

GAZDASÁG & TÁRSADALOM

Journal of Economy & Society

A TARTALOMBÓL:

Márk Joób:

Freiheit als Grundlage der moralischen Verantwortung
von Unternehmen und die Frage der Haftung

Joseph Huber:

Monetary and Banking Reform:
Bringing back in the monetary fundamentals of finance

Gabriella Dubcová:

Present Challenges of the International Business Ethics

Tomáš Dudáš

National Competitiveness of Slovakia
in the Context of Global Competitiveness Indexes

Emese Bruder - Csilla Obádovics:

Working but poor – countries with different path in European integration

Olaf H. Bode - Frank Brimmen - Ute Redeker:

Festlegung von Lohnuntergrenzen – tariflich oder gesetzlich

2012/1-2



SZÉCHENYI TERV

Gazdaság & Társadalom

Journal of Economy & Society

Megjelenik évente négy alkalommal

A kiadvány a TÁMOP - 4.2.2. B - 10/1 - 2010 - 0018. számú projekt keretében valósult meg

A folyóirat kiadását a Soproni Tudós Társaság támogatta

Főszerkesztő / Editor: Dr. Székely Csaba DSc

Főszerkesztő helyettes / Deputy Editor: Dr. Kulcsár László CSc

Szerkesztőbizottság / Associate Editors: Dr. Székely Csaba DSc, Dr. Fábián Attila PhD, Dr. Joób Márk PhD, Dr. Kulcsár László CSc

Szerkesztőségi munkatárs / Assistant: Szikra Andrea

Nemzetközi tanácsadó testület / International Advisory Board:

Prof. David L. Brown PhD (Cornell University, USA), Dr. Csaba László DSc (Közép Európai Egyetem, Budapest), Dr. Rechnitzer János DSc (Széchenyi István Egyetem, Győr), Dr. Nigel Swain PhD (School of History, University of Liverpool, UK), Dr. Caleb Southworth PhD (Department of Sociology University of Oregon, USA), Dr. Franz Schausberger PhD (Universität Salzburg, Österreich), Dr. Szirmai Viktória DSc (MTA Szociológiai Kutatóintézet, Budapest), Dr. Böhm Antal DSc (MTA Politikai Tudományok Intézete, Budapest), Dr. Ingrid Schwab-Matkovits PhD (Fachhochschulstudiengänge Burgenland, Eisenstadt, Österreich), Dr. Bozidar Lekovic PhD (Faculty of Economics, Subotica, Serbia), Dr. Djerdji Petkovic PhD (Faculty of Economics, Subotica, Serbia).

Közlésre szánt kéziratok / Manuscripts:

Kéziratokat kizárólag e-mailen fogadunk, nem őrünk meg, s nem küldünk vissza!

A kéziratok formai és szerkezeti követelményeit illetően lásd a folyóirat hátsó belső borítóját. / We accept APA (Harvard) style only.

A kéziratokat és a közléssel kapcsolatos kérdéseket a következő e-mail címre várjuk: / Send manuscripts and letters by e-mail only to: la.kulcsar@gmail.com

A közlésre elfogadott kéziratok összes szerzői és egyéb joga a kiadóra száll. / Acceptance of material for publication presumes transfer of all copyrights to the Publisher.

A kéziratokat két független anonim bíráló értékeli. / Articles are refereed by anonym reviewers before publication.

Ismertetésre szánt könyveket az alábbi címre várjuk / Send books for review to:

Dr. Kulcsár László egyetemi tanár

Nyugat Magyarországi Egyetem, Sopron Erzsébet. u. 9. 9400 Hungary

Előfizetés: Intézményeknek: 2800 Ft./év; Egyéni előfizetés: 1700 Ft./év;
Példányonkénti ár: 700 Ft./dupla szám: 1400 Ft.

Nyomdai munkálatok / Printing: Scarbantia Nyomda - Palatia Kft.

H-9400 Sopron, Tárczy-Hornoch Antal u. 12.

Tel.: 99/702-001 | E-mail: nyomda@scarbantia.hu

ISSN 0865 7823

Copyright © 2012 Nyugat – magyarországi Egyetem Kiadó

Gazdaság & Társadalom

4. ÉVFOLYAM

2012.

