is defined by x_{ij} . The determination of x_{ij} is one of the main difficulties with this approach, and the weight associated with the different attributes.

For the determination of x_{ij} , several proposals were made in the literature, including those developed by Cerioli and Zani (1990), and by Cheli and Lemmi (1995). In this study, we use the proposal of Cheli and Lemmi (1995), which gives a more consistent consideration of the suitability of the complex nature of poverty and the measurement tool, namely the fuzzy sets (Fusco, 2005).

Cheli and Lemmi (1995) describe their approach as Totally Fuzzy and Relative (TFR). It is totally fuzzy because, unlike Cerioli and Zani (1990), it avoids the specification of lower and higher critical thresholds. It is completely relative because the degree of deprivation of each individual on a given attribute depends on its place in the distribution of the attribute, as opposed to the method of Cerioli and Zani, which determines a linear function of belonging. The determination of membership functions depends on whether the variables are dichotomous (possession or non-possession of lasting goods), categorical or ordinal (level of education) and continuous or quantitative (expenses).

In the case of dichotomous variables, such as the possession or non-possession of a good or the participation or non-participation in an activity, Cheli and Lemmi (1995) use the same principle as Cerioli and Zani (1990). We have $x_{ij} = 1$ for the modality, indicating

a disadvantage (non-possession, non-participation) and $x_{ij}=0$ for those indicating a lack of disadvantage (possession, participation).

Furthermore, regarding the quantitative and categorical variables for each attribute, these terms are arranged in ascending order of deprivation, where each is associated with a modality P_{ij} equivalent to its position in the rank. Thus, for an attribute with k terms, we will designate by $P_{ij}=1$ to the modality that has the lowest risk of poverty, $P_{ij}=2$ to the next, and so on until the modality that has the highest risk of poverty represented by $P_{ij}=k$. In fact, we associate to the modality of a variable that indicates the lower risk of poverty the corresponding lowest level of deprivation (P_{ij}). By naming P_j^q the $q = 1, 2, \dots, k$ modalities that P_j can take, we have the relation $P_j^q = q$; with P_j^1 the modality with the lowest risk of poverty. For categorical and quantitative variables, Cheli and Lemmi (1995) propose a membership function of the form:

$$x_{ij} = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad P_{ij} = P_j^1 \quad (1)$$

$$x_{ij}^q = x_{ij}^{q-1} + \frac{F_j(P_j^q) - F_j(P_j^{q-1})}{1 - F_j(P_j^1)} \quad \text{if} \quad P_{ij} = P_j^q$$

where

F_j is the cumulative distribution function of the attribute j .

P_{ij} the degree of deprivation of the individual i with respect to the attribute j ;

P_j^1 the modality with the lower risk of poverty,

P_j^q the modality with the highest risk of poverty if $q = k$, and

x_{ij}^{q-1} is the membership function related to the modality $q-1$. In that case:

$x_{ij} = 1$ if the i -th household does not have the j -th attribute;

$x_{ij} = 0$ if the i -th household has the j -th attribute;

$0 < x_{ij} < 1$, if the i -th household has the j -th attribute of an intensity comprised between 0 and 1. The membership function of the i -th household to the fuzzy subset B can be defined as the average weight of x_{ij} :

$$\mu_B = (a_i) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m x_{ij} w_j}{\sum_{j=1}^m w_j} \quad [\text{weighted}] \quad (2)$$

The equation $\mu_B(a_i)$ measures the ratio of poverty of the i -th household, where w_j is the weight linked to the j -th attribute, and where:

$$0 \leq \mu_B(a_i) \leq 1.$$

The behavior of the membership function is as follows:

$$\mu_B(a_i) = 0, \text{ if } a_i \text{ possesses the } m \text{ attributes;}$$

$$\mu_B(a_i) = 1, \text{ if } a_i \text{ is totally deprived of the } m \text{ attributes; and}$$

$0 < \mu_B(a_i) < 1$, if a_i is partially or totally deprived of some attributes but not completely missing all the attributes.

The weight w_j represents the intensity of deprivation linked to the attribute j . It is an inverse function of the degree of deprivation of this attribute for the population of households. The smaller the number of private households for the attribute j , the more the greater the weight w_j . Cerioli and Zani (1990) define a function of intensity of deprivation given by the following relation:

$$w_j = \log \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n g(a_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^m x_{ij} g(a_i)} \right] \quad [\text{weight for the attribute } j] \quad (3)$$

where $g(a_i)$ is the frequency (weight) associated with the observation of the a_i household of the population. The fuzzy poverty index of the set A is a weighted average of $\mu_B(a_i)$ which can be given by the relationship:

$$P_\alpha = \mu_A = \mu_B = \sum_{i=1}^n (\mu_B(a_i))^\alpha g(a_i) / \sum_{i=1}^n g(a_i) \quad [\text{poverty index}] \quad (4)$$

for alphas equal to 0, 1 and 2, where $g(a_i) / \sum_{i=1}^n g(a_i)$ is the relative frequency associated with the observation a_i of the sample. Equation 4 is equal to zero when all individuals are rich in all the attributes. Equation 4 is equal to 100 when, all individuals are denied for all the attributes.

As the index defined in (4) is not additively decomposable for alpha equal to 0 and 2, we assume that in what follows, alpha is equal to 1 in order to perform decompositions.

Parallel to the determination of the multidimensional poverty index of the i -th household and that of the overall population, the use of the fuzzy sets theory allows the calculation of a one-dimensional index for each of the considered j attributes:

$$\mu(X_j) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_{ij} g(a_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n g(a_i)}, j=1,2,\dots,m \quad [\text{Poverty in the attribute } j] \quad (5)$$

$\mu(X_j)$ defines the degree of deprivation of the j -th attribute for the population of n households. The overall fuzzy index of poverty can also be defined as a weighted average of a one-dimensional index for each attribute: the weighting is done for alpha equal to 1 in order to perform the decompositions.

$$P = \mu_A = \mu_B = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m \mu(X_j) w_j}{\sum_{j=1}^m w_j} \quad [\alpha \text{ equal to 1 for this relation}] \quad (6)$$

The analysis of the results in (5) enables to identification of the correlates of poverty and the intervening structures to reduce it. The decomposition methods that follow will give more precision on the state of social exclusion.

Decomposition of the multidimensional index of poverty

We used the methods of decomposition of the fuzzy index of multidimensional poverty that have been introduced and developed in the work of Mussard and Pi Alperin (2005). We have considered the problem of non-separability, which affects decomposition in the calculation of the contributions of groups, and attributes of the poverty index.

Decomposition by groups

Another way to assess the pattern of poverty is to decompose the population into groups (Mussard and Pi Alperin, 2005). By dividing the total economic surface into R groups, S_r , of size $n_r (r = 1, \dots, R)$, the intensity of poverty of the i -th household of S_r is given by:

$$\mu_B = (a_i^r) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^m x_{ij}^r w_j}{\sum_{j=1}^m w_j} \quad [\text{weighted } x_{ij}^r] \quad (7)$$

where x_{ij}^r is the function of belonging to the B fuzzy subset of the i -th household ($i=1, \dots, n$) of S_r in relation to the j -th attribute ($j=1, \dots, m$).

The multidimensional index of poverty associated with the group S_r is then defined as follows

$$\mu^r = \sum_{i=1}^{n_r} \mu_B(a_i^r) g(a_i^r) / \sum_{i=1}^{n_r} g(a_i^r), \quad [\text{weighted } \mu_B = (a_i^r) \text{ for } \alpha = 1] \quad (8)$$

The contribution of a group to total poverty is obtained by taking the difference between the overall poverty index in equation (4) for $\alpha = 1$ or in equation 6, and the poverty rate calculated when the terms of all attributes of this group of individuals are equal to 0:

$$C_r = P - P_r, \quad [\text{contribution of } r \text{ to the poverty index}] \quad (9)$$

where P_r is the poverty index calculated when we assume that the group S_r is poor in all attributes. This decomposition allows us to identify the most affected groups (regions, religion, gender, etc), and specifically the groups that contribute to an increase of the state of social exclusion.

Decomposition by attributes

Dagum and Costa (2004) introduced the decomposition by attribute by showing that it is possible to calculate the contribution of the j -th attribute to the overall poverty index. From the equations for the one-dimensional indices of poverty (5) and the weights associated with each attribute (3), the authors obtained the contribution (absolute) of the j -th attribute to the multidimensional poverty index. In this work, to take into account the problem of non-separability of calculating poverty through people we have calculated the contribution of an attribute to global poverty as the difference between the overall poverty index α given by Equation (4) for $\alpha = 1$ or (6), and the poverty rate calculated when we assume that people are not poor from the attribute:

$$C_j = P - P_j \quad [\text{contribution of } j \text{ to the poverty index}] \quad (10)$$

where P_j is the poverty index calculated when the terms of the attribute j is equal to 0 that is to say when people are not poor from the attribute j .

The unidimensional poverty index of the j -th attribute for the r -th group is given by the following equation:

$$\mu(X_j^r) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_r} x_{ij}^r g(a_i^r)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n_r} g(a_i^r)}. \quad (11)$$

To address the issue of non-separability of calculating poverty across individuals, the contribution of an attribute to the poverty of a group will be the difference between the poverty of the group given by Equation (8) and the poverty group recalculated if one assumes that group members are not poor in relation to that attribute.

The contribution (absolute) of the j -th attribute to the r -th group is:

$$C_j^r = \mu^r - \mu_j^r \quad [\text{contribution of } j \text{ to the poverty index of } r] \quad (12)$$

where μ_j^r is the poverty index calculated from the group when the terms of the attribute is null and μ^r is the poverty index of the group given by Equation (8).

Unlike the decomposition by group, this second type of decomposition allows decision-makers to obtain more information on the different dimensions of poverty, thereby allowing greater precision in the implementation of appropriate socio-economic policies in order to reduce the state of poverty. Here, we used the Equation (12) for the contribution of the j -th attribute of the group to the index of overall poverty. The simultaneous decomposition (Mussard and Pi Alperin, 2005) gives all combinations (attribute/group) that contribute to the poverty of the economic area. Ultimately, we find all the information necessary to reduce the intensity of poverty.

4. Empirical analysis of poverty characteristics in Guinea

In this section, we deal with the nature of data used, the choice of socio-economic attributes, and analysis of the results.

Data source and choice of socio-economic attributes

We used the methodology of Dagum and Costa (2004) while introducing a synthetic decomposition analysis that describes specific dimensions related to housing, level of instruction and annual expenses by households, and the groups – gender, regions, religion, place of residence – all of which contribute to an increase in overall poverty.

Data source

To achieve the objectives of the study, we used data from the full base survey on poverty assessment, which provides basic indicators of well-being. We had a representative sample of the population of 7,095 households.

The Full Base Survey on Poverty Assessment (FBSPA) is the second survey conducted in Guinea after the Full Budget-Consumption Survey (FBCS). Carried out over a period of 12 months (23 October 2002 to 22 October 2003) and on a national sample of 7,612 households,⁹ this survey is part of a planned series of studies related to the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It was conducted at the same time as the survey on the Questionnaire of Basic Welfare Indicators (QBWI) and covering the same sample. The objective of these surveys is to monitor the implementation of these initiatives and assess their impact on the living conditions of households and poverty.

The FBSPA is a survey aimed at depicting the level reached for all the indicators of living standards of households and poverty during the year 2002, which is considered the first implementation year of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS). The survey includes a questionnaire for households to collect detailed information on household composition, migration, education, health, employment, economic, agricultural and non-agricultural activities of the household members aged five and over, housing, transfers, income, social capital and the perceptions of households on poverty. It also includes a community questionnaire that addresses the availability and accessibility of basic services to the populations of the localities included in the sample. This survey, unlike the FBCS (1995), includes the administrative regions of the country.

Choice of socio-economic attributes

The choice of all socio-economic attributes, the most significant in determining the condition of poverty, is based on the literature on multidimensional poverty and the contents of the EIBEP database. Each attribute is chosen as an indicator of social exclusion and deprivation of every household.¹⁰ From the EIBEP questionnaire, we selected the following attributes:¹¹

1. Level of education (X_1)
2. Nature of the roof (X_2)
3. Materials for exterior walls (X_3)
4. Type of toilet (X_4)
5. Index of settlement (X_5)
6. Annual expenditure per household (X_6)
7. Type of housing (X_7)
8. Housing ownership (X_8)
9. Water supply (X_9)
10. Fuel for cooking (X_{10})
11. Lighting mode (X_{11})
12. Lasting goods (X_{12})

The base does not allow us to choose an attribute related to health. In fact, out of the over 7,095 households questioned about the time it takes to reach a health facility, only 4,000 responded. Table A12 in the appendix provides descriptive statistics on some attributes.

Therefore, we are giving the main results of the multidimensional method of measuring poverty, and those of the methods of decomposition.

