

On the estimation of fuzzy poverty indices

Federico Crescenzi* and Lorenzo Mori †

Abstract

We review the fuzzy approach to poverty measurement by comparing poverty indices using different membership functions proposed in the literature. We put our main focus on the issue of estimation of the mean squared errors of these fuzzy methods showing which indices can be more accurately estimated using sample data. By means of simulations, we also investigate the role of parameters of the membership function when it comes to estimating mean squared errors via a robustness analysis.

1 Introduction

Estimating poverty measures for populations of individual based on a sample from a certain survey depends on the choice between two paradigms: the traditional approach and the fuzzy approach. In the first approach, an individual is regarded to as poor with respect to a poverty predicate (Y) if it belongs to the set of poor, usually defined with a rule on Y . The condition of being poor or not-poor with respect to Y is therefore binary. To follow the fuzzy approach means to allow that there is no such binary classification, instead, it only exists individuals that are more or less deprived than others with respect to Y .

It is not the objective of this paper to discuss theoretically or philosophically about these paradigms. The differences between these points of view are widely discussed in the books [1]; [2]; [3], therefore, we would not add much more original contribution to the debate.

It is the objective of this paper to focus on the estimation of fuzzy poverty measures (or indices) from a statistical perspective. In fact, to the best of our knowledge, the literature on fuzzy methods for poverty estimation have not focused on statistical properties of this indices either in terms of bias of the estimates nor in terms of their mean squared errors and, ultimately, in terms of their robustness to parameter specification. On the other hand, in a traditional approach to poverty and inequality measurement, the diffusion of sampling variances and assessments of indices has been widely addressed in the literature (see [4];[5];[6]). Also, R-package Laeken offers routines to estimate the variance via a non-parametric bootstrap approach ([7]).

The comparison between these methods is not straightforward because each fuzzy poverty index depends on the so-called membership function that ranks individuals in terms of their deprivation with respect to the poverty predicate. This function represents the researcher's belief on the poverty phenomenon and therefore different functions are intrinsically difficult to be compared. Moreover, they often depend on different parameters and usually authors suggest different synthetic measures over the function. Our comparison tackles this issue by addressing the mean squared error of these measures. In fact, while a approach may be appealing in theory, ultimately, when it comes to produce estimates from samples it is necessary to have estimates with good properties. To do so however, we need a common sample statistic to consider. We decided for the expected value of the membership function as it is the statistic that is reported by many (but not all) fuzzy methods, has known statistical

*University of Tuscia. Dep. of Economics, Engineering, Society and Business administration. Viterbo, Italy. Corresponding author Email: federico.crescenzi@unitus.it

†University of Bologna. Dep. of . Statistical Sciences, Bologna, Italy. Email: lorenzo.mori7@unibo.it

properties, and it is applicable to all membership functions. For example, the axiomatic approach lacks of axioms on the mean squared error of the estimator which may be important for small samples or sub-populations.

We address all these topics by setting out a simulation study that consists in creating a synthetic population from a real sample of individuals and evaluating the bias, the bias in the mean squared error, the coefficient of variation, and the robustness of the methods simulating two different sample surveys. The first one uses simple random sampling of individuals, the second one uses a more complex sampling design. All the measures discussed are compared using bootstrap and jackknife replications. In addition, for those indices that require the researcher to define parameters, we check their robustness and the impact, in reliability terms, at as these values change.

The remainder of the paper is so structured. Section 2 offers a brief history of poverty measurement for the not experienced reader although it has not to be intended as a comprehensive literature review of poverty estimation. Section 3 discusses in analytic details the fuzzy membership functions. Section 4 introduces the simulation set-up and revises the bootstrap and the jackknife approach that is used in the results Section 5 . Note that the jackknife procedure that we use here is an ad-hoc procedure for fuzzy poverty estimates suggested by [8]. Section 6 discuss the robustness of the fuzzy indicators. Eventually, Section 7 concludes the work and gives insights for further research.