1-2. SZÁM

TARTALOM

Table of Contents and Abstracts in English: See page 119

STUDIES

Freiheit als Grundlage der moralischen Verantwortung von Unternehmen und die Frage der Haftung

Márk Joób 3

Present Challenges of the International Business Ethics

Gabriella Dubcová 22

Monetary and Banking Reform. Bringing back in the monetary fundamentals of finance

Joseph Huber 38

Festlegung von Lohnuntergrenzen – tariflich oder gesetzlich

Olaf H. Bode – Frank Brimmen – Ute Redeker 54

National Competitiveness of Slovakia in the Context of Global Competitiveness Indexes

Tomáš Dudáš 74

Working but poor – countries with different path in European integration

Emese Bruder – Csilla Obádovics 88

Analysis of Commission Proposal on Direct Payments in 2014 - 2020

Fekete Pál Győző 98

KÖNYVISMERTETÉS – Három új könyv Kulcsár László könyvtárából (ismerteti Kulcsár László)

A társadalom, a jog, az intézmények és a mai problémák eredete 112

[Francis Fukuyama: A politikai rend eredete. Az ember előtti időktől a francia forradalomig, Akadémia Kiadó Budapest. 2012. 688 oldal [ISBN 9789630591935]

Eltérések és hasonlóságok az európai urbanizációs folyamatokban 114

[Viktória Szirmai (ed): Urban Sprawl in Europe. Similarities or differences?, Aula Kiadó, Budapest. 2011. 280 oldal [ISBN 9789633390153]

Minél jobban közeledünk feléje, annál inkább távolodik:

Svájc és Magyarország esete. 117

[Föderalizmus és Decentralizáció. Kézikönyv a svájci struktúrákról és a magyar hasznosíthatóságról. Szerk. Hajdú Zoltán és Kovács Sándor Zsolt. MTA Dunántúli Tudományos Intézet. Genfi Egyetem Európai Intézet. 2012.[ISBN 978-963-9899-58-2] 239. Oldal.

Table of Contents/Abstracts 119

Working but poor – countries with different path in European integration

Emese Bruder, PhD candidate³⁸

Szent István University, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, Gödöllő

Csilla Obádovics PhD, Associate Professor³⁹

University of West Hungary, Faculty of Economics, Sopron

ABSTRACT The working poor population had not been gained many emphasis in Europe until the European Union adopted the Lisbon Strategy in 2000 with a special focus on employment, economy and social policies. In the framework of the Lisbon Strategy, the EU has started to develop a list of statistical indicators on poverty and social exclusion. These indicators aimed to control country level development on the agreed common goals, and were adopted in 2001 at Laeken Council meeting in Belgium. In 2003, a new indicator, the *in-work poverty risk* has been added to the Laeken indicators. Since then, the existence of working poor population has took a more prominent place in the European debate. The objective of this paper is to give an insight of the situation of the working poor population in Visegrad countries, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland and Hungary and compare the results with the Benelux states. These groups of countries both have shared history, and common path in European integration. We analyse the extent of working poverty, the gender asymmetry and the full-time, part-time proportions over the working poor population. Based on the 2007 wave of EU-SILC database, we individualise various income sources received by the household in order to obtain total individual incomes. With this approach, we would like to show how each individual would perform, if he/she could only rely on his/her own income.

KEYWORDS: poverty, working poor, inequality

Introduction

The concept of working poor is often discussed by researchers as it seems that having an employment today is not an escape from poverty. Although all researchers agree that the working poor are persons who are working but who are poor, the statistical implementation of the notion tends to alter a lot.

The European Commission (EC) emphasised the need for a common indicator which can detect the working poor population. The *in-work poverty risk* indicator has been introduced in 2003 and it became part of the Laeken indicators.

38 bruder.emese@gtk.szie.hu

39 obadovics.csilla@ktk.nyme.hu

According to the EC definition, the working poor are all full-time or part-time employees/self-employed workers aged 15-64 who live in a household with an equivalised household disposable income below 60% of the median of the same income in the country. This indicator has been amply analysed and criticized since its introduction (Lelièvre, Marlier and Pétour 2004, Ponthieux 2007, Cazenave 2006).

The objective of this paper is to show the differences in working poor population between the Visegrad countries (V4) (CZ, HU, PL, SK) and the Benelux states (BE, NL, LU).⁴⁰ Each of these two groups of states shares a common history and a common path in European integration and economic development.