Analysis of the results

Variable related to poverty

The index of multidimensional poverty in Guinea is 0.5448. In other words, 54.48% of households in Guinea are structurally poor. From the fuzzy one-dimensional indices of poverty, we have identified the dimensions that indicate the most important degree of deprivation of poor households. The major correlates of poverty in Guinea are fuel for cooking (83.59% of Guinean households are poor according to that attribute), the nature of the roof (81.39%), the level of education (80.38%), the lighting mode (77.86%), the materials of outer walls (76.48%), the lasting goods (75.92%), the type of toilet (72.86%) and the index of settlement (67.68%). When considering only dimensions such as fuel for cooking and nature of the roof, only two out of 10 people escape from poverty. This also applies to the level of education. Based on the lighting mode and settlement index, around seven persons out of 10 are considered poor.

These major correlates are followed by the attribute of type of housing (63.97%), water supply (63.05%) and the attribute of annual expenditure per household (54.09%), which indicate that more than half of the population is categorised as poor (Table 1).

The analysis in terms of relative contributions reveals that dimensions such as lasting goods (17.56%) and annual expenditure (10.52%) contribute a great extent to the overall poverty index. Indeed, the relative contribution is obtained by taking the ratio between absolute contribution (equation 10) and the sum of all absolute contributions, which is the index of overall poverty (0.5448). The absolute contribution of each attribute was calculated as the difference between the index of overall poverty and the poverty index obtained when the terms of this attribute are zero for all individuals. The removal order of attributes in the calculation of contributions is done according to their order of presentation in Table 1. The absolute contribution of attributes of durable goods and annual expenditure is higher compared to others. This is supported by the fact that the indices of poverty that one obtains after supposing that the households are not poor in comparison with these dimensions are weak.

In Table 1, the attribute housing ownership (X₈) shows the largest weight, $w_j = 29.62\%$. The number of private households deprived of this attribute is small (of 7,095 households, 5,054 are not deprived of this attribute). On applying the formula of equation (4) for alpha equal to 0, we get a poverty incidence of 100%. This means that no Guinean is rich in all the attributes. For alpha equals 2, we have an index of severity of poverty 0.3127. Table 1 is completed for alpha equals 1, which is to say that the intensity of poverty is 54.48%. Because of the diverse socio-economic behaviour of the sub-groups of the population, it can also be noticed that the influence of the attributes in determining the extent of poverty varies according to the selected group.

Table 1: One-dimensional Indexes of poverty, absolute and relative contributions and weight of attributes

| Attributes | $\mu(X_j)^*$ | absolute Contribution | relative Contribution | Weight of attributes $w_j/\text{total } w_j$ |
|--|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Level of Education (X ₁) | 0.8038 | 0.0303 | 5.56% | 3,77% |
| Nature of the Roof (X ₂) | 0.8139 | 0.0289 | 5.30% | 3,55% |
| Materials for exterior walls (X ₃) | 0.7648 | 0.0354 | 6.49% | 4,62% |
| Type of toilet (X ₄) | 0.7286 | 0.0398 | 7.30% | 5,46% |
| Index of settlement (X ₅) | 0.6768 | 0.0455 | 8.36% | 6,73% |
| Annual expenditure per household (X ₆) | 0.5409 | 0.0573 | 10.52% | 10,59% |
| Type of housing (X ₇) | 0.6397 | 0.0493 | 9.04% | 7,70% |
| Housing ownership (X ₈) | 0.1794 | 0.0531 | 9.75% | 29,62% |
| Water supply (X ₉) | 0.6305 | 0.0501 | 9.20% | 7,95% |
| Fuel for cooking (X ₁₀) | 0.8359 | 0.0258 | 4.74% | 3,09% |
| Lighting mode (X ₁₁) | 0.7786 | 0.0336 | 6.17% | 4,31% |
| Lasting goods (X ₁₂) | 0.7592 | 0.0957 | 17.56% | 12,60% |
| Total | 0.5448 | 0.5448 | 100% | 100% |

* $\mu(X_j)$ is the one-dimensional index of poverty as per the j attribute.

Source: Author's calculations

Though these results provide the information needed to identify the correlates of poverty, the decomposition methods provide more accuracy in determining the multidimensional phenomenon of overall poverty. As such, the most affected socio-economic groups will be identified.

Decomposition by groups

The decompositions have been carried out on the basis of the following groups: (i) religion of the household; (ii) administrative region; (iii) natural area; (iv) gender of household head; (v) place of residence; and (vi) the size of the household. Table 2 presents the multidimensional poverty indices for each group after decomposition, and the absolute and relative contributions for each group to global poverty.

By religion and regions

The regional dimension is essential for the development of policies against poverty. It is important to know the level of deprivation according to the attributes of regions, and their contribution to the overall poverty index. Regarding religion, it is important to know whether there are differences between sub-groups of religion, whether in terms of overall indices or in terms of deprivation compared to the attributes.

Regarding decomposition by religion, households whose heads are neither Muslims nor Christians are the most vulnerable, with 58.58% of them structurally poor. Households whose head is Muslim or Christian are, respectively, 54.08% and 55.40% poor. In terms of contribution, households whose head is Muslim contribute up to 83.69% of the overall poverty. This is explained by the fact that Muslims account for 84.3% of the total population. Table A6 in the Appendix shows that there is a significant difference between the three indices when compared two by two at a level of 5% significance. These differences are not due to variability of sample of sub-groups (see Table A6*).

In terms of administrative regions, the poorest (most vulnerable) regions are N'Zérékoré (57.97%), Faranah (57.45%) and Labé (57.11%), followed by the regions of Kankan (55.87%), Mamou (55.20%) and Kindia (54.55%). Table A7 in the Appendix shows that there is no significant difference between the indices of N'Zérékoré, Faranah and Labé. These three regions have the same level of poverty, with a 5% risk of being wrong. Kankan, Mamou and Kindia have the same level of poverty, but they are less poor than Labé, Faranah and Nzérékore. There is a significant difference between the poverty indices of the capital, Conakry, and Boké and those of all the other regions.

The region of Boké, after Conakry (46.64%), is the least poor, with 52.07% of its inhabitants poor, see Table 2. This is not surprising since in Guinea, among the administrative regions, Conakry exempted, Boké is the most urbanized, with nearly one out of four households living in urban centres. Because of its natural endowment in mineral resources, this region has large mining companies and many attractions, including the National Park of Badiar, and possesses large entryways into Conakry, Labé and countries bordering Guinea. In terms of school enrollment, the region has the highest gross enrollment rate for girls in the country.

With regard to access to drinking water, there are water supply systems in all the urban centres (except in one of the prefectures of the region: Gaoual) and wells have been drilled in rural areas. Boké records a significantly higher level of access to drinking water compared to other areas, apart from Conakry. In terms of electricity, there is an imbalance between the northern region (where the situation is precarious) and the southern region of Boké (where the situation is relatively good).

Table 2: Multidimensional poverty indices for each decomposition, absolute and relative contributions for $\alpha = 1$

| Decomposition | | Multidimensional Index of poverty as per the group $r : \mu^r$ | Absolute contribution | Relative contribution (%) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Religion | Muslim | 0.5408 | 0.4560 | 83.69 |
| | Christian | 0.5540 | 0.0534 | 9.81 |
| | Other | 0.5858 | 0.0354 | 6.50 |
| Administrative regions | Boké | 0.5207 | 0.0498 | 9.14 |
| | Conakry | 0.4664 | 0.0742 | 13.62 |
| | Faranah | 0.5745 | 0.0517 | 9.49 |
| | Kankan | 0.5587 | 0.0621 | 11.39 |
| | Kindia | 0.5455 | 0.0770 | 14.13 |
| | Labé | 0.5711 | 0.0685 | 12.56 |
| | Mamou | 0.5520 | 0.0508 | 9.33 |
| Natural regions | N'Zérékoré | 0.5797 | 0.1108 | 20.33 |
| | Conakry | 0.4664 | 0.0742 | 13.62 |
| | Lower Guinea | 0.5285 | 0.1069 | 19.63 |
| | Middle Guinea | 0.5647 | 0.1391 | 25.54 |
| | High Guinea | 0.5665 | 0.0969 | 17.79 |
| | Forest Guinea | 0.5772 | 0.1276 | 23.42 |
| Gender of the head of the household | Male | 0.5437 | 0.4456 | 81.79 |
| | Female | 0.5496 | 0.0992 | 18.21 |
| Place of residence | Conakry | 0.4664 | 0.0742 | 13.62 |
| | Other urban | 0.5017 | 0.0651 | 11.94 |
| | Rural | 0.5702 | 0.4055 | 74.44 |
| Size of the household | 1 person | 0.5250 | 0.0208 | 3.81 |
| | 2 persons | 0.5397 | 0.0362 | 6.64 |
| | 3 persons | 0.5612 | 0.0722 | 13.25 |
| | 4 persons | 0.5663 | 0.0647 | 11.88 |
| | 5 persons | 0.5395 | 0.3509 | 64.42 |

Source: Author's calculations

The situation in the region of N'Zérékoré can be explained by the fact that its high mining potential (iron, diamond) is largely under-exploited. In addition, access to drinking water and electricity is a persistent problem in the region. Here, wood is the most

commonly used cooking fuel. These realities are valid for most areas, except Conakry, but with varying intensities (DSRP, 2002). N'Zérékoré, Kindia and Conakry regions contribute most to global poverty (Table 2). The poverty multidimension of administrative regions is similar to that observed in monetary terms.¹² However, the region of Kankan is counted among the moderately poor regions in the multidimensional case, contrary to the monetary aspect where it is counted among the poorest.

Among the natural regions, the poorest region is the forest Guinea, where N'Zérékoré with 57.72% of poor is located, then Upper and Middle Guinea where Faranah, Kankan and Labé have, respectively, 57.45%, 55.87% and 57.11% of the poor. The less poor natural area is the special zone of Conakry (46.64%) followed by Lower Guinea, where Boké region is located, with 52.85% of the inhabitants poor. The poverty index of Boké is significantly different from that of Conakry and the other regions. The poverty index in Conakry is also significantly different from other indices. There is no significant difference between the indices of the regions of Middle and Upper Guinea (Table 2 for indices and Table A8 in the Appendix for differences).

The analysis in terms of contribution shows that regions of Middle and Upper Guinea contribute most to the national poverty index. A comparison with the results of the monetary approach shows the same trend, with an increase in poverty in the Forest Guinea region's multidimensional plan.

By gender, place of residence and size

The discrimination that may exist between men and women, and between rural and urban areas, led us to do a breakdown by gender and area of residence. Several studies have examined whether poverty increases with the size of the family.

The decomposition by gender shows that households headed by women have an index of 54.96%, while those headed by men have an index of 54.37%.

Referring to Table A9 in the Appendix, there is no significant difference between the two indices; therefore, women and men have the same level of poverty, with a 5% risk of being wrong. In monetary terms, households headed by women have a lower poverty rate than those headed by men.

With regard to contributions, households headed by men have a greater contribution to the state of poverty at 81.79% (Table 2).

The decomposition by area of residence such as Conakry, other urban centres and rural areas show that the rural area is the most poor with 57.02%. Table A10 in the Appendix shows that there is a significant difference between the index of rural areas and the other indices; therefore, poverty is a rural phenomenon in Guinea.

This is not surprising because of the striking disparities between urban and rural areas in terms of education, the possession of lasting goods, mode of lighting and fuel. Rural areas are responsible for the greatest contribution, 74%, to the country's poverty level. Thus, rural areas remain more affected than urban areas.

Based on the size of households, those with five or more persons have an index of 53.95% and households of four persons 56.63%, against 56.12% for those containing three persons and 53.97% for those with two persons. Households with one person have the lowest index, 52.50%. Table A11 in the Appendix shows that there is no significant

difference between the indices for households with two and one, one and five, and four and three persons. In monetary terms, poverty increases with household size, unlike the multidimensional plan.

Decomposition by attribute and group

Unlike the method of decomposition by group described earlier, the decomposition method we are presenting here will give us a greater indication of the deprivation of the different groups according to the dimensions of poverty. By considering the combination of groups and attributes, we can obtain the one-dimensional indices of poverty by attribute and group.

An analysis of the relative contributions of the one-dimensional indices of poverty in comparison to the different groups also provides a clear picture of the exclusion of each group with regard to the different attributes.

The values of the one-dimensional indices of poverty reflect the degree of deprivation of each attribute for the population of each group. We notice that the intensity of poverty is not the same in each population group and according to the selected dimension, because the values of the indices vary from one group to another. Thus, one can see that the variable consumption expenditure does not always reflect the state of poverty of the Guinean population. Dimensions such as the level of education (X_1), the nature of the roof (X_2), the materials of the exterior walls (X_3), the index of settlement (X_5), fuel for cooking (X_{10}), the mode of lighting (X_{11}), the supply of drinking water (X_9), and lasting goods (X_{12}) are dominant dimensions of the poverty phenomenon within the different groups.

