DETERMINANTS OF POVERTY IN LITHUANIA

Algimantas MISIŪNAS

Mykolas Romeris University
Ateities g. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius;
Vilnius University
Universiteto st. 3, LT-01122 Vilnius
E-mail: *algis.misiunas@gmail.com*

Gražina BINKAUSKIENĖ

Department of Statistics to the Government of the Republic of Lithuania
Gedimino av. 29, LT-01500 Vilnius, Lithuania;
Vilnius Gediminas Technical University
Saulėtekio al. 11, LT-10223 Vilnius, Lithuania
E-mail: gb@ygle.lt

Abstract. This article examines the determinants of poverty in Lithuania. This study is based on 2006 Household Budget Survey data.

Regression analysis technique was used to identify the contributions of different variables to poverty. It was attempted to explain the level of expenditure per capita – the dependent variable – as a function of a variety of explanatory variables. The independent variables such as size of the household, living place of the households and various household heads characteristics: age, sex, education, socio-economic status were included into regression model.

Introduction

Identifying and measuring poverty is an important issue facing policymakers in the whole European Union. In March 2000 the Lisbon European Council agreed on the need to take steps to make a decisive impact on the eradication of poverty by 2010. In December 2000, at the Nice European Council, the Heads of the States and Governments implemented a decision that the efforts against poverty and social exclusion might be best achieved by means of the open method of co-ordination. Key elements of this approach are the definition of commonly agreed objectives for the European Union (EU) as a whole, the development of appropriate national action plans to meet these objectives, and the periodic reporting and monitoring of the progress made.

Fight against poverty was launched long before Lithuania's integration into the EU. In 2000, Lithuania has developed a Strategy on Poverty Reduction, which was used for the elaboration and approval of Program on Implementation of Poverty Reduction Strategy. Lithuania joined the Community process of reduction of poverty and social exclusion in 2002 with the signing of memorandum of agreement with the European Commission. Following the document and the provisions of Accession Partnership, the government of the Republic of Lithuania backed by the European Commission worked out the Joint Inclusion Memorandum, which established the main

challenges in fight against poverty and social exclusion and outlined the main measures of that policy. By signing this document, Lithuania pledged to initiate the inclusion of joint EU objectives for fight against poverty and social exclusion into the national policy and defined the main spheres of policy, which should be monitored and controlled in future.

The World Bank (1990) defined poverty as "the inability to attain a minimum standard of living". Lipton and Ravallion (1995) stated that "poverty exists when one or more persons fall short of a level of economic welfare deemed to constitute a reasonable minimum, either in some absolute sense or by the standards of a specific society". Poverty in the modern society usually is defined as a lack of income and other resources (financial, cultural and social) guaranteeing a tolerable standard of living to the people of the state. From these definitions we can say that the conception of poverty is multimeaningful, relative and is subject to the standard of living in the country.

Referring to that the Laeken European Council in December 2001 endorsed the first set of 18 common statistical indicators for social inclusion which will allow comparable monitoring of the Member States progress towards the agreed EU objectives. These indicators cover four important dimensions of social inclusion: financial poverty, employment, health and education.

Statistics Lithuania in their analysis of poverty is analyzing the evolution of poverty levels and poverty profiles using these defined Laeken indicators. This kind of analysis focuses on what happening to poverty during the time periods as well as what happening to the composition of the poor according to several demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. This knowledge can be useful since it allows us to know whether poverty is increasing or decreasing as well as the changes in the composition of the poor.

However, it does not provide us with much insight about the causes of poverty. For instance, we know that poor people tend to have low levels of education; but are they poor because they have little education, or do they have little education because they are poor? On the other hand why rural people have low levels of education in the first place: Were the school fees too high? Was there no school nearby? Was the quality of the education abysmal? Were their parents unsupportive, or even hostile to education?

For Lithuania, while there has been a lot of works on a descriptive analysis of the characteristics of the poor, to my knowledge, there is no papers to an empirical modeling of the determinants of poverty using nationally representative

data. In this article, I have tried to extend the descriptive analysis of the Lithuania poverty by modeling the determinants of poverty, using data from the 2006 Household Budget Survey.