Literature review

The existing literature on working poverty is extremely heterogeneous in methodological terms. The computed rate of working poor is very sensitive to some basic assumptions made at the outset of any analysis: the definition of worker, the definition of poor, the reference population, the income and the unit of analysis. Although all researchers agree that the working poor are persons who are working but who are poor, the statistical implementation of the notion tends to alter a lot.

In the definition of poverty, the European literature is quite solid. The majority of researchers defined being poor on the basis of a relative poverty threshold (equivalised household income being under the 50% or 60% of the national median income). As an equivalence scale, the so called *OECD-modified equivalence scale* is used mostly, which assigns a value of 1 to the household head, 0.5 to each additional adult member and 0.3 to each child. This method bases on assumptions about economies of scale in consumption as well as on judgments about the needs of each individuals in the household such as children or the elderly (OECD 2008).

The American Bureau of Labour Statistics (BLS) set an absolute poverty threshold expressed in dollars. This threshold varies by the size of the family. This method is used by Klein and Rones (1989) and Gardner and Herz (1992) American researchers. Australian researchers like Robson and Rogers (2005) use again, the European style, relative poverty threshold, but set to 50% of the national median income level.

The definition of worker shows a much diverse picture even only in Europe. As for the French INSEE definition, worker is a person who has spent at least 6 months in the labour market in the reference year with a minimum of 1 month

40 Country codes: Czech Republic=CZ, Hungary=HU, Poland=PL, Slovakia=SK, Belgium=BE, Netherlands=NL, Luxembourg=LU

of employment. The European approach - what Eurostat adopted in the in-work poverty risk indicator - defines the workers as those people who are actually working at the time of survey and who has spent at least 7 months in employment during the reference year. The BLS definition of worker, namely a person who has spent at least 27 weeks in the year of reference in the labour market by working or looking for a job.

The next issue to consider is the type of income on which to base our analysis. In literature, there is again much variety in the kinds of income researchers use to determine working poverty. Most of the papers use equivalised household disposable income. This is also the approach used by Eurofound (2010). However, as far as the analysis focuses on the working poor, income is sometimes limited to earned income only, studies focusing on the working poor in a broader sense including also the unemployed and those on sickness leave tend to limit income to market income, still others sum up household income before or after taxation, with or without social welfare allowances, etc.

New approaches suggest, that taking the household as the income recipient unit leads to a false evaluation of poverty. (Wooley and Marchal 1994, Kabeer 1994, Meulders et al. 2009, Ponthieux 2009) The household acts as a *fig-leaf* of the household-members' poverty, because some are above the poverty threshold because they can rely on their partner sharing his/her income. The household approach assigns the same poverty risk for all household members, neglecting how each one of them earns personally. However, as of Sen (1990) "perceived contribution response" exists, which suggests that women receive less from household resources because they need less and their contributions to household income are valued less than those of men. We argue that individual measures are more appropriate in a society where the divorce rates grow continuously since the 1960s (González and Viitanen 2006) and where the pooling of income within the household cannot be proven.

Ponthieux (2009) introduced the concept of "poverty in earned income" or "economic poverty" based on individual income. She used market income to measure working poverty, which is all income connected to employment (wages and salaries, self-employed incomes, unemployment and sickness benefits). This study showed that - contrary to what Eurofound found in its study based on equivalised household income (Eurofound 2010) - women are much more exposed to economic poverty than men.

Meulders et al. (2009) developed a methodology in order to analyse poverty based on the resources of each individual, whatever the characteristics of the household in which he/she lives. This involved measuring inequalities between men's and women's individual incomes. A statistical and econometric study of these income disparities was carried out in order to propose indicators for monitoring purposes. The present paper is based on this methodology to revisit the issue of the working poor among V4 and the Benelux countries.

Data and methodology

In this analysis, the working poor population is analysed in 7 EU countries, the Visegrad countries (CZ, HU, PL, SK) and the Benelux states (BE, NL, LU) using the 2007 wave of the EU-SILC. This database is an instrument aiming at collecting, timely and comparable cross-sectional and longitudinal multidimensional micro data on income, poverty, social exclusion and living conditions in EU countries. The sample size of the countries are 23,059 in CZ, 22,297 in HU, 42,852 in PL, 14,864 in SK, 15,493 in BE, 25,905 in NL and 10,419 in LU. We made our calculations by applying the cross-sectional personal weights provided by Eurostat.

In our analysis, the definition of worker is those individuals who were employed/self-employed full-time or part-time at least through 7 months of the reference year. The definition of poor is defined as those individuals, whose individual net income is under the 60% of the same national median income.