Dimensions such as possession of lasting goods, nature of the roof, fuel for cooking, level of education, mode of lighting, materials of the walls, type of toilet and index of settlement are the main variables in relation to poverty within the Muslim group. However, for Christians, the main variables related to poverty are: lasting goods, fuel for cooking, materials of the walls, mode of lighting, type of toilet, nature of the roof, and drinking water supply. For the others who are neither Muslim nor Christian, the main correlates of poverty are the materials of the walls, fuel for cooking, lasting goods, type of toilet, mode of lighting, level of education, nature of the roof, and drinking water supply. The variables show that education is crucial for Muslims but not Christians, probably because Muslims emphasize the study of the Koran while Christians emphasize the study of the French language.

Table 3: One-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and religion

| Religion | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|----------|----------|
| | X_1 | X_2 | X_3 | X_4 | X_5 | X_6 | X_7 | X_8 | X_9 | X_{10} | X_{11} | X_{12} |
| Muslims | 0.8231 | 0.8268 | 0.7383 | 0.7124 | 0.6821 | 0.5323 | 0.6715 | 0.1786 | 0.6147 | 0.8227 | 0.7672 | 0.8610 |
| Christians | 0.6206 | 0.7279 | 0.8643 | 0.7751 | 0.6443 | 0.5279 | 0.4649 | 0.2212 | 0.6889 | 0.8647 | 0.8143 | 0.9108 |
| Others | 0.8266 | 0.7710 | 0.9756 | 0.8816 | 0.6544 | 0.6827 | 0.4747 | 0.1245 | 0.7568 | 0.9735 | 0.8807 | 0.9713 |

Source: Author's calculations. X_1 =Level of education, X_2 =Nature of the roof, X_3 =Materials for exterior walls, X_4 =Type of toilet, X_5 =Index of settlement, X_6 =Annuals expenditure, X_7 =Type of housing, X_8 =Housing ownership, X_9 =Water supply, X_{10} =Fuel for cooking, X_{11} =Mode of lighting, X_{12} =Lasting goods.

Table 4: One-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and administrative region

| Regions | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|----------|----------|
| | X_1 | X_2 | X_3 | X_4 | X_5 | X_6 | X_7 | X_8 | X_9 | X_{10} | X_{11} | X_{12} |
| Others | 0.8266 | 0.7710 | 0.9756 | 0.8816 | 0.6544 | 0.6827 | 0.4747 | 0.1245 | 0.7568 | 0.9735 | 0.8807 | 0.9713 |
| Boké | 0.8080 | 0.8132 | 0.7753 | 0.7592 | 0.6640 | 0.5039 | 0.6240 | 0.1235 | 0.6453 | 0.8846 | 0.7954 | 0.8573 |
| Conakry | 0.5638 | 0.6859 | 0.3184 | 0.3958 | 0.7723 | 0.1825 | 0.5489 | 0.5139 | 0.1844 | 0.3640 | 0.3646 | 0.6746 |
| Faranah | 0.8412 | 0.8984 | 0.9171 | 0.8184 | 0.6898 | 0.6597 | 0.7553 | 0.1053 | 0.6272 | 0.9118 | 0.8847 | 0.9254 |
| Kankan | 0.8967 | 0.9216 | 0.9030 | 0.6996 | 0.5978 | 0.6754 | 0.8068 | 0.0752 | 0.6407 | 0.9466 | 0.9043 | 0.9147 |
| Kindia | 0.8649 | 0.8129 | 0.8037 | 0.7694 | 0.6183 | 0.5141 | 0.6272 | 0.1393 | 0.7664 | 0.9209 | 0.7881 | 0.8867 |
| Labé | 0.8080 | 0.8132 | 0.7753 | 0.7592 | 0.6640 | 0.5039 | 0.6240 | 0.1235 | 0.6453 | 0.8846 | 0.7954 | 0.8573 |
| Mamou | 0.5638 | 0.6859 | 0.3184 | 0.3958 | 0.7723 | 0.1825 | 0.5489 | 0.5139 | 0.1844 | 0.3640 | 0.3646 | 0.6746 |
| N'Zérékoré | 0.8412 | 0.8984 | 0.9171 | 0.8184 | 0.6898 | 0.6597 | 0.7553 | 0.1053 | 0.6272 | 0.9118 | 0.8847 | 0.9254 |

Source: Author's calculations. X_1 =Level of education, X_2 =Nature of the roof, X_3 =Materials for exterior walls, X_4 =Type of toilet, X_5 =Index of settlement, X_6 =Annuals expenditure, X_7 =Type of housing, X_8 =Housing ownership, X_9 =Water supply, X_{10} =Fuel for cooking, X_{11} =Mode of lighting, X_{12} =Lasting goods.

On comparing the levels of deprivation, we notice that for the dimensions of the nature of the roof, types of toilet, index of settlement and type of housing, Muslims have the highest deprivation. The households whose head is neither Muslim nor Christian show the higher degree of deprivation with regard to dimensions such as level of education, materials of the walls, yearly expenses, drinking water supply, fuel for cooking, mode of lighting and lasting goods.

By analyzing the contributions from Table A1 of the Appendix, we notice that Muslim households make the largest contribution to the state of poverty, mainly in terms of type of housing (9.56%), settlement index (8.49%), level of education (5.73%) and nature of the roof (5.31%). We can conclude that these dimensions contribute to an increase in the state of exclusion within the Muslim group, and to the overall poverty index.

Regarding dimensions such as lasting goods (19.01%), materials of the walls (7.21%), housing ownership (11.83%) and type of toilet (7.64%), Christians have a greater contribution compared to Muslims. In view of the highest contributions, the dimensions of housing ownership, lasting goods, annual expenditure, and drinking water supply contribute to the growing of the state of exclusion of Christians, and also an increase of the overall poverty index.

Among the administrative regions, the dominant dimensions, or the main correlates of poverty, by region are:

- Boké:** fuel for cooking, lasting goods, nature of the roof, level of education, mode of lighting, materials of the walls, and type of toilet;
- Conakry:** index of settlement, possession of lasting goods, nature of the roof, type of housing, and housing ownership;
- Faranah:** lasting goods, materials of the walls, fuel for cooking, nature of the roof, mode of lighting, level of education, type of toilet and type of housing;
- Kankan:** fuel for cooking, nature of the roof, mode of lighting, materials of the walls, level of education, type of housing, type of toilet;
- Kindia:** fuel for cooking, lasting goods, level of education, nature of the roof, materials of the walls, mode of lighting, type of toilet, water supply;
- Labé:** fuel for cooking, lasting goods, level of education, mode of lighting, nature of the roof, type of roof, materials of the walls, water supply, type of housing, annual expenditure;
- Mamou:** fuel for cooking, level of education, lasting goods, mode of lighting, nature of roof, water supply, type of roof, materials of the walls; and
- N'Zérékoré:** lasting goods, materials of the walls, fuel for cooking, mode of lighting, type of toilet, level of education, nature of roof and water supply.

Apart from Conakry, dimensions such as water supply, mode of lighting, fuel for cooking, level of education, material of the walls and nature of roof are the main variables associated with poverty within the groups.

Compared to other regions, Conakry has the highest degree of deprivation in relation to the dimensions associated with housing (index of settlement, type of housing, and housing ownership). This result is not surprising, since Conakry is the capital city and the prices and rents of houses are expensive. N'Zérékoré has the highest indices as far as dimensions such as material of the walls and lasting goods are concerned. The degree of deprivation in terms of index of settlement, type of housing, level of education and water supply are higher in the region of Mamou. For the dimensions annual expenditure, fuel for cooking and type of toilet, the region of Labé has the highest degree of deprivation. Kankan region has the highest levels of deprivation in relation to dimensions such as nature of roof, mode of lighting and type of housing.

An analysis of contributions to the overall poverty index shows that the dimensions of lasting goods, annual expenditure, water supply and type of housing significantly increase the amount of overall poverty and the state of social exclusion in Labé. Dimensions such as housing ownership, index of settlement, and lasting goods greatly increase the state of social exclusion in the capital, Conakry, and thus contribute greatly to the overall poverty index. The mode of lighting also greatly increases the state of exclusion in the regions of N'Zérékoré and Kankan, while water supply is the highest contributor in the regions of Kindia, Labé, N'Zérékoré and Mamou (Table A2 in the Appendix).

Within the natural regions, the main characteristics of poverty, except in Conakry, are the level of education, material of the walls, nature of the roof, water supply, fuel for cooking, mode of lighting and lasting goods, which also vary from one region to another. In the capital city, Conakry, dimensions such as index of settlement, type of housing, nature of roof and lasting goods are the main characteristics of poverty, followed by type of housing and housing ownership, for which slightly more than half the population is not categorised as poor in the capital (see Table 5).

If we compare the degrees of deprivation in the regions according to the attributes, Conakry has the highest degree of deprivation with regard to dimensions such as index of settlement and housing ownership. Middle Guinea records the highest levels of deprivation in dimensions such as level of education, water supply, type of roof and fuel for cooking. High Guinea supersedes the other regions with regard to the dimensions of nature of the roof, mode of lighting, type of housing and annual expenditure per household. Forest Guinea records the highest indices for dimensions such as material of the walls and lasting goods.

In terms of contributions (Table A2 in the Appendix), lasting goods, annual expenditure, water supply, level of education and fuel for cooking contribute to a great extent to the state of social exclusion within the region of Middle Guinea. In High Guinea, the mode of lighting, annual expenditure per household, type of housing and nature of the roof are the dimensions of greatest concern compared to other regions.

With regard to gender (Table 6), the intensity of poverty is higher among women than among men. In fact, nine of the 12 attributes indicate that women have the higher index. The dimensions of level of education, possession of lasting goods, fuel for cooking, mode of lighting, nature of the roof and the material of the walls are the main characteristics of poverty that affect both male and female genders, but with greater intensity on women. As a result, women appear to be vulnerable regardless of the dimensions being considered.

Table 5: One-dimensional Indexes of poverty by attributes and natural region

| Regions | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|----------|----------|
| | X_1 | X_2 | X_3 | X_4 | X_5 | X_6 | X_7 | X_8 | X_9 | X_{10} | X_{11} | X_{12} |
| Conakry | 0.5638 | 0.6859 | 0.3184 | 0.3958 | 0.7723 | 0.1825 | 0.5489 | 0.5139 | 0.1844 | 0.3640 | 0.3646 | 0.6746 |
| Lower Guinea | 0.8361 | 0.7943 | 0.7750 | 0.7401 | 0.6297 | 0.4972 | 0.5933 | 0.1412 | 0.7220 | 0.8940 | 0.7720 | 0.8659 |
| Middle Guinea | 0.9077 | 0.8722 | 0.8018 | 0.8400 | 0.6873 | 0.6416 | 0.7297 | 0.0676 | 0.7632 | 0.9587 | 0.8791 | 0.9102 |
| High Guinea | 0.9013 | 0.9346 | 0.9104 | 0.7432 | 0.6366 | 0.6973 | 0.8229 | 0.0660 | 0.6449 | 0.9456 | 0.8988 | 0.9161 |
| Forest Guinea | 0.7558 | 0.7654 | 0.9230 | 0.8222 | 0.6707 | 0.6058 | 0.5055 | 0.1862 | 0.7086 | 0.9005 | 0.8777 | 0.9453 |

Source: Author's calculations. X_1 =level of education, X_2 =Nature of the roof, X_3 =Materials for exterior walls, X_4 =Type of toilet, X_5 =Index of settlement, X_6 =Annuals expenditure, X_7 =Type of housing, X_8 =Housing ownership, X_9 =Water supply, X_{10} =Fuel for cooking, X_{11} =Mode of lighting, X_{12} =Lasting goods.

Table 6: One-dimensional Indexes of poverty by attributes and gender of the household

| Gender | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|----------|----------|
| | X_1 | X_2 | X_3 | X_4 | X_5 | X_6 | X_7 | X_8 | X_9 | X_{10} | X_{11} | X_{12} |
| Men | 0.7795 | 0.8132 | 0.7639 | 0.7210 | 0.6908 | 0.5432 | 0.6396 | 0.1886 | 0.6260 | 0.8295 | 0.7730 | 0.8637 |
| Women | 0.9139 | 0.8169 | 0.7692 | 0.7633 | 0.6134 | 0.5308 | 0.6401 | 0.1379 | 0.6506 | 0.8649 | 0.8039 | 0.9125 |

Source: Author's calculations. X_1 =Level of education, X_2 =Nature of the roof, X_3 =Materials for exterior walls, X_4 =Type of toilet, X_5 =Index of settlement, X_6 =Annuals expenditure, X_7 =Type of housing, X_8 =Housing ownership, X_9 =Water supply, X_{10} =Fuel for cooking, X_{11} =Mode of lighting, X_{12} =Lasting goods.

The households headed by men have a higher degree of deprivation in terms of the dimensions of index of settlement, annual expenditure and housing ownership, whereas those headed by women indicate a higher deprivation in the other dimensions. In terms of contribution related to the dimensions of level of education, water supply, fuel for cooking, mode of lighting, nature of the roof, type of toilet and lasting goods, women have a state of exclusion higher than that of men. Thus, women make a greater contribution to the amount of overall poverty (see Table A3 in the Appendix) in these dimensions.