This paper is organized as follows. The next section describes measures of poverty approach to modeling the determinants of poverty. Section 3 introduces the HBS data set and survey methodology and introduces the set of main concepts used in this analysis. Section 4 presents the regression model, explains dependant and explanatory variables. Section 5 presents empirical results.

1. Measuring poverty

To measure the pervasion of poverty or poverty determinants it is necessary to be able to distinguish the poor from the non-poor. The traditional approach involves establishing an income threshold and calculating how many individuals, families or households fall below it. The question is how to establish the income threshold. There is no single correct approach; a wide range of methods has been used in different countries and at different times. Moreover, there is the question of whether income itself is a reliable indicator of living standards.

Most modern definitions of poverty using an income threshold set at a particular fraction of mean or median income. This approach has been used by international bodies such as the European Union, World Bank and the OECD.

For this study a little bit different approach was used: instead of income consumption expenditure was used as the poverty indicator. The decision to use consumption expenditure is explained in the section 4.

2. Data source

Data source used for research was provided by Statistics Lithuania and contains Household Budget Survey data for the year 2006.

Survey Methodology. The target population of the HBS is based on private households in Lithuania. Persons living in the institutional households (nursing homes for elderly people, imprisonment institutions, compulsory military service installations, etc.) have been excluded from the current survey. The household and its members can be classified according to various socioeconomic and demographic characteristics such as income, education, place of residence, type of employment.

Reference Periods. The selected households are being surveyed for the period of one month. Af-

ter one month other households replace them. There were different reference periods for the variables included in the Surveys. For the socio-demographic variables the reference period was at the moment of the interview. For the income and non food expenditures variables, the reference period is one month, for food expenditures reference period is two weeks.

Geographic Coverage. The Survey is statistically representative at the national level, at the urban and rural level and at the counties level as well.

Sampling Design. The population register was used as a sampling frame. Stratified sample design with simple random sample and two-stage cluster sample was used in strata. All Lithuanian territory was divided in 31 not overlapping groups – strata. The biggest towns of Lithuania counties, medium, small towns and rural areas of counties are divided in separate strata. Sample of households was selected from each stratum. Different sample design was used in each stratum: a simple random sample of persons 16 and older is drawn from the Population Register in major county towns and two-stage cluster sample design was used in the medium and small towns of counties as well as in rural areas of counties.

Main concepts used in the analysis

Household – is an association of people tied with relationship or other personal bonds who have common budget, have meals together and are accommodated in one housing unit (an apartment, etc.). One person may also comprise a household.

Household head – is a person who has the highest income. Due to the fact, that household members' income may differ by different months, the head of the household is a person, who, based on the opinion of the household members, receives the highest yearly income. In cases, when it is impossible to determine a person receiving the highest yearly income (for e.g. all the family members are involved in farming activities and the income received by the family may not be assigned to one of the members), the head of the household shall be determined by the family itself.

Social-economic group is determined based on the income source of the head of the household. Based on this attribute, the following household groups are pointed out:
- self employers in agriculture – households, where the income by the head of the household is received from individual agricultural activities;
- hired workers – households, where the income of the head of the household is received from hired work within public or private sectors;
- self employers – households, where the income of the head of the household is received from business, trades and free professional activities;
- pensioners – households, where the income of the head of the household is received in the form of pension;
- other – households, where the income of the head of the household is received in the form of various benefits, scholarships, income from property, as well as other income sources.

Household type is determined based on demographic structure of the household. Household types are as follows:
- Single person;
- Single adult with children under 18;
- Couple without children under 18;
- Couple with children under 18;
- Other households with children under 18. This type of a household includes households consisting of parents with children under 18 and older, households of few generations with children under 18, grandparents with grandchildren under 18, etc.
- Other households without children under 18.

Consumption expenditure includes expenditure in cash and kind for household consumption needs, i.e. food, clothes, dwelling, health care, culture and recreation.

3. Empirical model

Tabulated or graphical information on the characteristics of the poor is remarkably helpful in painting a profile of poverty. However, it is not always enough when one wants to discover the relative contributions of different influences on poverty.