We individualise all income sources received by the household and add these incomes to real individual incomes in order to obtain total individual incomes. With this approach, we would like to show how each individual would perform, if he/she could rely only on his/her own income. We calculate total income from EU-SILC personal and household data. Concerning total income, there are variables which are provided individually by the database (employee cash or near cash income, cash benefits or losses from self-employment, unemployment, old-age, survivors, sickness and disability benefits, as well as education-related allowances) and there are household-based variables (family/children related allowances, other social exclusion benefits, housing allowances, cash transfers received and income from capital investments). After individualising household incomes, we computed the net revenue of each individual, and calculated the 60% of the median of these incomes for each country. This income serves as the poverty threshold in our analysis.

There are countries where only the gross income variables are available (CZ, HU, SK, NL). For these countries, we applied an inflation rate on the poverty thresholds. The inflation rates (Net-gross ratio: NGR) have been developed by Ponthieux (2010), by dividing disposable (net) household incomes with the gross household incomes. Ponthieux computed the NGR rate as a ratio of the weighted sum of total disposable household income (variable HY020) to the weighted sum of total household gross income (variable HY010), negative incomes are expressed as zero. The ratio can be applied in our analysis because it includes the same variables we used to calculate total income, only on company car (PY021) and income received by people aged under 16 (HY110) is additional, and short of non-cash employee income (PY020) and interest repayments on mortgage (HY100). The poverty threshold inflation rates and the final poverty thresholds are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Poverty threshold inflation rates

	CZ	HU	PL	SK	NL	BE	LU
Inflation rate	0.938	0.893	1.00	0.923	0.844	1.00	1.00
Poverty threshold (€)	2,427	1,663	1,659	1,698	7,521	9,491	14,306

Source: Ponthieux (2010)

Those individuals who dispose a yearly income lower than the poverty threshold are designated *poor* (or rather at-risk of poverty), and those who dispose higher income are *not poor*. To sum up, the working poor population has to match three criteria, to be poor (dispose lower income than the 60% of the national median), to be a worker (full-time or par-time at least 7 months in the reference year) and to be 15-64 years old (in order to exclude pupils, young earners and old pensioners from the analysis).

The advantage of applying NGR ratio is that to include all countries into our analysis is rather simple. The disadvantage lying in applying the NGR ratio is on one hand that we only judge the individual net value by the household values which might reduce the comparability of the results. On the other hand, we have to take into account when we read the results, that applying a common NGR neglects that those who earn less, pay less taxes, and those who earn more, pay more (women are more likely to earn less). This method actually increases the existing net income differences.

Results

Among V4 countries, the highest working poverty rate affects PL, where 5.92% of the population is a worker whose individual income is lower than the 60% of the national median income, which drifts them into the risk of poverty. We observe the lowest working poverty rate in CZ among the V4 but Benelux as well. These rates let us calculate the number of poor workers in each country, which could be 129,164 in CZ, 311,366 in HU, 2,258,898 in PL, 67904 in SK 325853 in BE, 205811 in NL, 21156 people in LU based on our calculations.

Table 2: Percentage of working poor within the total population

	Percentage of working poor within the total population	Total population
CZ	1.26	10,251,079
HU	3.09	10,076,581

	Percentage of working poor within the total population	Total population
PL	5.92	38,157,055
SK	4.47	5,389,180
V4	4.60*	63,873,895
BE	3.10	10,511,382
NL	5.03	16,334,210
LU	4.51	469,086
Benelux	4.28*	27,314,678

Source: Own calculations based on EU-SILC 2007 and Eurostat 2006

*V4 and Benelux total values are calculated by weighting the country results by the size of the total population of the country.

The working poverty rate is slightly lower in Benelux states if we take the group of countries as a whole, but within the countries, there are few interesting findings e.g. NL and LU has higher poverty rate than SK and HU, and BE has the lowest working poverty rate among Benelux countries. This is a remarkable result, as facts prove that the gross domestic product per inhabitant is almost three and a half times higher in average in Benelux states than in V4 countries (Eurostat 2007).