Regarding the place of residence, fuel for cooking, lasting goods, material of walls, mode of lighting, level of education, nature of the roof, type of toilet, water supply and type of housing are the main dimensions of the phenomenon of poverty in rural areas.

In urban areas, except Conakry, durable goods, nature of the roof, fuel for cooking, lighting mode, index of settlement, level of education and the materials for exterior walls are the dominant dimensions. In the capital, Conakry, one observes the same dimensions as in the natural and administrative regions. When we compare the areas of residence against the attributes, rural areas present the highest degree of deprivation for dimensions such as fuel for cooking, mode of lighting, material of the walls, level of instruction, nature of roof, type of toilet, water supply, type of housing, lasting goods and annual expenditure. In terms of contributions, dimensions such as level of education, nature of roof, type of toilet, water supply, fuel for cooking, mode of lighting, annual expenditure, materials for exterior walls and lasting goods contribute to the state of exclusion in rural areas, compared to Conakry and other urban areas (Table A4 in the Appendix).

The main correlates of poverty at the level of households with one person are possession of lasting goods (87.98%), nature of roof (77.26%), fuel for cooking (68.47%), type of toilet (66.42%), material of the walls (65.40%) and the mode of lighting (70.06%). We found similar correlates for households of different sizes (see Table 8), only that these dimensions are complemented by the index settlement and the supply of water for households with three persons or more.

A comparison of households according to their size in relation to the degree of deprivation for the different dimensions indicates that households with two persons show the highest index for the dimensions of level of education, type of housing, and lasting goods. Dimensions such as the nature of roof, material of the walls and index of settlement are typical to households with three, four and five persons, and which have the highest degree of deprivation. Households with five or more persons also show a higher degree of deprivation associated with dimensions such as annual expenditure and lighting mode.

An analysis in terms of relative contributions shows that the index of settlement, and annual expenditure per household contribute greatly to the state of exclusion of households consisting of five or more persons. For households with one person, it is the housing ownership, while for those with two persons, it is the level of education (Table A5 in the Appendix).

The pattern of distribution of poverty within the groups is not the same in terms of monetary and multidimensional poverty. In other words, the level of poverty varies from one group to another not only in monetary terms, but also in multidimensional terms.

Table 7: One-dimensional Indexes of poverty by attributes and Place of Residence

| Place of residence | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|----------|----------|
| | X_1 | X_2 | X_3 | X_4 | X_5 | X_6 | X_7 | X_8 | X_9 | X_{10} | X_{11} | X_{12} |
| Conakry | 0.5638 | 0.6859 | 0.3184 | 0.3958 | 0.7723 | 0.1825 | 0.5489 | 0.5139 | 0.1844 | 0.3640 | 0.3646 | 0.6746 |
| Other urban | 0.6561 | 0.7282 | 0.6009 | 0.5927 | 0.6785 | 0.3533 | 0.4970 | 0.3405 | 0.4534 | 0.7043 | 0.6810 | 0.7962 |
| Rural | 0.8844 | 0.8581 | 0.8946 | 0.8279 | 0.6551 | 0.6554 | 0.6860 | 0.0752 | 0.7625 | 0.9655 | 0.8890 | 0.9307 |

Source: Author's calculations. X_1 =Level of education, X_2 =Nature of the roof, X_3 =Materials for exterior walls, X_4 =Type of toilet, X_5 =Index of settlement, X_6 =Annuals expenditure, X_7 =Type of housing, X_8 =Housing ownership, X_9 =Water supply, X_{10} =Fuel for cooking, X_{11} =Mode of lighting, X_{12} =Lasting goods.

Table 8: One-dimensional Indexes of poverty by attributes and size of the household

| Size | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|----------|----------|
| | X_1 | X_2 | X_3 | X_4 | X_5 | X_6 | X_7 | X_8 | X_9 | X_{10} | X_{11} | X_{12} |
| 1 person | 0.6391 | 0.7726 | 0.6540 | 0.6642 | 0.2722 | 0.1101 | 0.6334 | 0.4659 | 0.5166 | 0.6847 | 0.7006 | 0.8798 |
| 2persons | 0.8584 | 0.8256 | 0.7671 | 0.7517 | 0.3284 | 0.3129 | 0.6836 | 0.2598 | 0.6193 | 0.8096 | 0.7956 | 0.9177 |
| 3persons | 0.8333 | 0.8295 | 0.7876 | 0.7655 | 0.6090 | 0.4135 | 0.6746 | 0.2360 | 0.6579 | 0.8587 | 0.7956 | 0.9073 |
| 4persons | 0.8110 | 0.8294 | 0.7988 | 0.7583 | 0.5815 | 0.4999 | 0.6756 | 0.2293 | 0.6457 | 0.8229 | 0.7934 | 0.9114 |
| 5persons | 0.8019 | 0.8225 | 0.7789 | 0.7482 | 0.7017 | 0.5481 | 0.6506 | 0.1893 | 0.6483 | 0.8526 | 0.7969 | 0.8924 |

Source: Author's calculations. X_1 =Level of education, X_2 =Nature of the roof, X_3 =Materials for exterior walls, X_4 =Type of toilet, X_5 =Index of settlement, X_6 =Annuals expenditure, X_7 =Type of housing, X_8 =Housing ownership, X_9 =Water supply, X_{10} =Fuel for cooking, X_{11} =Mode of lighting, X_{12} =Lasting goods.

5. Conclusion and implications for economic policy

The approach of Dagum and Costa (2004), supplemented with the decompositions introduced by Mussard and Pi Alperin (2005), allowed us to measure the poverty index for each attribute and for the total population. These indices enabled us to identify the main variables in relation to poverty, which helped us understand the state of deprivation of the different groups, namely regions, religion, place of residence and gender. More than half the population of Guinea is structurally poor. Of the different attributes selected, fuel for cooking, type of roof, level of education, mode of lighting, material of the wall, lasting goods, type of toilet and the index of settlement emerged as the key correlates of poverty. These dimensions are followed by drinking water supply, type of housing and annual expenditure per household.

The group decompositions show that households whose head is neither Muslim nor Christian are the most vulnerable. From the administrative region point of view, the most vulnerable regions are N'Zérékoré, Faranah, Labé, Kankan and Mamou, as Conakry and Boké appear to be the least poor. When we take a look at natural regions, Forest Guinea, High Guinea and Middle Guinea seem to be the poorest. The decomposition by place of residence shows that poverty is a rural phenomenon in Guinea. Based on gender, the intensity of poverty is slightly higher among households headed by women. However, there is no significant difference between the indices of households headed by women and those headed by men.

The decomposition with a combination of attributes and groups shows that dimensions such as level of education, nature of the roof, material of walls, index of settlement, fuel for cooking, mode of lighting, water supply and lasting goods are the dominant dimensions of poverty within different groups as a whole. In the capital, Conakry, it is dimensions such as index of settlement, type of housing and housing ownership that are of most concern. Middle Guinea has the greatest degree of deprivation in line with the dimensions of level of education, water supply and fuel for cooking. High Guinea ranks first compared to other regions for dimensions such as nature of the roof, type of toilet, and annual expenditure per household. Forest Guinea has the highest indices in the dimensions of material of walls, mode of lighting, and lasting goods.

The decomposition attributes and area of residence show that rural areas have the greatest degree of deprivation for dimensions such as fuel for cooking, mode of lighting, material of the walls, level of education, nature of the roof, water supply and annual expenditure per household.

Regarding gender, the degree of deprivation is relatively higher among households headed by women for most of the attributes compared to those headed by men.

Some policy implications aimed at reducing poverty in Guinea can be put forward, despite the fact that we must keep in mind that the results of this study provide necessary but not sufficient conditions for intervention.

First, to increase the standards of living of the people, policies should take into account the mode of lighting, fuel for cooking, quality of construction, drinking water supply and level of education mainly in the regions of Faranah, Kankan, N'Zérékoré, Labé, Kindia, Mamou and Boké. For the region of Conakry, it is necessary to introduce social policies on habitat, including the construction of Habitat for Moderate Rental (HLM). For the natural regions, policies for access to education and better housing conditions should be considered, especially for the regions of Middle, Forest and Upper Guinea, where improvement of the quality of buildings is paramount.

Secondly, regarding gender, literacy, access to drinking water and improved sources of lighting and cooking fuel are a priority for households headed by women. With regard to households headed by men, issues related to housing and financial resources need to be addressed through policy.

Measures aimed at raising the living standards of rural households while promoting better access to materials for exterior walls, potable water, electricity, durable goods, education, financial resources and better fuels for cooking could alleviate poverty in rural areas.

Finally, this work has provided static results. However, a dynamic study would better analyze the phenomenon of poverty in Guinea.

Notes

1. This paper has immensely benefited from the comments of Jean-Yves Duclos, Eric Thorbecke and Paolo Falco, members's of the Poverty Group A of AERC; and the participants at CSAE Conference 2010 on Economic Development in Africa. Gratitude is also extended to Mbaye Diene, Wladimir Raymond, Yaya Ky and Moussa Hamani Ounténi. The financial support of AERC is highly acknowledged. Part of this study was completed when I was visiting the United Nations University Maastricht Economic (and Social) Research (and Training) Centre on Innovation and Technology (UNU—MERIT). All viewpoints and any errors are, however, mine.
2. Correspondence: Fatoumata L. Diallo, CRES/UCAD B.P. 7988 Dakar Senegal. Email: faatdiallo@yahoo.fr
3. Since 2003, poverty has significantly worsened in Guinea PRSP-DSRP (2007).
4. See report FBSPA 2002-2003.
5. The collection of household poverty has been taken into account in the choice of socio-economic attributes. Among the selected attributes, we took the dimensions that households considered missing.
6. In the traditional approach of basic needs, basic amenities include: food, drinking water, sanitary facilities, housing, health services, basic education and a public transport service.
7. Pattanaik, P.K. (2009) shows that in the measure of poverty, the aggregatio must first be done through the variables.
8. For an explanation of the different axioms, see Bibi (2002) or Bibi and El Lahga (2006).
9. It should be noted that 7,095 households have responded to the questionnaire of the survey.
10. The household is defined as a group of people, related or not, who usually live together and share some or all of their resources to meet their basic needs such as food and housing. These people recognize the authority of a single person as the head of the household (FBSPA 2002-2003).
11. In the Appendix, we find the levels of belonging of each socio-economic attribute selected for the purpose of this analysis.
12. The results of the monetary approach come from the report of the EIBEP 2002-2003.

References

- Ambapour S. 2006. Pauvreté multidimensionnelle au Congo: une approche non monétaire, Document de Travail, Bureau d'Application des Méthodes Statistiques et Informatiques.
- Anand, S. and A. K. Sen. 1997. *Concepts of Human Development and Poverty: A Multidimensional Perspective*. Human Development Papers, Programme des Nations Unies pour le Développement (PNUD), New York.
- Asselin L. M. 2002. "Multidimensional poverty: Composite indicator of multidimensional poverty", Institut de Mathématique Gauss: Lévis, Québec.
- Atkinson, A. B. 1987. "On the measurement of poverty", *Econometrica*, Vol. 55 (4): 749-764.
- Baliamoune M.N. 2004. *On the Measurement of Human Welfare: Fuzzy Set Theory and Sen's Capability Approach*. Research Paper 2004/16, Helsinki: WIDER.
- Ben Hassine O. 2006. *Analyse de la pauvreté multidimensionnelle en France*, Université Lumière, Lyon2 version préliminaire.
- Bibi S. 2002. Mesurer la pauvreté dans une perspective multidimensionnelle: une revue de la littérature, FSEG de Tunis et CREFA-CIRPEE, Université Laval, Québec, Canada.
- Bibi S. and El Lahga A-R. 2006. Les mesures multidimensionnelles de la pauvreté: une application sur l'Afrique du Sud et l'Égypte, Cahier de recherche 06-39 CIRPEE.
- Both C. 1969. *Life and Labour of the People in London*, New York: A. M. Kelley.
- Bourguignon, F., Chakravarty, S.R. 2002. "Multidimensional poverty orderings". DELTA Working Paper 2002-22.
- Bourguignon, F., Chakravarty, S.R. 2003. "The measurement of multidimensional poverty", *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 1:25-49.
- Bry, X. 1996. "Analyses factorielles multiples", *Economica*, Paris.
- Ceriolii, A. and Zani, S. 1990. "A Fuzzy Approach to the measurement of Poverty" in Dagnon C and Zenga M (eds), *Income and Wealth Distribution, Inequality and Poverty, Studies in Contemporary Economics*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 272-284.
- Chakravarty S.R. 2006. "An axiomatic approach to multidimensional poverty measurement via fuzzy sets" in *Fuzzy set approach to multidimensional poverty measurement, Economics Studies in Inequality, Social Exclusion and Wellbeing*, Springer, US.
- Chakravarty S.R., Mukherjee D., Ranade R.R. 1998. "On the family of sub-group and factor decomposable measures of multidimensional poverty", *Research on Economic Inequality* 8: 175-194.
- Cheli B. and Lemmi A. 1995. "A totally fuzzy and relative approach to multidimensional analysis of poverty", *Economic Notes* 24 (1): 115-133.
- Cheli, B. Ghellini, G. Lemmi, A. and Pannuzu, N. 1994. "Measuring poverty in the countries in transition via TFR method: The case of Poland in 1990-1991", *Journal of the Polish Statistical Association, Statistics in Transition* 585-636.
- Costa M. 2002. "A multidimensional approach to the measurement of poverty", IRISS Working Paper No. 2002-05.