The most widespread technique used to identify the contributions of different variables to poverty is regression analysis. This kind of analysis attempts to explain the level of expenditure (or income) per capita – as a function of a variety of explanatory variables.

A regression estimate shows how closely each independent variable is related to the dependent variable (e.g. consumption per capita), holding all other influences constant.

Having data available from Lithuanian HBS, it is possible to formulate an empirical model for testing the determinants of poverty in Lithuania.

Dependent variable

Lithuania HBS collects information about household disposable income as well as the information about household consumption expenditure. Before starting the analysis, it is necessary to decide which indicator will be used as a welfare indicator in poverty analysis. Most of the countries prefer to use consumption expenditure information for the following reasons:

– In countries, where agricultural income is quite important source of income, income often is very lumpy. Farming households receive a large amount of cash income in summer and autumn, and receive very little the rest of the year. On an income basis, a household which most would view as wealthy may be categorized as poor if the interview of that household was done at the beginning of the year or the oppositely, poor household can be treated as wealthy, if the interview was conducted at the moment when household received income for the sold harvest. At this point of view expenditure is a smoother measure of welfare through time.

– Data on expenditures are generally more reliable and stable than income data. Households are often more willing to truthfully report their consumption expenditure than their income.

All these comments are suitable and for Lithuanian HBS data.

In the Lithuanian Poverty Reduction Strategy when analyzing the prevalence of poverty and planning the measures of social and economical policy the main criterion of poverty was selected the relative poverty line estimated as 50 per cent of the average consumption expenditure.

Concluding all listed above comments and to be in one line with Lithuanian Poverty Reduction Strategy it was decided to include per capita consumption expenditure as the dependent variable.

Independent variables

Many variables can be considered as the determinants of wealth, and thus, of poverty. The set of independent variables that are hypothesized to be determinants of consumption includes household and household head characteristics. The key selection criteria for these variables was exogeneity. As the goal of the model was to infer causality, variables which might be affected by current consumption in a household – endogenous variables – are excluded from the model. Selection of potential determinants was guided by the results of the poverty profile conducted in the previous studies.

Endogenous, or jointly determined variables, have values which are determined through the joint interaction of other variables within the specified system (Judge et al. 1988, p. 601). In contrast, exogenous variables are variables that affect the levels of the endogenous variables, but whose own levels will be determined outside the system. Exogenous variables are assumed to influence the values for the endogenous variables, but are not influenced by those variables in return because no feedback relation between the endogenous and exogenous variables is assumed. Examples of endogenous variables that are likely to be an outcome of current household living standards (as measured via consumption levels) are the possession of durable goods by household members, dwelling characteristics, current school attendance of children in the household, and so on.

Endogenous variables are not selected as regressors because they are determined by current household living standards, i.e. by income or consumption expenditure.

So, the objective, selecting independent variables, was to select variables whose values determine the level of household welfare, but they can not be explained be household welfare measure.

The set of regressors, or independent variables, that were chosen as possible determinants of poverty in Lithuania are as follows:

Characteristics of the household:
• size of the household,
• number of children under 7 years in the household,
• number of children 8–17 years in the household,
• number of members with highest education in the household,
• number of dependants in the household
• number of earners in the household
• household type (reference group – single person household)
• living county of the household (reference group – Vilnius county)
• living in rural or urban area (reference group – urban)

Characteristics of the household head:
• age of the household head,
• sex of the household head,
• marital status of the household head (reference group – single),
• education of the household head (reference group – highest education),
• socio-economic status of the household head (reference group – others).

Finally regression equation, as applied to this poverty analysis, look likes this:

$$\log(y_i / z) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i^1 + \beta_2 x_i^2 + ... + \beta_k x_i^k + \varepsilon$$

where z is the poverty line, y_i is per capita consumption expenditure, the $x_j^{n^i}$ are the "explanatory" variables and the β_j are the coefficients that are to be estimated and ε is a normally distributed random error term.

Following most similar studies, semi-logarithmic form of the regression was choose. This introduces some non-linearity into the model, and typically improves goodness of fit measures in comparison with similar estimations based on the absolute value of consumption. This model was estimated for the whole country and separately for urban and rural areas.