Table 3: Proportion of men and women within the working poor and all workers

	Working poor				All workers			
	Men	Women	Total	Ratio W/M	Men	Women	Total	Ratio W/M
CZ	38.22	61.78	100.00	1.62	57.14	42.86	100.00	0.75
HU	55.59	44.41	100.00	0.80	54.07	45.93	100.00	0.85
PL	44.86	55.14	100.00	1.23	55.36	44.64	100.00	0.81
SK	41.50	58.50	100.00	1.41	53.17	46.83	100.00	0.88
V4	45.20	54.80	100.00	1.24	55.26	44.74	100.00	0.81
BE	32.27	67.73	100.00	2.10	55.40	44.60	100.00	0.81
NL	25.44	74.56	100.00	2.93	54.21	45.79	100.00	0.84
LU	23.16	76.84	100.00	3.32	58.12	41.88	100.00	0.72
Benelux	28.03	71.97	100.00	2.62	54.74	45.26	100.00	0.83

Source: Own calculations based on EU-SILC 2007

As previous studies showed, men and women are marked by different working poverty rates. As of Eurofound (2010) and its household based analysis showed, working women are less likely than working men to live in a poor household. As of Ponthieux (2009) individualised analysis, this is because they are more likely to live with a partner who earns enough to lift the equivalised household income above the poverty threshold. She also stated that women - more often than men - live with a partner who has higher earnings than she has, while men, more often than women, live with a partner who has no earnings at all.

As we stated above, we would like to know how each individual would perform, if he/she could only rely his/her own income. Table 3 shows the gender asymmetry of working poverty, using the fully individualised incomes. We can observe that among women, the working poverty rate is significantly higher than that of men in all countries but HU. We add, that the proportion of men and women among all workers is 55% men and 45% women in average both in V4 and Benelux. This illustrates the turn towards the higher representation of women among working poor population compared to all workers.

In V4 countries, CZ has the highest women overrepresentation among working poverty, i.e. 61.78% of working poor is women. However, this rate is lower than any Benelux rates, where the women representation among working poverty is 71.97% in total, with LU reaching 76.84%.

Table 4: Percentage of full-time and part-time workers within the working poor and all workers

	Working poor				All workers			
	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Ratio PT/FT	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Ratio PT/FT
CZ	78.01	21.99	100.00	0.28	96.90	3.10	100.00	0.03
HU	81.83	18.17	100.00	0.22	95.27	4.73	100.00	0.05
PL	72.86	27.14	100.00	0.37	90.72	9.28	100.00	0.10
SK	93.08	6.92	100.00	0.07	97.50	2.50	100.00	0.03
V4	76.81	23.19	100.00	0.30	93.00	7.00	100.00	0.08
BE	59.47	40.53	100.00	0.68	78.32	21.68	100.00	0.28
NL	31.54	68.46	100.00	2.17	62.47	37.53	100.00	0.60
LU	43.67	56.33	100.00	1.29	82.48	17.52	100.00	0.21
Benelux	42.50	57.50	100.00	1.35	68.91	31.09	100.00	0.45

Source: Own calculations based on EU-SILC 2007

Part-time work is much more spread in Benelux states than in V4. 31% of all workers in the Benelux work part-time, while this rate is 7% in V4. Among V4, PL has the highest rate of part-time workers among all workers, therefore it is not surprising to discover the highest rate among working poor as well. If we take a look at CZ and SK results, we can observe, that full-time and part-time work among all workers have very similar proportions, while turning to the working poor population, we can state that proportions do not change as much as it do in other V4 countries. In other words, the overrepresentation of part-time workers among working poor is not as significant in SK as it is in the rest of the V4.

The working poor of Benelux states is also overrepresented by part-time workers, reaching 68.46% in NL, 56.33 in LU and 40.53% in BE. To conclude, the proportion of part-time workers is higher among working poor than among all workers in all countries.

Table 5: Percentage of full-time and part-time workers within the working poor men and women

	Men				Women			
	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Ratio PT/FT	Full-time	Part-time	Total	Ratio PT/FT
CZ	90.55	9.45	100.00	0.10	70.25	29.45	100.00	0.42
HU	82.73	17.27	100.00	0.21	80.71	19.29	100.00	0.24
PL	79.96	20.04	100.00	0.25	67.06	32.91	100.00	0.49
SK	97.80	2.20	100.00	0.02	89.74	10.26	100.00	0.11
V4	83.60	16.40	100.00	0.20	71.64	28.30	100.00	0.40
BE	84.50	15.50	100.00	0.18	47.55	52.45	100.00	1.10
NL	81.10	18.90	100.00	0.23	16.07	83.93	100.00	5.22
LU	86.22	13.78	100.00	0.16	30.84	69.16	100.00	2.24
Benelux	82.50	17.50	100.00	0.21	28.44	71.56	100.00	2.52

Source: Own calculations based on EU-SILC 2007

Table 5 illustrates the inequality of part-time and full-time workers within the working poor men and women. The proportion of part-time workers is significantly higher among working poor women than among man, especially in Benelux states, where 71.56% of working poor women works part-time. The rate stands out again in NL, where it reaches 83.93%. To conclude, part-time workers are overrepresented among working poor, and especially among working poor women in all countries.