- Dagum C. 2002. "Analysis and measurement of poverty, univariate and multivariate approaches and their policy implications: A case study", Italy, University of Bologna.
- Dagum C. and Costa, M. 2004. "Analysis and measurement of poverty univariate and multivariate approaches and their policy implications: A case of study, Italy", In Dagum C. and Ferrari G. (eds), *Household Behaviour, Equivalence Scales, Welfare and Poverty*, Springer Verlag, Germany, 221-271 .
- Direction Nationale de la Statistique/ Ministère du Plan. 2002-2003. Enquête Intégrée de Base pour l'Évaluation de la Pauvreté, EIBEP Rapport Final.
- Direction Nationale de la Statistique/ Ministère du Plan. 1994-1995. Enquête Intégrale avec Module Budget Consommation, EIBC Rapport Final.
- Document de stratégie de Réduction de la pauvreté DSRP. 2002. Ministère de l'économie des finances et du plan république de Guinée
- Document de stratégie de Réduction de la pauvreté DSRP. 2007-2010. Ministère de l'économie des finances et du plan République de Guinée
- Duclos, J.-Y., D. Sahn, and S. D. Younger. 2006. "Robust multidimensional poverty comparisons", *Economic Journal* 116, no 514, 943-968.
- Dutta I., Foster J.E. and Mishra A. 2009. On measuring vulnerability to poverty." Mimeo.
- Escofier B. and Pages J. 1990. Analyses factorielles simples et multiples, objectifs méthodes et interprétation, DUNOD, 284 P.
- Fusco, A. 2005. "La contribution des analyses multidimensionnelles à la compréhension et à la mesure du concept de pauvreté; application empirique au PCM", Thèse de Doctorat ès Sciences Economiques, Université de Nice-Sophia Antipolis.
- Ki J.B., Faye B. and Faye S. 2005. "Pauvreté multidimensionnelle au Sénégal: approche non monétaire fondée sur les besoins de base", Rapport final, pr-pmma 044, Réseau PEP.
- Lelli, S. 2001. "Factor analysis vs fuzzy sets theories assessing the influence of different techniques on Sen's functioning approach", Centre for economic Studies, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Discussion Paper 01.21.
- Martinetti E.C. 1994. "A new approach to evaluation of well-being and poverty by fuzzy set theory", in *Giornale degli economisti e annali di economia* 7-9 pp367-388.
- Martinetti E.C. 2000. "A multidimensional assessment of well-being based on Sen's functioning approach", *Revista Internazionale di scienze sociali*, No. 2.
- Meulman, J. J. 1992. "The integration of multidimensional scaling and multivariate analysis with optimal transformations", *Psychometrika*, Vol. 57, No. 4, 539-565.
- Miceli D. 1998. "Measuring poverty using fuzzy sets", Discussion Paper No. 38, NATSEM, University of Canberra.
- Mussard S. and Pi Alperin M. N. 2005. Théorie des ensembles flous et décompositions multidimensionnelles de la pauvreté: le cas du Sénégal", GREDI Groupe de Recherche en Economie et Développement International, université de sherbrooke.
- Pattanaik P.K. 2009. *Essays on individual decision-making and social welfare*, Oxford University Press.
- Programme des Nations Unies pour le Développement PNUD. 2004. Human Development Report, Paris, Economica.
- Ravallion M. 1994. *Poverty Comparisons*, Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Rowntree B.S. 1901. *Poverty: A Study of Town Life*, London: MacMillan.
- Sen A.K. 1987. *The Standard of Living*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sen A.K. 1985. "Commodities and capabilities", Amsterdam North Holland.
- Tsui, K. 2002. "Multidimensional poverty indices", *Social Choice and Welfare*, Vol. 19, 69-93.
- Volle, M. 1993. "Analyse des données", *Econometrica*, Paris.

Appendix

Appendix A: Tables on the absolute and relative contributions of the attributes to the poverty indexes of the groups and to the overall poverty index.

Table 1.A: Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the One-dimensional Indexes of poverty by attributes and religion

| Religions | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | X ₁ | X ₂ | X ₃ | X ₄ | X ₅ | X ₆ | X ₇ | X ₈ | X ₉ | X ₁₀ | X ₁₁ | X ₁₂ |
| Muslims | 0.0310 | 0.0294 | 0.0341 | 0.0389 | 0.0459 | 0.0564 | 0.0517 | 0.0529 | 0.0489 | 0.0254 | 0.0331 | 0.0931 |
| | 5.73 | 5.43 | 6.31 | 7.19 | 8.49 | 10.43 | 9.56 | 9.78 | 9.04 | 4.70 | 6.12 | 17.22 |
| Christians | 0.0234 | 0.0258 | 0.0400 | 0.0423 | 0.0434 | 0.0559 | 0.0358 | 0.0655 | 0.0548 | 0.0267 | 0.0351 | 0.1053 |
| | 4.22 | 4.67 | 7.21 | 7.64 | 7.83 | 10.09 | 6.46 | 11.83 | 9.89 | 4.82 | 6.34 | 19.01 |
| Others | 0.0311 | 0.0274 | 0.0451 | 0.0481 | 0.0440 | 0.0723 | 0.0366 | 0.0369 | 0.0602 | 0.0301 | 0.0380 | 0.1161 |
| | 5.31 | 4.67 | 7.70 | 8.21 | 7.52 | 12.35 | 6.24 | 6.29 | 10.27 | 5.14 | 6.49 | 19.82 |

Source: Author's calculations. X₁=level of education, X₂=Nature of the roof, X₃=Materials for exterior walls, X₄=Type of toilet, X₅=Index of settlement, X₆=Annuals expenditure, X₇=Type of housing, X₈=Housing ownership, X₉=Water supply, X₁₀=Fuel for cooking, X₁₁=Mode of lighting, X₁₂=Lasting goods.

Table 2.A: Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the One-dimensional Indexes of poverty by attributes and administrative regions

| Regions | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | X ₁ | X ₂ | X ₃ | X ₄ | X ₅ | X ₆ | X ₇ | X ₈ | X ₉ | X ₁₀ | X ₁₁ | X ₁₂ |
| Boke | 0.0304 5.84 | 0.0289 5.55 | 0.0358 6.88 | 0.0414 7.96 | 0.0447 8.58 | 0.0534 10.25 | 0.0481 9.23 | 0.0366 7.03 | 0.0513 9.86 | 0.0273 5.25 | 0.0343 6.59 | 0.0885 16.99 |
| Conakry | 0.0212 4.55 | 0.0244 5.22 | 0.0147 3.16 | 0.0216 4.63 | 0.0520 11.14 | 0.0193 4.14 | 0.0423 9.06 | 0.1522 32.64 | 0.0147 3.14 | 0.0112 2.41 | 0.0157 3.37 | 0.0770 16.52 |
| Faranah | 0.0317 5.51 | 0.0319 5.55 | 0.0424 7.38 | 0.0447 7.78 | 0.0464 8.08 | 0.0699 12.16 | 0.0582 10.13 | 0.0312 5.43 | 0.0499 8.68 | 0.0282 4.91 | 0.0382 6.64 | 0.1019 17.75 |
| Kankan | 0.0338 6.04 | 0.0327 5.86 | 0.0417 7.47 | 0.0382 6.83 | 0.0402 7.20 | 0.0715 12.81 | 0.0621 11.12 | 0.0223 3.98 | 0.0510 9.12 | 0.0293 5.24 | 0.0390 6.98 | 0.0969 17.35 |
| Kindia | 0.0326 5.97 | 0.0289 5.29 | 0.0371 6.81 | 0.0420 7.70 | 0.0416 7.63 | 0.0545 9.98 | 0.0483 8.86 | 0.0413 7.56 | 0.0610 11.17 | 0.0285 5.22 | 0.0340 6.23 | 0.0958 17.57 |
| Labe | 0.0339 5.94 | 0.0312 5.46 | 0.0377 6.61 | 0.0474 8.30 | 0.0469 8.21 | 0.0748 13.09 | 0.0580 10.16 | 0.0155 2.71 | 0.0608 10.66 | 0.0297 5.20 | 0.0382 6.69 | 0.0969 16.97 |
| Mamou | 0.0349 6.33 | 0.0300 5.44 | 0.0346 6.27 | 0.0423 7.67 | 0.0457 8.28 | 0.0613 11.11 | 0.0513 9.29 | 0.0241 4.36 | 0.0627 11.35 | 0.0293 5.31 | 0.0372 6.73 | 0.0986 17.86 |
| N'Zerekore | 0.0288 4.96 | 0.0271 4.68 | 0.0428 7.38 | 0.0450 7.76 | 0.0453 7.82 | 0.0659 11.36 | 0.0383 6.60 | 0.0537 9.26 | 0.0580 10.01 | 0.0281 4.84 | 0.0379 6.53 | 0.1089 18.78 |

Source: Author's calculations. X₁=level of education, X₂=Nature of the roof, X₃=Materials for exterior walls, X₄=Type of toilet, X₅=Index of settlement, X₆=Annuals expenditure, X₇=Type of housing, X₈=Housing ownership, X₉=Water supply, X₁₀=Fuel for cooking, X₁₁=Mode of lighting, X₁₂=Lasting goods.

Table 3.A: Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the One-dimensional Indexes of poverty by attributes and natural regions

| Regions | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | X ₁ | X ₂ | X ₃ | X ₄ | X ₅ | X ₆ | X ₇ | X ₈ | X ₉ | X ₁₀ | X ₁₁ | X ₁₂ |
| Conakry | 0.0212 4.55 | 0.0244 5.22 | 0.0147 3.16 | 0.0216 4.63 | 0.0520 11.14 | 0.0193 4.14 | 0.0423 9.06 | 0.1522 32.64 | 0.0147 3.14 | 0.0112 2.41 | 0.0157 3.37 | 0.0770 16.52 |
| Lower Guinea | 0.0315 5.96 | 0.0282 5.34 | 0.0358 6.78 | 0.0404 7.64 | 0.0424 8.02 | 0.0527 9.97 | 0.0457 8.65 | 0.0418 7.91 | 0.0574 10.86 | 0.0276 5.23 | 0.0333 6.30 | 0.0917 17.35 |
| Middle Guinea | 0.0342 6.05 | 0.0310 5.48 | 0.0371 6.56 | 0.0458 8.12 | 0.0463 8.19 | 0.0680 12.04 | 0.0562 9.95 | 0.0200 3.54 | 0.0607 10.75 | 0.0296 5.25 | 0.0379 6.72 | 0.0980 17.35 |
| High Guinea | 0.0339 5.99 | 0.0332 5.86 | 0.0421 7.43 | 0.0406 7.16 | 0.0428 7.56 | 0.0739 13.04 | 0.0634 11.19 | 0.0195 3.45 | 0.0513 9.05 | 0.0292 5.16 | 0.0388 6.84 | 0.0978 17.27 |
| Forest Guinea | 0.0285 4.93 | 0.0272 4.71 | 0.0427 7.39 | 0.0449 7.77 | 0.0451 7.82 | 0.0642 11.12 | 0.0389 6.74 | 0.0551 9.55 | 0.0564 9.76 | 0.0278 4.82 | 0.0379 6.56 | 0.1086 18.81 |

Source: Author's calculations. X₁=level of education, X₂=Nature of the roof, X₃=Materials for exterior walls, X₄=Type of toilet, X₅=index of settlement, X₆=Annuals expenditure, X₇=Type of housing, X₈=Housing ownership, X₉=Water supply, X₁₀=Fuel for cooking, X₁₁=Mode of lighting, X₁₂=Lasting goods.

Table 4.A: Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the One-dimensional Indexes of poverty by attributes and by the gender of the head of the household

| Gender | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | X ₁ | X ₂ | X ₃ | X ₄ | X ₅ | X ₆ | X ₇ | X ₈ | X ₉ | X ₁₀ | X ₁₁ | X ₁₂ |
| Men | 0.0294 | 0.0289 | 0.0353 | 0.0394 | 0.0465 | 0.0575 | 0.0493 | 0.0559 | 0.0498 | 0.0256 | 0.0333 | 0.0929 |
| | 5.40 | 5.31 | 6.49 | 7.24 | 8.55 | 10.58 | 9.06 | 10.27 | 9.16 | 4.71 | 6.13 | 17.09 |
| Women | 0.0344 | 0.0290 | 0.0356 | 0.0417 | 0.0413 | 0.0562 | 0.0493 | 0.0408 | 0.0517 | 0.0267 | 0.0347 | 0.1082 |
| | 6.26 | 5.28 | 6.47 | 7.58 | 7.51 | 10.23 | 8.97 | 7.43 | 9.41 | 4.86 | 6.31 | 19.68 |

Source: Author's calculations. X₁=level of education, X₂=Nature of the roof, X₃=Materials for exterior walls, X₄=Type of toilet, X₅=Index of settlement, X₆=Annuaals expenditure, X₇=type of housing, X₈=Housing ownership, X₉=Water supply, X₁₀=Fuel for cooking, X₁₁=Mode of lighting, X₁₂=Lasting goods.