4. Empirical results

Table 1 presents the parameter estimates of the regression model for the determinants of poverty.

The size of the coefficient for independent variable gives you the size of the effect that variable is having on dependent variable, and the sign of the coefficient (positive or negative) gives the direction of the effect.

Since dependant variable is in natural logarithm form the estimated coefficient tells approximate expected percentage increase (if the coefficient is positive) or decrease (if the coefficient is negative) of the ratio of consumption expenditure per capita and poverty line when that independent variable increases by one, holding all the other independent variables constant. In case if independent variable is classification variable – set of dummy variables are created and included in the model. Last dummy variable (called reference) always excluded from the model to avoid linear dependency of independent variables. In this case estimated coefficient tells approximate expected percentage increase (if the coefficient is positive) or decrease (if the coefficient is negative) of the ratio consumption expenditure per capita and poverty line when comparing to the reference group dummy, holding all the other independent variables constant.

The fit of the fixed effects model for the whole country is estimated with an R^2 of 0.341 with a sample of 7,178. The R^2 for the rural model was 0.320 with a sample of 2,844 households. For the urban model the R^2 was 0.349 for a sample of 4,334 households.

Impact living place. Household's living in rural areas have negative effect on welfare compare to urban household by -0.135. As showed the results of regression, to living in any county in Lithuania (except Klaipėda) have negative effect on household standards of living. The highest negative effect was found in Utena and Alytus counties. The only Klaipėda county showed a positive effect on households welfare compare to Vilnius county analyzing regression model for the whole country. Analyzing regression model for urban areas the same picture was found, but analyzing regression for rural areas, the all counties showed negative effect compare to Vilnius County.

Impact of size and type of the household. As it was already expected, household size has a negative effect on households' well-being: the bigger household, the worse well-being of the household. Effect of household size is smaller in rural areas than in urban. Any composition of the household compare to the single person household also have negative effect on households' welfare. Multigenerational households (with or without children) have the highest negative effect compared to single person households. All these conclusions can be said about urban households as well. In rural areas situation is a little bit different. Living as a couple (with or without children) has positive effect on household well being in rural areas, even single parent households are better-off compare with single person households in rural areas. Just multigenerational households have a negative effect on welfare in rural areas.

Impact of number of dependants and number of earners in the household. Examining the number of dependants, it can be noticed that this indicator have negative impact on household well-being. The more dependants in the household, the poorer household living conditions. The opposite situation is analyzing number of earners in the household. Contrarily, number of earners have a positive impact on household welfare: more earners in the household, the higher living of standard in the household.

Impact of number of children in the household. The number of children in the household has a negative impact on the welfare of the household. Households with more children, holding other variables constant, will tend to be poorer than households which have fewer children. Number of children under 8 years have higher negative impact that number of children between 8 and 18 years old. Surprisingly, number of children have positive effect on households welfare in rural areas. We were able to found the only one