Here we add, that part-time job occupied by women is also overrepresented among all workers, especially in Benelux states. 10% of working women holds a part-time job in V4 while this rate is 56.7% in Benelux. Therefore, excluding part-time workers from the analysis would have resulted in excluding a 10% of working women in V4, and as high as 56.7% of working women in Benelux.

Conclusions

V4 and Benelux states went through a different path of economic development, partly due to historical matters. Our first result was, that we calculated the poverty thresholds in each country, which have been set to a yearly income of 2,427 € in CZ, 1,663 € in HU, 1,659 € in PL, 1,698 € in SK, 9,491 € in BE, 7,521 € in NL and 14,306 € in LU. With these poverty thresholds we could identify those individuals, who are in-work, but whose individual income does not reach the poverty threshold. We replaced equivalised disposable household income by individual incomes in order to get a fully individualised poverty risks.

It turned out, that the percentage of working poor population within the total population is slightly higher in V4 than in Benelux, but there are some alterations within the groups of states. Contrary what Eurofound found, our results show that women are overrepresented among working poor population in most of the countries.

We also found, that the proportion of part-time workers is much higher among the working poor than among all workers. Additionally, part-time work is especially overrepresented among working poor women.

References

- Cazenave, M.C. (2006). Les travailleurs pauvres dans les pays développés: acquis et controverses, Paris, Matisse, *Les Travaux de l'Observatoire 2005-2006*, pp. 199-225.
- Eurofound (2010). *Working poor in Europe*, Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions
- Gardner, J.M. & Hertz, D.E. (1992). Working and poor in 1990, *Monthly Labor Review*, 115/12, Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Labor Statistics
- González, L. & T. Viitanen (2009). The effect of divorce laws on divorce rates in Europe, *European Economic Review*, vol. 53, n°2, pp. 127-38, February.
- Jones, E. (2005). The Benelux Countries: Identity and Self-Interest, in: *Member States and the European Union*, Bulmer, S., Leques, Ch. (Eds), Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Kabeer, N. (1994). *Reversed realities: gender hierarchies in development thought*, London: Verso

- Klein, B.W., & Rones, P.L. (1989). A profile of the working poor, *Monthly Labor Review*, Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Labor Statistics
- Lelièvre, M., E. Marlier, & P. Pétour (2004). Un nouvel indicateur européen: les travailleurs pauvres, In: *Les indicateurs dans l'Union européenne: avancement et perspectives, dossiers Solidarité et Santé de la DREES*, n°2, avril-juin.
- Meulders, D., O'Dorchai S., Plasman, R., & Rycx F. (2009). *Genre et revenu: analyse et développement d'indicateurs*, final report of the research project: Belgian Gender and Income Analysis (BGIA), 472 p.
- Nicholson T., Fiedin J. (Eds) (2006). *The Visegrad Group – A Central European Constellation*, International Visegrad Fund, Bratislava
- OECD (2008). *Growing Unequal? Income Distribution and Poverty in OECD Countries*. Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs, October, 310 p.
- Ponthieux, S. (2007). *The working poor – Limits of the EU indicator in-work poverty risk, limits of the statistical category working poor, and exploration of a notion of poverty in earned income*, Paris, Insee, ECINEQ, June, 15 p.
- Ponthieux, S. (2009). *The working poor as a statistical category – Methodological difficulties and exploration of a notion of poverty in earned income*, Paris, INSEE.
- Ponthieux, S. (2010). *In-work poverty in the EU*, Eurostat Methodologies and Working Papers
- Sen, A. K. (1990). Gender and Cooperative Conflicts, in: Tinker I. (Ed.) *Persistent Inequalities: Women and World Development*. New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 123-149
- Woolley, F. & J. Marshall (1994). Measuring inequality within the household, *Review of Income and Wealth*, vol. 40, n° 4 (December), pp. 415-431.