Table 5.A: Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the One-dimensional Indexes of poverty by attributes and by place of residence

| Place of residence | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | X ₁ | X ₂ | X ₃ | X ₄ | X ₅ | X ₆ | X ₇ | X ₈ | X ₉ | X ₁₀ | X ₁₁ | X ₁₂ |
| Conakry | 0.0212 | 0.0244 | 0.0147 | 0.0216 | 0.0520 | 0.0193 | 0.0423 | 0.1522 | 0.0147 | 0.0112 | 0.0157 | 0.0770 |
| | 4.55 | 5.22 | 3.16 | 4.63 | 11.14 | 4.14 | 9.06 | 32.64 | 3.14 | 2.41 | 3.37 | 16.52 |
| Other urbans | 0.0247 | 0.0259 | 0.0278 | 0.0324 | 0.0457 | 0.0374 | 0.0383 | 0.1009 | 0.0361 | 0.0218 | 0.0294 | 0.0816 |
| | 4.92 | 5.15 | 5.54 | 6.45 | 9.10 | 7.46 | 7.63 | 20.11 | 7.19 | 4.34 | 5.86 | 16.26 |
| Rural | 0.0333 | 0.0305 | 0.0414 | 0.0452 | 0.0441 | 0.0694 | 0.0528 | 0.0223 | 0.0606 | 0.0298 | 0.0384 | 0.1024 |
| | 5.84 | 5.34 | 7.25 | 7.92 | 7.73 | 12.17 | 9.27 | 3.91 | 10.64 | 5.23 | 6.73 | 17.96 |

Source: Author's calculations. X₁=Level of education, X₂=Nature of the roof, X₃=Materials for exterior walls, X₄=Type of toilet, X₅=Index of settlement, X₆=Annuaals expenditure, X₇=Type of housing, X₈=Housing ownership, X₉=Water supply, X₁₀=Fuel for cooking, X₁₁=Mode of lighting, X₁₂=Lasting goods.

Table 6.A: Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the One-dimensional Indexes of poverty by attributes and by the size of the household

| Size | Attributes | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | X ₁ | X ₂ | X ₃ | X ₄ | X ₅ | X ₆ | X ₇ | X ₈ | X ₉ | X ₁₀ | X ₁₁ | X ₁₂ |
| 1 person | 0,0241 | 0,0274 | 0,0302 | 0,0363 | 0,0183 | 0,0117 | 0,0488 | 0,1380 | 0,0411 | 0,0212 | 0,0302 | 0,0978 |
| | 4,58 | 5,23 | 5,76 | 6,91 | 3,49 | 2,22 | 9,29 | (26,28 | 7,83 | 4,03 | 5,76 | 18,63 |
| 2 persons | 0,0323 | 0,0293 | 0,0355 | 0,0410 | 0,0221 | 0,0331 | 0,0527 | 0,0769 | 0,0493 | 0,0250 | 0,0343 | 0,1081 |
| | 5,99 | 5,43 | 6,57 | 7,60 | 4,10 | 6,14 | 9,76 | 14,26 | 9,13 | 4,64 | 6,36 | 20,04 |
| 3 persons | 0,0314 | 0,0295 | 0,0364 | 0,0418 | 0,0410 | 0,0438 | 0,0520 | 0,0699 | 0,0523 | 0,0265 | 0,0343 | 0,1024 |
| | 5,59 | 5,25 | 6,49 | 7,44 | 7,30 | 7,80 | 9,26 | 12,45 | 9,32 | 4,73 | 6,12 | 18,24 |
| 4 persons | 0,0305 | 0,0295 | 0,0369 | 0,0414 | 0,0391 | 0,0530 | 0,0520 | 0,0679 | 0,0513 | 0,0254 | 0,0342 | 0,1049 |
| | 5,39 | 5,20 | 6,52 | 7,31 | 6,91 | 9,35 | 9,19 | 11,99 | 9,07 | 4,49 | 6,04 | 18,53 |
| 5 persons | 0,0302 | 0,0287 | 0,0352 | 0,0392 | 0,0516 | 0,0660 | 0,0479 | 0,0396 | 0,0501 | 0,0261 | 0,0335 | 0,0913 |
| | 5,59 | 5,33 | 6,52 | 7,26 | 9,57 | 12,23 | 8,88 | 7,35 | 9,29 | 4,84 | 6,20 | 16,93 |

Source: Author's calculations. X₁=Level of education, X₂=Nature of the roof, X₃=Materials for exterior walls, X₄=Type of toilet, X₅=Index of settlement, X₆=Annuals expenditure, X₇=Type of housing, X₈=Housing ownership, X₉=Water supply, X₁₀=Fuel for cooking, X₁₁=Mode of lighting, X₁₂=Lasting goods.

Test comparison of two means

Tests of difference between the indices in Table 2 were made from a test comparing the average of two independent samples. Indeed, when we take two samples for example Muslims and Christians, or the regions of Conakry and Boke, or men and women, we will have two samples of size n_1 of X_1 and n_2 of X_2 .

We note $m_{x_1}, m_{x_2}, \sigma_{x_1}, \sigma_{x_2}$ as the theoretical averages and standard deviations of X_1 and X_2 respectively and $\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2, S_x, S_y$ as their corresponding empirical characteristics.

As the sample sizes (n_i) are large, we have $\sqrt{n_i} \frac{\bar{X}_i - m_{x_i}}{\sigma_{x_i}} \approx N(0,1) \text{ } i=1,2$

We tested $H_0 : m_{x_1} = m_{x_2}$ versus $H_1 : m_{x_1} \neq m_{x_2}$

Under the assumption of equality of means, we have $\frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sigma_{x_1}^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sigma_{x_2}^2}{n_2}\right)}} \rightarrow N(0,1)$

Moreover, as $\sqrt{\frac{\frac{\sigma_{x_1}^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sigma_{x_2}^2}{n_2}}{\frac{S_{x_1}^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_{x_2}^2}{n_2}}} \rightarrow 1$, then $t_{obs} = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{S_{x_1}^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_{x_2}^2}{n_2}\right)}} \rightarrow t_{n_1+n_2-2}$

Decision rule : if $t_{obs} > t_{lu}$ at α , we reject H_0 .

By comparing the values of probabilities (p-value) the decision rule is as follows: if $p\text{-value} < \alpha$, we reject H_0 , therefore we conclude that there is a significant difference between the averages, in this instance the two indices.

The test was performed with STATA using the command "Lincom", which takes into account the weightings in the calculation of averages and standard deviations.

Table 7.A: Multidimensional indexes and test of difference for the group religion

| Religions | Indexes | Probability (P> t) | | |
|------------|---------|---------------------|------------|--------|
| | | Muslims | Christians | Others |
| Muslims | 0.5408 | - | 0.047 | 0.000 |
| Christians | 0.5540 | 0.047 | - | 0.001 |
| Others | 0.5858 | 0.000 | 0.001 | - |

Source: Author's calculations.

Tableau 7.A*: Test of difference taking into account standard errors

| Religions | Indexes | Standard Errors | Probabilité (P> t) | | |
|------------|---------|-----------------|---------------------|------------|--------|
| | | | Muslims | Christians | Others |
| Muslims | 0.5408 | 0.0018239 | - | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Christians | 0.5540 | 0.0064049 | 0.000 | - | 0.000 |
| Others | 0.5858 | 0.0070027 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - |

Source: Author's calculations.

Table 8.A: Multidimensional indexes and test of difference for the group administrative region

| Regions | Indexes | Probability (P> t) | | | | | | | |
|------------|---------|---------------------|---------|---------|--------|--------|-------|-------|------------|
| | | Boke | Conakry | Faranah | kankan | Kindia | Labe | Mamou | N'Zerekore |
| Boke | 0.5207 | - | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Conakry | 0.4664 | 0.000 | - | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Faranah | 0.5745 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - | 0.008 | 0.000 | 0.576 | 0.001 | 0.388 |
| Kankan | 0.5587 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.008 | - | 0.032 | 0.029 | 0.293 | 0.000 |
| Kindia | 0.5455 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.032 | - | 0.000 | 0.354 | 0.000 |
| Labe | 0.5711 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.576 | 0.029 | 0.000 | - | 0.004 | 0.135 |
| Mamou | 0.5520 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.293 | 0.354 | 0.004 | - | 0.000 |
| N'Zerekore | 0.5797 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.388 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.135 | 0.000 | - |

Source: Author's calculations.

Table 9.A: Multidimensional indexes and test of difference for the group natural region

| Natural regions | Indexes | Probability (P> t) | | | | |
|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| | | Conakry | Lower Guinea | Middle Guinea | High Guinea | Forest Guinea |
| Conakry | 0.4664 | - | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Lower Guinea | 0.5285 | 0.000 | - | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Middle Guinea | 0.5647 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - | 0.672 | 0.010 |
| High Guinea | 0.5665 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.672 | - | 0.026 |
| Forest Guinea | 0.5772 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.010 | 0.026 | - |

Source: Author's calculations.

Table10.A: Multidimensional indexes and test of difference for the group gender

| Gender | Indeces | Probability (P> t) | |
|--------|---------|---------------------|--------|
| | | Male | Female |
| Men | 0,5437 | - | 0.206 |
| Women | 0,5496 | 0.206 | - |

Source: Author's calculations.

Table 11.A: Multidimensional indexes and test of difference for the group place of de residence

| Place of residence | Indexes | Probability (P> t) | | |
|--------------------|---------|---------------------|--------------|-------|
| | | Conakry | Other urbain | Rural |
| Conakry | 0,4664 | - | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Other urban | 0,5017 | 0.000 | - | 0.000 |
| Rural | 0,5702 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - |

Source: Author's calculations.

Table 12.A: Multidimensional indexes and test of difference for the group size

| Group size | Indeces | Probability (P> t) | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|
| | | 1 person | 2 persons | 3 persons | 4 persons | 5 persons and more |
| 1 person | 0,5250 | - | 0.195 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.118 |
| 2 persons | 0,5397 | 0.195 | - | 0.017 | 0.002 | 0.979 |
| 3 persons | 0,5612 | 0.001 | 0.017 | - | 0.524 | 0.001 |
| 4 persons | 0,5663 | 0.000 | 0.002 | 0.524 | - | 0.000 |
| 5 persons and more | 0,5395 | 0.118 | 0.979 | 0.001 | 0.000 | - |

Source: Author's calculations.

Table 13.A : Descriptive statistics on some attributes

| Attributes | Modalities | Percentage (%) | Attributes | Modalities | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Educational level | Without education | 70,44 | Type of housing | | |
| | Personal house | 37,62 | | | |
| | Primary | 9,02 | | | |
| | High school | 9,85 | | Flat | 20,28 |
| | Vocational | 4,99 | | Room/apartment | 4,76 |
| | University | 5,69 | | Hut | 22,55 |
| Indexe of settlement | Under-populated | 5,69 | | Hut and house | 6,07 |
| | Normal | 38,87 | | Several houses | 8,71 |
| | Over-populated | 55,43 | | | |
| Housing ownership | Owner | 71,23 | Mode of lighting | Oil lamp | 59,32 |
| | Tenant | 19,10 | | Gas lamp | 0,61 |
| | Free housing | 7,84 | | Electricity | 26,74 |
| | Office housing | 1,83 | | from sogel | |
| | | | | Power generator | 0,79 |
| | | | | Firewood/candle/ others | 12,54 |
| Drinking Water supply | Water tap in-house | 12,35 | Fuel for cooking | Wood | 69,63 |
| | Public water tap | 8,26 | | Charcoal | 29,01 |
| | Neighbour's water tap | 14,15 | | kerosene | 0,44 |
| | Drilling | 25,86 | | Gas | 0,16 |
| | Developed source | 7,19 | | Electricity | 0,78 |
| | Natural source | 32,19 | | | |

Source: Author's calculations.

Appendix B: Functions of belonging for the socio-economic attributes selected

Education level

| Modalities | | Function of belonging | |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------|--------|
| | | Fj | Xij |
| 1-University | 1 | 0.0569 | 0 |
| 2-Vocational | 2 | 0.1068 | 0.0529 |
| 3-High school | 3 | 0.2054 | 0.1574 |
| 4-Primary | 4 | 0.2956 | 0.2530 |
| 5-Without education | 5 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Author's calculations.