Table 1. **Model of the determinants of poverty**

	Overall		Urban		Rural	
	Coefficients	T statistics	Coefficients	T statistics	Coefficients	T statistics
(Constant)	1.479*	593.2	1.665*	585.3	0.761*	149.4
Living in rural area	-0.135*	-190.7				
Living in Kaunas county	-0.088*	-119.6	-0.017*	-20.6	-0.326*	-207.9
Living in Klaipėda county	0.036*	38.7	0.059*	58.8	-0.132*	-61.1
Living in Šiauliai county	-0.060*	-58.2	-0.024*	-20.5	-0.267*	-130.6
Living in Panevėžys county	-0.164*	-137.6	-0.138*	-92.3	-0.254*	-128.9
Living in Alytus county	-0.239*	-160.6	-0.248*	-142.8	-0.275*	-100.3
Living in Marijampolė county	-0.130*	-80.4	-0.123*	-57.6	-0.221*	-91.9
Living in Telšiai county	-0.043*	-26.4	-0.064*	-33.6	-0.068*	-23.3
Living in Tauragė county	-0.206*	-99.3	-0.261*	-84.0	-0.301*	-110.9
Living in Utena county	-0.239*	-147.9	-0.209*	-100.9	-0.366*	-146.7
Size of Household	-0.199*	-138.1	-0.193*	-114.9	-0.355*	-132.9
Type of Household						
Single adult with children under 18	-0.121*	-68.4	-0.184*	-87.4	0.049*	15.5
Couple without children	-0.103*	-70.1	-0.203*	-116.3	0.111*	41.2
Couple with children under 18	-0.204*	-125.8	-0.290*	-149.5	0.012*	4.1
Other households with children under 18	-0.189*	-104.1	-0.264*	-124.5	-0.014*	-4.0
Other households without children under 18	-0.176*	-118.8	-0.204*	-116.9	-0.062*	-23.2
Number of dependant members in the household	-0.002*	-3.6	-0.011*	-16.0	0.042*	34.2
Number of earners in the household	0.086*	116.8	0.043*	51.3	0.246*	162.7
Number of members with highest education in the household	0.114*	171.4	0.107*	149.5	0.241*	129.3
Number of children under 8 years in the HH	-0.043*	-46.7	-0.041*	-35.8	0.018*	11.5
Number of children 8–18 years in the HH	-0.005*	-6.3	-0.001	-1.6	0.067*	47.5
Characteristics of Head of Household						
Gender of HH Head-Female	0.000	0.1	0.004*	5.5	-0.076*	-60.5
Age of HH Head (years)	-0.006*	-195.4	-0.006*	-168.4	-0.002*	-34.7
Education						
College	-0.106*	-90.2	-0.119*	-92.4	0.012*	4.0
Secondary education	-0.203*	-176.4	-0.197*	-157.5	-0.088*	-30.9
Basic education	-0.390*	-260.2	-0.433*	-242.5	-0.126*	-40.0
Primary education	-0.389*	-234.1	-0.387*	-181.9	-0.298*	-89.8
Socio-economic group						
Self-employed in agriculture	0.059*	23.9	0.294*	24.0	0.254*	70.1
Employees	0.037*	20.6	-0.047*	-22.0	0.222*	67.7
Self-employed, employers	0.373*	167.4	0.121*	45.8	1.008*	246.9
Pensioners	-0.091*	-46.6	-0.188*	-78.7	0.045*	13.6
Marital Status:						
Married	0.275*	187.4	0.325*	189.5	0.174*	62.8
Cohabited	0.147*	90.6	0.255*	134.3	-0.018*	-5.8
Spouse lives separately	0.041*	18.0	0.130*	42.9	0.131*	38.4
Widowed	0.093*	63.9	-0.003	-1.6	0.310*	121.1
Divorsed	-0.034*	-24.7	-0.008*	-5.1	-0.057*	-21.5

a Dependent Variable: Logarithm of Consumption expenditure and poverty line ratio
b Weighted Least Squares Regression – Weighted by sampling weight
* significant at 1 percent level.

reason for that: households with children receives benefits form the government and sometimes it is the only source of income. Therefore these households with children compare to other households are better-off. Coefficient for number of children between 8 and 18 years old in urban areas is not statistically significant.

Impact of Age of Household head. As It could be seen from the table above, the age of the household head has a relatively small impact on the welfare of the household. However, it is important to note the high level of statistical significance of the coefficients for the whole country and for rural and urban areas separately. Households headed by older individuals, holding other variables constant, will tend to be poorer than those headed by younger individuals.

Impact of Gender of Household head. Coefficient for the gender of the head of household is not statistically significant for the whole country, but is statistically significant in urban and rural models. Female-headed household have negative effect compare to male households in rural areas. In urban areas the effect of the female headed household on the household welfare is positive, but quite small just 0.004 compare to male-headed households.

Impact of Education of Household head. The coefficients for the variables for education of household head are very significant. The following conclusion can be done from these coefficients: the higher education of household head, the lower decrease of welfare. If head of household have the primary education, there is a substantial decrease of household well-being: approximately – 0.389 for the whole Lithuania and of – 0.387 and – 0.298 respectively in urban and rural areas compared to the households which head have the highest education level. While for the households which head have a colleague degree decrease of welfare is much lower –0.106 for the whole Lithuania and in urban – 0.119 compared to the households which head have the highest education level. In rural areas colleague degree have a positive impact on household welfare compare to highest education.