2 A brief history of poverty measurement

From a statistical point of view the main problem to evaluate poverty is the definition of a certain threshold beyond which a statistical unit (i.e. an individual or household) is defined poor. This threshold is usually a function of a (monetary) variable denoting the welfare status of the unit. The definition of the poverty line is not only a statistical problem but it is also political and in general, from an official statistics perspective, it is held fixed by national statistical institutes. It is customary to trace the origin of the poverty line back to the works published in the 1960s by Mollie Orshansky, but this concept places its origins well before ([9]). In order to understand the needs that led researchers to define fuzzy poverty measures, we review concisely the history of the poverty line ([10] and [11]).

In 1887 Charles Booth during a meeting of the Royal Statistical Society presents the results of a survey conducted in London. In this presentation, for the very first time, Booth uses the concept of "line of poverty". A line defined in terms of daily income that admits to divided the population in to two sub-set the poor and the non-poor one ([12]).

During the 20th century three different concept of poverty were developed: subsistence, basic needs and relative deprivation. The concept of subsistence - which spread in Great Britain - was the first to be developed by Benjamin Seebohm Rowntree in 1901. Rowntree set a poverty line in terms of a minimum weekly sum of money for a healthy life. This paradigm defines as poor those who are unable to obtain the minimums resources to ensure an efficient physical condition and was created in cooperation with nutritionists under the responsibility of entrepreneurs ([13]).

In 1964 were published the recalled works of Mollie Orshansky who defined the poverty threshold as a measure of income inadequacy by taking the cost of food plan per family. This threshold is officially adopted, in 1969 by the American inter agency poverty level review committee. All these three approaches, Booth, Rowntree and Orshansky, lead to the concept of absolute poverty. Within this approach the threshold is fixed to a monetary quantity (usually a daily one) necessary to reach the basic life necessities. The absolute poverty approach is still used, especially in the under-developed countries, and the World Bank use a threshold of 1.90\$ per day.

Few years later, in 1976, a new formulation to express the concept of poverty, based on basic needs, was introduced at the International Labour Organization's World Employment Conference ([14]). This approach enlarged the concept of subsistence with the feature of circumscribing poverty in a context of development social and economic status of a country. It is still used for the developing countries.

Following the ideas of Adam Smith the concept of a relative poverty become to be more and

more popular from the 1950s. The idea that is not possible to define a threshold of poverty without considering the community in which individuals live find bring, in 1967, Victor Fuchs to define the poverty threshold as one-half the median family income. From 1967 on-wards this concept remain almost stable with only small changes in the value of the percentage of the median family income to be considered. Today the most common used threshold is set at 60% of the median household income. Relative poverty measures are officially used, among others, by the European Union, UNICEF and the OECD.

The dichotomization of the population in two non-overlapped subsets of poor units and not-poor units was criticized in the early 90s of the last century ([15]; [17]). At the core of the debate that criticizes the poor/not-poor dichotomy there is the fuzzy approach. The aim is to obtain index able to capture a complicated social phenomenon that cannot be reduced to a trite true/false (poor/non-poor) binary logic. This paradigm replaces the dichotomy with a measure of degree (or propensity) to be poor defined as a function of the the distribution of income (or an equivalent poverty predicate).

This propensity is based on the fuzzy set approach ([16]; [17]) in which a unit i does not belong or not belong to set of poors A (i.e either $i \in A$ or $i \notin A$) but it is given a propensity or degree of poverty or deprivation with respect to the poverty predicate.

The function that maps each unit to the fuzzy set approach is called the (fuzzy) membership function. Interestingly, this approach comprehends the traditional approach as this can be viewed as a fuzzy approach that uses a staircase-membership.

3 Fuzzy approaches to poverty estimation

The traditional approach to poverty measurement instead is based on the crisp sets theory, where the population is divided into the subset of poor and the subset of non-poor according to a rule on \mathcal{Y} . For example people whose Y level falls below the poverty line τ are regarded as poor (1) while the remaining as not-poor (0). We thus say that poverty measurement based on crisp set assigns a value of either 1 or 0 to each individual in the universal set according to the rule ($1(y_i < \tau)$).