Nature of the roof

| Modalities | | Function of belonging | |
|-------------------|---|-----------------------|--------|
| | | Fj | Xij |
| 1-Concrete/cement | 1 | 0.0079 | 0 |
| 2-Slates/tiles | 2 | 0.0124 | 0.0057 |
| 3-Iron sheet | 3 | 0.7044 | 0.7021 |
| 4-Thatch/straw | 4 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Author's calculations.

Material of external walls

| Modalities | | Function of belonging | |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|--------|
| | | Fj | Xij |
| Stone bricks | 1 | 0.0021 | 0 |
| Cement bricks | 2 | 0.2781 | 0.2766 |
| Steady clay bricks | 3 | 0.4342 | 0.4331 |
| Baked bricks | 4 | 0.4654 | 0.4643 |
| Clay/clay brick | 5 | 0.9903 | 0.9903 |
| Bamboo/Wood | 6 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Author's calculations.

Type of toilet

| Modalities | | Function of belonging | |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------|
| | | Fj | Xij |
| Ventilated and improved Latrines | 1 | 0.0066 | 0 |
| Flush | 2 | 0.0400 | 0.0336 |
| Bowl/bucket | 3 | 0.0468 | 0.0404 |
| Covered latrines | 4 | 0.3346 | 0.3302 |
| Non covered latrines | 5 | 0.8004 | 0.7991 |
| None | 6 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Author's calculations.

Index of settlement

| Modalities | Function of belonging | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | Fj | Xij |
| Under populated | 1 | 0.0569 | 0 |
| Normal | 2 | 0.4457 | 0.4122 |
| Over populated | 3 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Author's calculations.

Annual expenditures by household

| Modalities | Function of belonging | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | Fj | Xij |
| 5th Quintile | 1 | 0.2000 | 0 |
| 4th Quintile | 2 | 0.4000 | 0.2500 |
| 3rd Quintile | 3 | 0.6000 | 0.5000 |
| 2nd Quintile | 4 | 0.8000 | 0.7500 |
| 1st Quintile | 5 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Author's calculations.

Type of housing

| Modalities | Function of belonging | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | Fj | Xij |
| Several houses | 1 | 0.0871 | 0 |
| Personal house | 2 | 0.4633 | 0.4121 |
| Flat | 3 | 0.6661 | 0.6342 |
| Room/apartment | 4 | 0.7137 | 0.6864 |
| Hut and house | 5 | 0.7745 | 0.7530 |
| Hut/other | 6 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Author's calculations.

Housing ownership

| Modalities | Function of belonging | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | Fj | Xij |
| Owner | 1 | 0.7123 | 0 |
| Office housing | 2 | 0.7307 | 0.0637 |
| Tenant | 3 | 0.9216 | 0.7276 |
| Free housing/other | 4 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Author's calculations.

Mode of lighting

| Modalities | Function of belonging | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| | | Fj | Xij |
| 1-Power generator | 1 | 0.0079 | 0 |
| 2- Gas lamp | 2 | 0.0140 | 0.0061 |
| 3- Electricity from Sogel | 3 | 0.2813 | 0.2756 |
| 4-Oil lamp | 4 | 0.8746 | 0.8736 |
| 5-Fire wood / candle / other | 5 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Author's calculations.

Possession of lasting goods

| Modalities | Function of belonging | X_{ij} |
|--------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Refrigerator | yes | 0 |
| | No | 1 |
| Car | Yes | 0 |
| | No | 1 |
| Television | Yes | 0 |
| | No | 1 |
| Radio | Yes | 0 |
| | No | 1 |
| Iron | Yes | 0 |
| | No | 1 |

Source: Author's calculations.

Drinking water supply

| Modalities | | Function of belonging | |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------|
| | | Fj | Xij |
| 1-Water tap in-house | 1 | 0.1235 | 0 |
| 2-Public water tap | 2 | 0.2061 | 0.0942 |
| 3-Neighbour's water tap | 3 | 0.3476 | 0.2557 |
| 4-Drilling | 4 | 0.6062 | 0.5507 |
| 5-Developed source | 4 | 0.6781 | 0.6327 |
| 6-Natural source/other | | 1 | 1 |

Source: calculation of the writer.

Fuel for cooking

| Modalities | | Function of belonging | |
|---------------|---|-----------------------|--------|
| | | Fj | Xij |
| 1-Gas | 1 | 0.0016 | 0 |
| 2-Electricity | 2 | 0.0093 | 0.0078 |
| 3-Kerosene | 3 | 0.0137 | 0.0121 |
| 4-Charcoal | 4 | 0.3037 | 0.3027 |
| 5-Wood /other | 4 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Author's calculations.

Other recent publications in the AERC Research Papers Series:

- Food Security and Child Nutrition Status among Urban Poor Households in Uganda: Implications for Poverty Alleviation*, by Sarah Nakabo-Sswanyana, Research Paper 130.
- Tax Reforms and Revenue Mobilization in Kenya*, by Moses Kinyanjui Muriithi and Eliud Dismas Moyi, Research Paper 131.
- Wage Determination and the Gender Wage Gap in Kenya: Any Evidence of Gender Discrimination?* by Jane Kabubo-Mariara, Research Paper 132.
- Trade Reform and Efficiency in Cameroon's Manufacturing Industries*, by Ousmanou Njikam, Research Paper 133.
- Efficiency of Microenterprises in the Nigerian Economy*, by Igbekele A. Ajibefun and Adebisi G. Daramola, Research Paper 134.
- The Impact of Foreign Aid on Public Expenditure: The Case of Kenya*, by James Njeru, Research Paper 135.
- The Effects of Trade Liberalization on Productive Efficiency: Electrical Industry in Cameroon*, by Ousmanou Njikam, Research Paper 136.
- How Tied Aid Affects the Cost of Aid-Funded Projects in Ghana*, by Barfour Osei, Research Paper 137.
- Exchange Rate Regimes and Inflation in Tanzania*, by Longinus Rutasitara, Research Paper 138.
- Private Returns to Higher Education in Nigeria*, by O.B.Okuwa, Research Paper 139.
- Uganda's Equilibrium Real Exchange Rate and Its Implications for Non-Traditional Export Performance*, by Michael Atingi-Ego and Rachel Kaggwa Sebudde, Research Paper 140.
- Dynamic Inter-Links among the Exchange Rate, Price Level and Terms of Trade in a Managed Floating Exchange Rate System: The Case of Ghana*, by Vijay K. Bhasin, Research Paper 141.
- Financial Deepening, Economic Growth and Development: Evidence from Selected Sub-Saharan African Countries*, by John E. Udo Ndebbio, Research Paper 142.
- The Determinants of Inflation in South Africa: An Econometric Analysis*, by Oludele A. Akinboade, Franz K. Siebrits and Elizabeth W. Niedermeier, Research Paper 143.
- The Cost of Aid Tying to Ghana*, by Barfour Osei, Research Paper 144.
- A Positive and Normative Analysis of Bank Supervision in Nigeria*, by A. Soyibo, S.O. Alashi and M.K. Ahmad, Research Paper 145.
- The Determinants of the Real Exchange Rate in Zambia*, by Kombe O. Mungule, Research Paper 146.
- An Evaluation of the Viability of a Single Monetary Zone in ECOWAS*, by Olawale Ogunkola, Research Paper 147.
- Analysis of the Cost of Infrastructure Failures in a Developing Economy: The Case of Electricity Sector in Nigeria*, by Adeola Adenikinju, Research Paper 148.
- Corporate Governance Mechanisms and Firm Financial Performance in Nigeria*, by Ahmadu Sanda, Aminu S. Mikailu and Tukur Garba, Research Paper 149.
- Female Labour Force Participation in Ghana: The Effects of Education*, by Harry A. Sackey, Research Paper 150.
- The Integration of Nigeria's Rural and Urban Foodstuffs Market*, by Rosemary Okoh and P.C. Egbon, Research Paper 151.
- Determinants of Technical Efficiency Differentials amongst Small- and Medium-Scale Farmers in Uganda: A Case of Tobacco Growers*, by Marios Obwona, Research Paper 152.
- Land Conservation in Kenya: The Role of Property Rights*, by Jane Kabubo-Mariara, Research Paper 153.
- Technical Efficiency Differentials in Rice Production Technologies in Nigeria*, by Olorunfemi Ogundele, and Victor Okoruwa, Research Paper 154.
- The Determinants of Health Care Demand in Uganda: The Case Study of Lira District, Northern Uganda*, by Jonathan Odwee, Francis Okurut and Asaf Adebua, Research Paper 155.
- Incidence and Determinants of Child Labour in Nigeria: Implications for Poverty Alleviation*, by Benjamin C. Okpukpara and Ngozi Odurukwe, Research Paper 156.
- Female Participation in the Labour Market: The Case of the Informal Sector in Kenya*, by Rosemary Atieno, Research Paper 157.
- The Impact of Migrant Remittances on Household Welfare in Ghana*, by Peter Quartey, Research Paper 158.
- Food Production in Zambia: The Impact of Selected Structural Adjustments Policies*, by Muacinga C.H. Simatele, Research Paper 159.
- Poverty, Inequality and Welfare Effects of Trade Liberalization in Côte d'Ivoire: A Computable General Equilibrium Model Analysis*, by Bédia F. Aka, Research Paper 160.

- The Distribution of Expenditure Tax Burden before and after Tax Reform: The Case of Cameroon*, by Tabi Atemnkeng Johannes, Atabongawung Joseph Nju and Afeani Azia Theresia, Research Paper 161.
- Macroeconomic and Distributional Consequences of Energy Supply Shocks in Nigeria*, by Adeola F. Adenikinju and Niyi Falobi, Research Paper 162.
- Analysis of Factors Affecting the Technical Efficiency of Arabica Coffee Producers in Cameroon*, by Amadou Nchare, Research Paper 163.
- Fiscal Policy and Poverty Alleviation: Some Policy Options for Nigeria*, by Benneth O. Obi, Research Paper 164.
- FDI and Economic Growth: Evidence from Nigeria*, by Adeolu B. Ayanwale, Research Paper 165.
- An Econometric Analysis of Capital Flight from Nigeria: A Portfolio Approach*, by Akanni Lawanson, Research Paper 166.
- Extent and Determinants of Child Labour in Uganda*, by Tom Mwebaze, Research Paper 167.
- Oil Wealth and Economic Growth in Oil Exporting African Countries*, by Olomola Philip Akanni, Research Paper 168.
- Implications of Rainfall Shocks for Household Income and Consumption in Uganda*, by John Bosco Asimwe, Research Paper 169.
- Relative Price Variability and Inflation: Evidence from the Agricultural Sector in Nigeria*, by Obasi O. Ukoha, Research Paper 170.
- A Modelling of Ghana's Inflation: 1960–20031*, by Mathew Kofi Ocran, Research Paper 171.
- The Determinants of School and Attainment in Ghana: A Gender Perspective*, by Harry A. Sackey, Research Paper 172.
- Private Returns to Education in Ghana: Implications for Investments in Schooling and Migration*, by Harry A. Sackey, Research Paper 173.
- Oil Wealth and Economic Growth in Oil Exporting African Countries*, by Olomola Philip Akanni, Research Paper 174.
- Private Investment Behaviour and Trade Policy Practice in Nigeria*, by Dipo T. Busari and Phillip C. Omoke, Research Paper 175.
- Determinants of the Capital Structure of Ghanaian Firms*, by Jochua Abor, Research Paper 176.
- Privatization and Enterprise Performance in Nigeria: Case Study of some Privatized Enterprises*, by Afeikhena Jerome, Research Paper 177.
- Sources of Technical Efficiency among Smallholder Maize Farmers in Southern Malawi*, by Ephraim W. Chirwa, Research Paper 178.
- Technical Efficiency of Farmers Growing Rice in Northern Ghana*, by Seidu Al-hassan, Research Paper 179.
- Empirical Analysis of Tariff Line-Level Trade, Tariff Revenue and Welfare Effects of Reciprocity under an Economic Partnership Agreement with the EU: Evidence from Malawi and Tanzania*, by Eviois K. Zgou and Josaphat P. Kweka, Research Paper 180.
- Effect of Import Liberalization on Tariff Revenue in Ghana*, by William Gabriel Brafu-Insaidoo and Camara Kwasi Obeng, Research Paper 181.
- Distribution Impact of Public Spending in Cameroon: The Case of Health Care*, by Bernadette Dia Kamgnia, Research Paper 182.
- Social Welfare and Demand for Health Care in the Urban Areas of Côte d'Ivoire*, by Arsène Kouadio, Vincent Monsan and Mamadou Gbongue, Research Paper 183.
- Modelling the Inflation Process in Nigeria*, by Olusanya E. Olubusoye and Rasheed Oyaromade, Research Paper 184.
- Determinants of Expected Poverty Among Rural Households in Nigeria*, by O.A. Oni and S.A. Yusuf, Research Paper 185.
- Exchange Rate Volatility and Non-Traditional Exports Performance: Zambia, 1965–1999*, by Anthony Musonda, Research Paper 186.
- Macroeconomic Fluctuations in the West African Monetary Union: A Dynamic Structural Factor Model Approach*, by Romain Houssa, Research Paper 187.
- Price Reactions to Dividend Announcements on the Nigerian Stock Market*, by Olatundun Janet Adelegan, Research Paper 188.
- Does Corporate Leadership Matter? Evidence from Nigeria*, by Olatundun Janet Adelegan, Research Paper 189.
- Determinants of Child Labour and Schooling in the Native Cocoa Households of Côte d'Ivoire*, by Guy Blaise Nkamleu, Research Paper 190.
- Poverty and the Anthropometric Status of Children: A Comparative Analysis of Rural and Urban Household in Togo*, by Kodjo Abalo, Research Paper 191.
- African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU)*¹, by Sandrine Kablan, Research Paper 192.