Impact of Socio-Economic group of Household head. The coefficients on socio-economic status of household head mostly are positive; all are statistically significant for the whole country and in both rural and urban areas. Self employment in agriculture as well as self-employment or employer in non agriculture of household head have positive effect on the welfare compare to whose households which head have so call "other" socio-economic status. However, what is surprising is the negative coefficient for household which head is employees in urban areas. These household have negative effect at –0.047. Negative effect on welfare was observed in the pensioners' household as well. But this finding is common just for the urban areas.

Impact of marital status of Household head. The coefficient for the marital status of household head surprisingly are statistical significant, except coefficient for widowed persons in urban areas. To by married have the highest positive effect on consumption expenditure level for the whole country and in urban areas compare to a single households. Oppositely, in rural areas the highest effect on welfare compare to single households has the households which head was widowed. Cohabitation in rural areas has negative effect on welfare, as well as to be divorced.

Conclusions

The study uses micro data from Lithuanian Household Budget survey 2006 to examine the determinants of poverty in Lithuania. This paper presents a simple regression model used to find out which households characteristics have impact on poverty in Lithuania.

Household size defined by adult equivalent units has significant negative effect on the welfare status of a household. The size of the effect of household size on poverty is not the same in urban and rural areas, in urban areas it has higher negative effect.
The importance of the head of household's age and sex was found relatively small.

The trait which most strongly and positively affected the amount of household consumption expenditure per capita and poverty line ratio was the level of education held by the head of the household followed by the living place of the households. The model shows that a rural household have negative effect on household well-being compare to urban households. The living county of Lithuania have also significant impact on living standards.
The regression analysis showed that increases in educational attainment have an important impact on household welfare.
It is in fact the level of education which in this new economic system has become the deciding factor in terms of professional career and the amount of income earned.

Also quite high impact of socio-economic group of household head was found.

References

1. Datt, Gaurav; and Jolliffe Dean. October 1999. *Determinants of poverty in Egypt: 1997.* International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D. C., FCND discussion paper, no. 75.
2. Deaton, A. 1997. *Analysis of household surveys: A microeconometric approach to development policy.* Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.: Johns Hopkins University Press for the World Bank.
3. *European social statistics. Income, poverty and social excision.* Eurostat, 2000.
4. *Household income and expenditure.* Statistics Lithuania, 2005, 2006.
5. Townsend, Ian. *Research paper 04/23 Poverty: Measures and Targets.* 4 March 2004.
6. *Living standard and poverty.* Statistics Lithuania. 2005, 2006.
7. *World Bank. Poverty Manual.* All, JH Revision of August 8, 2005.

SKURDĄ LIETUVOJE LEMIANTYS VEIKSNIAI

Algimantas MISIŪNAS
Mykolo Romerio universitetas
Vilniaus universitetas

Gražina BINKAUSKIENĖ
Vilniaus Gedimino technikos universitetas
Lietuvos statistikos departamentas prie Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės

Santrauka. Skurdo nustatymas ir įvertinimas yra svarbi problema, su kuria susiduria visos Europos Sąjungos politikos kūrėjai. Europos Taryba 2000 m. kovą Lisabonos susitikime vienu iš svarbiausių Europos Sąjungos uždavinių įvardijo skurdo ir socialinės atskirties esminį sumažinimą. 2000 m. gruodį Europos Tarybos susitikime Nicoje valstybių vadovai pritarė nuomonei, kad geriausių rezultatų kovojant su skurdu ir socialine atskirtimi galima pasiekti taikant atviro koordinavimo metodą. Pagrindiniai jo elementai yra bendrų tikslų Europos Sąjungai kaip visumai apibrėžimas, nacionalinių veiksmų planų šiems tikslams pasiekti parengimas ir periodiška pasiektų tikslų stebėsena.

Dar prieš Lietuvai integruojantis į Europos Sąjungą buvo taikomos kovos su skurdu priemonės. 2000 m. sudarytos Skurdo mažinimo Lietuvoje strategijos metmenys, kurių pagrindu buvo parengta ir patvirtinta Skurdo mažinimo strategijos įgyvendinimo programa.