In the fuzzy approach, given a poverty predicate Y (e.g. the equalised disposable income), its support \mathcal{Y} , and the (fuzzy) set \mathcal{A} , a membership function μ is a mapping between the support of Y to $\mathcal{A} = [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$, i.e. $\mu : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. The higher is the value of μ the most is the membership of the unit to the set. Each fuzzy set is uniquely and completely defined by its membership function.

Two of the most important concept of fuzzy sets, used also in fuzzy index, are the α - cut and the strong α - cut. Given a fuzzy set \mathcal{A} defined on Y and any number $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, the α - cut (${}^\alpha\mathcal{A}$) and the strong α - cut (${}^{+\alpha}\mathcal{A}$) are the crisp sets ${}^\alpha\mathcal{A} = \{y | \mathcal{A}(y) \geq \alpha\}$ and ${}^{+\alpha}\mathcal{A} = \{y | \mathcal{A}(y) > \alpha\}$. That is, the α - cut of a fuzzy set \mathcal{A} is the crisp set ${}^\alpha\mathcal{A}$ that contains all the elements of the universal set Y whose membership grades in \mathcal{A} are greater than or equal to the specified value of α . The concept of the strong α - cut is the same with value that can be only greater than the specified value of α . A last definition that will return in the following is the cardinality of a fuzzy set, i.e. $Card(A) = |A| = \sum_i \mu(y_i)$.

A first roughly classification based on the type of membership function assumed distinguishes between distance based and distribution based membership functions.

3.1 Distance based membership functions

A number of authors developed fuzzy indices on the basis of the concept of α - cut. In this case, the membership function is defined through a distance between y and a threshold z ($y, z \in \mathcal{Y}$) of the kind of

$$\mu(y_i) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 < y_i < z_1 \\ f(y_i), & z_1 \leq y_i < z_2 \\ 0, & y_i \geq z_2 \end{cases}$$

where $f(y_i)$ is a positive decreasing function. The literature have suggested several membership function depending on the definition of the function $f(\cdot)$. According to [18] the distance based membership functions can be classified into triangular, trapezoidal and Gaussian functions. In triangular functions, $f(\cdot)$ is expressed as the combinations of two different functions $f_1(\cdot)$ and $f_2(\cdot)$. In trapezoidal unctions, $f(\cdot)$ is of the form $\frac{z_2-y_i}{z_2-z_1}$, with z_1 and z_2 being two threshold values. A special case of the trapezoidal are the linear functions where z_1 and z_2 are, taken as the maximum and minimum values of Y . For Gaussian functions $f(\cdot)$ is expressed in the form of a Gaussian distribution. At the best of our knowledge, there is no Gaussian functions for fuzzy poverty indicators.

In chronological order, the most used distance based functions are [19], [20], [21], [22], and Chakravarty (2019).

3.1.1 Cerioli and Zani (1990)

The first proposal of a membership function is that of [19] who suggest

$$\mu(y_i) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 < y_i \leq z_1 \\ \frac{z_2-y_i}{z_2-z_1}, & z_1 < y_i < z_2 \\ 0, & y_i \geq z_2 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

This formulation states that the membership function is a simple trapezoidal form leading to a fuzzy index in which the values of z_1 and z_2 have to be chosen by the researcher, and a linear function $f(\cdot)$ is used for all intermediate values.

3.1.2 Belhadj (2011)

[20] suggests the following membership function

$$\mu(y_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & 0 < y_i < z_{min} \\ \frac{-x_i}{z_{max}-z_{min}} + \frac{z_{max}}{z_{max}-z_{min}} & z_{min} \leq y_i < z_{max} \\ 0 & y_i \geq z_{max} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where z_{min}, z_{max} are defined respectively as the upper and lower poverty line. The upper poverty line corresponds to the level of the total expenditure per-capita necessary so that the households can satisfy their basic food needs without sacrifice while the lower poverty line includes minimum expenditure to satisfy basic food and non-food needs. Remarkably, we notice that this membership function is a special case of Equation 1 for given values of the threshold parameters. Therefore, throughout the paper we will not make any further distinction between Equation 1 and Equation 2.