- Economic Liberalization, Monetary and Money Demand in Rwanda: 1980–2005*, by Musoni J. Rutayisire, Research Paper 193.
- Determinants of Employment in the Formal and Informal Sectors of the Urban Areas of Kenya*, by Wambui R. Wamuthenya, Research Paper 194.
- An Empirical Analysis of the Determinants of Food Imports in Congo*, by Léonard Nkouka Safoulanitou and Mathias Marie Adrien Ndinga, Research Paper 195.
- Determinants of a Firm's Level of Exports: Evidence from Manufacturing Firms in Uganda*, by Aggrey Niringiye and Richard Tuyiragize, Research Paper 196.
- Supply Response, Risk and Institutional Change in Nigerian Agriculture*, by Joshua Olusegun Ajatomobi, Research Paper 197.
- Multidimensional Spatial Poverty Comparisons in Cameroon*, by Aloysius Mom Njong, Research Paper 198.
- Earnings and Employment Sector Choice in Kenya*, by Robert Kivuti Nyaga, Research Paper 199.
- Covergence and Economic Integration in Africa: the Case of the Franc Zone Countries*, by Latif A.G. Dramani, Research Paper 200.
- Analysis of Health Care Utilization in Côte d'Ivoire*, by Alimatou Cissé, Research Paper 201.
- Financial Sector Liberalization and Productivity Change in Uganda's Commercial Banking Sector*, by Kenneth Alpha Egesa, Research Paper 202.
- Competition and Performance in Uganda's Banking System* by Adam Mugume, Research Paper 203.
- Parallel market exchange premiums and customs revenue in Nigeria*, by Olumide S. Ayodele and Francis N. Obafemi, Research Paper 204.
- Fiscal Reforms and Income Inequality in Senegal and Burkina Faso: A Comparative Study*, by Mbaye Diene, Research Paper 205.
- Factors Influencing Technical Efficiencies among Selected Wheat Farmers in Uasin Gishu District, Kenya*, by James Njeru, Research Paper 206.
- Exact Configuration of Poverty, Inequality and Polarization Trends in the Distribution of well-being in Cameroon*, by Francis Menjo Baye, Research Paper 207.
- Child Labour and Poverty Linkages: A Micro Analysis from Rural Malawian Data*, by Leviston S. Chiwaula, Research Paper 208.
- The Determinants of Private Investment in Benin: A Panel Data Analysis*, by Sosthène Ulrich Gnansounou, Research Paper 209.
- Contingent Valuation in Community-Based Project Planning: The Case of Lake Bamendjim Fishery Restocking in Cameroon*, by William M. Fonta, Hyacinth E. Ichoku and Emmanuel Nwosu, Research Paper 210.
- Multidimensional Poverty in Cameroon: Determinants and Spatial Distribution*, by Paul Ningaye, Laurent Ndjanyou and Guy Marcel Saakou, Research Paper 211.
- What Drives Private Saving in Nigeria*, by Tochukwu E. Nwachukwu and Peter Odigie, Research Paper 212.
- Board Independence and Firm Financial Performance: Evidence from Nigeria*, by Ahmadu U. Sanda, Tukur Garba and Aminu S. Mikailu, Research Paper 213.
- Quality and Demand for Health Care in Rural Uganda: Evidence from 2002/03 Household Survey*, by Darlison Kaija and Paul Okiira Okwi, Research Paper 214.
- Capital Flight and its Determinants in the Franc Zone*, by Ameth Saloum Ndiaya, Research Paper 215.
- The Efficacy of Foreign Exchange Market Intervention in Malawi*, by Kisukyabo Simwaka and Leslie Mkandawire, Research Paper 216.
- The Determinants of Child Schooling in Nigeria*, by Olanrewaju Olaniyan, Research Paper 217.
- Influence of the Fiscal System on Income Distribution in Regions and Small Areas: Microsimulated CGE Model for Côte d'Ivoire*, by Bédia F. Aka and Souleymane S. Diallo, Research Paper 218.
- Asset price Developments in an Emerging stock market: The Case Study of Mauritius* by Sunil K. Bundoo, Research Paper 219.
- Intrahousehold resources allocation in Kenya* by Miriam Omolo, Research Paper 220.
- Volatility of resources inflows and Domestic Investment in Cameroon* by Sunday A. Khan, Research Paper 221.
- Efficiency Wage, Rent-Sharing Theories and Wage Determination in Manufacturing Sector in Nigeria* by Ben E. Aigbokhan, Research Paper 222.
- Government Wage Review Policy and Public-Private Sector Wage Differential in Nigeria* by Alarudeen Aminu, Research Paper 223.
- Rural Non-Farm Incomes and Poverty Reduction In Nigeria* by Awoyemi Taiwo Timothy, Research Paper 224.
- After Fifteen Year Use of the Human Development Index (HDI) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP): What Shall We Know?* by Jean Claude Saha, Research Paper 225.
- Uncertainty and Investment Behavior in the Democratic Republic of Congo* by Xavier Bitemo Ndiwulu and Jean-Papy Manika Manzongani, Research Paper 226.

- An Analysis of Stock Market Anomalies and Momentum Strategies on the Stock Exchange of Mauritius* by Sunil K. Bundoo, Research Paper 227.
- The Effect of Price Stability On Real Sector Performance in Ghana* by Peter Quartey, Research Paper 228.
- The Impact of Property Land Rights on the Production of Paddy Rice in the Tillabéry, Niamey and Dosso Regions in Niger* by Maman Nafiou Malam Maman and Boubacar Soumana, Research Paper 229.
- An Econometric Analysis of the Monetary Policy Reaction Function in Nigeria* by Chukwuma Agu, Research Paper 230.
- Investment in Technology and Export Potential of Firms in Southwest Nigeria* by John Olatunji Adeoti, Research Paper 231.
- Analysis of Technical Efficiency Differentials among Maize Farmers in Nigeria* by Luke Oyesola Olarinde, Research Paper 232.
- Import Demand in Ghana: Structure, Behaviour and Stability* by Simon Kwadzogah Harvey and Kordzo Sedegah, Research Paper 233.
- Trade Liberalization Financing and Its Impact on Poverty and Income Distribution in Ghana* by Vijay K. Bhasin, Research Paper 234.
- An Empirical Evaluation of Trade Potential in Southern African Development Community* by Kisukyabo Simwaka, Research Paper 235.
- Government Capital Spending and Financing and Its Impact on Private Investment in Kenya: 1964-2006* by Samuel O. Oyieke, Research Paper 236.
- Determinants of Venture Capital in Africa: Cross Section Evidence* by Jonathan Adongo, Research Paper 237.
- Social Capital and Household Welfare in Cameroon: A Multidimensional Analysis* by Tabi Atemnkeng Johannes, Research Paper 238.
- Analysis of the Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment Flows to the West African and Economic Union Countries* by Yélé Maweki Batana, Research Paper 239.
- Urban Youth Labour Supply and the Employment Policy in Côte d'Ivoire* by Clément Kouadio Kouakou, Research Paper 240.
- Managerial Characteristics, Corporate Governance and Corporate Performance: The Case of Nigerian Quoted Companies* by Adenikinju Olayinka, Research Paper 241.
- Effects of Deforestation on Household Time Allocation among Rural Agricultural Activities: Evidence from Western Uganda* by Paul Okiira Okwi and Tony Muhumuza, Research Paper 242.
- The Determinants of Inflation in Sudan* by Kabbashi M. Suliman, Research Paper 243.
- Monetary Policy Rules: Lessons Learned From ECOWAS Countries* by Alain Siri, Research Paper 244.
- Zimbabwe's Experience with Trade Liberalization* by Makoche Kanwa Albert, Hurungo T. James and Kambarami Prosper, Research Paper 245.
- Determinants in the Composition of Investment in Equipment and Structures in Uganda* by Charles Augustine Abuka, Research Paper 246.
- Corruption at Household Level in Cameroon: Assessing Major Determinants* by Joseph-Pierre Timnou and Dorine K. Feunou, Research Paper 247.
- Growth, Income Distribution and Poverty: The Experience of Côte d'Ivoire From 1985 To 2002* by Kouadio Koffi Eric, Mamadou Gbongue and Ouattara Yaya, Research Paper 248.
- Does Bank Lending Channel Exist In Kenya? Bank Level Panel Data Analysis* by Moses Muse Sichei and Githinji Njenga, Research Paper 249.
- Governance and Economic Growth in Cameroon* by Fondo Sikod and John Nde Teke, Research Paper 250.

THIS RESEARCH STUDY was supported by a grant from the African Economic Research Consortium. The findings, opinions and recommendations are those of the author, however, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Consortium, its individual members or the AERC Secretariat.

Published by: The African Economic Research Consortium
P.O. Box 62882 – City Square
Nairobi 00200, Kenya

Printed by: Modern Lithographic (K) Ltd
P.O. Box 52810 – City Square
Nairobi 00200, Kenya

ISBN 978-9966-023-28-5

© 2012, African Economic Research Consortium.

Contents

List of tables

Abstract

Acknowledgements

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1. | Introduction | 1 |
| 2. | Literature review | 3 |
| 3. | Methodological approach | 7 |
| 4. | Empirical analysis of poverty characteristics in Guinea | 13 |
| 5. | Conclusion and implications for economic policy | 26 |
| | Notes | 28 |
| | References | 29 |
| | Appendix | 31 |

List of tables

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1: | One-dimensional indexes of poverty, absolute and relative contributions and weight of attributes | 15 |
| 2: | Multidimensional poverty indices for each decomposition, absolute and relative contributions | 17 |
| 3: | One-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and by religion | 20 |
| 4: | One-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and by administrative region | 20 |
| 5: | One-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and by natural region | 23 |
| 6: | One-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and by gender of the head of household | 23 |
| 7: | One-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and by place of residence | 25 |
| 8: | One-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and by size of the household | 25 |

Appendix A: Tables on the absolute and relative contributions of the attributes to the poverty indexes of the groups and to the overall poverty index. **31**

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 1.A: | Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the one-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and religion | 31 |
| 2.A: | Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the one-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and administrative regions | 32 |
| 3.A: | Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the one-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and natural regions | 33 |
| 4.A: | Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the one-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and by the gender of the household | 34 |
| 5.A: | Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the one-dimensional indexes of poverty by attributes and by place of residence | 34 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 6.A: Absolute and relative (%) contributions to the overall poverty index of the one-dimensional indeces of poverty by attributes and by the size of the household | 35 |
| 7.A: Multidimensional indeces and test of difference for the group religion | 36 |
| 7.A*: Test of difference taking into account standard errors | 37 |
| 8.A: Multidimensional indeces and test of difference for the group administrative region | 37 |
| 9.A: Multidimensional indeces and test of difference for the group natural region | 37 |
| 10.A: Multidimensional indeces and test of difference for the group gender | 37 |
| 11.A: Multidimensional indeces and test of difference for the group place of de residence | 38 |
| 12.A: Multidimensional indeces and test of difference for the group size | 38 |
| 13.A : Descriptive statistics on some attributes | 38 |

Appendix B: Functions of belonging for the socio-economic attributes selected **39**

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| - Education level | 39 |
| - Nature of the roof | 39 |
| - Material of external walls | 39 |
| - Type of toilet | 39 |
| - Index of Settlement | 40 |
| - Annual expenditures by household | 40 |
| - Type of housing | 40 |
| - Housing ownership | 40 |
| - Mode of lighting | 40 |
| - Possession of lasting goods | 41 |
| - Drinking water supply | 41 |
| - Fuel for cooking | 41 |

Abstract

This study examines the multidimensional aspect of poverty in Guinea, taking into account both the monetary and non-monetary dimensions of poverty. We use data from the Full Base Survey on Poverty Assessment (FBSPA, 2002-2003). The methodology relies on the fuzzy set approach of Dagum and Costa (2004), which is supplemented by the decomposition methods of Mussard and Pi Alperin (2005).

The main results that emerge are: i) the identification of the key variables associated with poverty; and ii) the identification of deprivation state according to selected attributes for different groups such as natural regions, administrative regions, area of residence, gender, religion and household size. The effect of attributes on the deprivation of each group and the global poverty index has also been tested.

Keywords: *Fuzzy Set, Decompositions, Multidimensional Poverty*

JEL Classification: *I32*