Skurstančiais laikomi tokie asmenys, kurių gaunamos pajamos ir kiti ištekliai (materialiniai, kultūriniai ir socialiniai) yra tokie maži, kad negali užtikrinti galimybės gyventi pakankamai gerai. Pagrindinis skurdo rodiklis yra santykinė skurdo riba, kuri sudaro 50 procentų šalies vartojimo išlaidų vidurkio. Būtent šis rodiklis ir buvo pasirinktas atliekant šią analizę.

Įprastai atliekamos skurdo analizės tikslas yra išsiaiškinti skurdo paplitimo mastą, jo kitimo tendencijas, nustatyti, kokios gyventojų grupės labiausiai kenčia nuo skurdo. Deja, tokia analizė neleidžia įvertinti skurdą lemiančius veiksnius bei skurdo atsiradimo priežastis. Iš ankstesnių analizių žinoma, kad skurstantys asmenys yra žemesnio išsilavinimo negu neskurstantys, tačiau neaišku, ar jie gyvena žemiau skurdo ribos todėl, kad jų išsilavinimas yra žemas, ar atvirkščiai – jų išsilavinimas yra žemas ir todėl jie skursta.

Šiame straipsnyje bandoma išsiaiškinti skurdą lemiančius veiksnius. Siekiant šio tikslo naudoti Lietuvos statistikos departamento atlikto namų ūkių biudžetų tyrimo duomenys. Šio tyrimo objektas yra privatus namų ūkis. Tyrimo metu yra renkama informacija apie namų ūkio narių demografines charakteristikas, socialinį-ekonominį statusą, ekonominę veiklą, būsto sąlygas, išlaidas ir pajamas ir kt. Ši analizė buvo atlikta remiantis 2006 m. tyrimo duomenimis. Iš viso buvo analizuojami 7178 namų ūkiai.

Regresinė analizė yra tinkamas metodas nustatyti skurdą lemiančius veiksnius. Tokios rūšies analizė parodo priklausomo kintamojo (šiuo atveju vartojimo išlaidų vienam namų ūkio nariui) ir nepriklausomų kintamųjų (įvairių veiksnių, lemiančių skurdą) sąryšį.

Įvertinus regresijos lygties rezultatus, galima padaryti tokias išvadas.

Neigiamą įtaką namų ūkių gyvenimo sąlygoms turi namų ūkių gyvenamoji vieta, namų ūkio dydis, išlaikytinių skaičius namų ūkyje, vaikų iki 8 metų skaičius namų ūkyje. Priešingai, teigiamai namų ūkių vartojimo išlaidas veikia dirbančiųjų skaičius namų ūkyje, namų ūkio galvos išsilavinimas, tam tikra namų ūkio galvos socialinė-ekonominė grupė ir net šeiminis namų ūkio galvos statusas. Namų ūkio galvos lytis namų ūkių gyvenimo sąlygoms neturi įtakos, tačiau namų ūkio galvos amžius neigiamai veikia namų ūkio gerovę; ši įtaka nėra didelė.

—————————————

Algimantas Misiūnas – Asociate Professor, Department of Banking and Investments, Faculty of Economics and Finance Management, Mykolas Romeris University; Department of Quantitative Methods and Modelling, Faculty of Economics, Vilnius University.

Mykolo Romerio universiteto Ekonomikos ir finansų valdymo fakulteto Bankininkystės ir investicijų katedros, Vilniaus universiteto Ekonomikos fakulteto Kiekybinių metodų ir modeliavimo katedros docentas, socialinių mokslų daktaras.

Gražina Binkauskienė – Living Standard Statistics Division, Department of Statistics to the Government of the Republic of Lithuania, also PhD student, Faculty of Business Management Department of Finance Engineering, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University.

Statistikos departamento prie Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės Gyvenimo lygio statistikos skyriaus vedėjos pavaduotoja ir Vilniaus Gedimino technikos universiteto Verslo vadybos fakulteto Finansų inžinerijos katedros doktorantė.