3.1.3 Zedini and Belhadj (2015)

[21] propose another triangular membership function defined by:

$$\mu(y_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & a \leq y_i < b \\ \frac{-y_i}{c-b} + \frac{c}{c-b} & b \leq y_i < c \\ 0 & x_i < a \cup y_i \geq c \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where a, c, b are percentiles estimated with via the bootstrap over a series of fuzzy latent poverty states (see [21] for more details).

3.1.4 Belhadj (2014)

[22] suggest the following trapezoidal membership function

$$\mu(y_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & y_i < z_1 \\ \mu_1 = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{y_i - z_1}{z_1} \right)^\beta & z_1 \leq y_i < z^* \\ \mu_2 = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{z_2 - y_i}{z_2} \right)^\beta & z^* \leq y_i < z_2 \\ 0 & y_i \geq z_2 \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where z^* is the flex point of μ and β is a shape parameter ruling the degree of convexity of the function. In particular, when $\beta = 1$ the trend is linear.

3.1.5 Chakravarty (2019)

Finally, Chakravarty (2019) presents five important properties that should be fulfilled by a membership function when defining a fuzzy poverty index that are Homogeneity of Degree Zero, Linear Decreasingness, Continuity, Maximality, and Independence of Non-meager Attribute Quantities. On the basis of such axioms the author suggests the following triangular membership function:

$$\mu(y_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & y_i = 0 \\ \frac{z_2 - y_i}{z_2} & 0 \leq y_i < z_2 \\ 0 & y_i \geq z_2 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Note as, again, the membership function defined by Chakravarty (2019) can be viewed as a special case of the Equation 1 for $z_1 = 0$.

3.2 Distribution based membership functions

3.2.1 Cheli and Lemmi (1995)

Alongside to the distance based membership function there are the distribution based membership function at which belongs the indicators defined by [15]. The authors proposed the ‘‘Totally Fuzzy and Relative’’ (TFR) approach defining the membership function for a monetary variable as:

$$\mu(y_i) = (1 - F_Y(y_i))^\alpha \quad (6)$$

where F_Y is the cumulative distribution function of Y calculated for the i -th individual. The parameter $\alpha \geq 1$ is chosen so that the average fuzzy measure equals the traditional head count ratio for the overall population.

3.2.2 Betti and Verma (1999)

Starting from TFR approach, [23] suggested to replace the cumulative distribution function of (Y) with the Lorenz curve (L) obtaining

$$\mu(y_i) = (1 - L_Y(y_i))^{\alpha-1} = \left(\frac{\sum_j w_j y_j | y_j > y_i}{\sum_j w_j y_j | y_j > y_1} \right)^{\alpha-1} \quad (7)$$

The parameter $\alpha \geq 1$, as before, is chosen so that the average fuzzy measure equals the traditional head count ratio for the overall population.

3.2.3 Betti et al. (2006)

Based on the TFR approach, [24] take into account both the proportion of individuals less poor than the person concerned, $(1 - F_Y(y_i))$, and the share of the total equivalised income received by all individuals less poor than the person concerned to propose the following membership function

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(y_i) &= (1 - F_Y(y_i))^{\alpha-1} (1 - L_Y(y_i)) = \\ &= \left(\frac{\sum_j w_j |y_j > y_i}{\sum_j w_j |y_j > y_1} \right)^{\alpha-1} \left(\frac{\sum_j w_j y_j |y_j > y_i}{\sum_j w_j y_j |y_j > y_1} \right)\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

where w_i is the sampling weight of statistical unit i and α is computed as before.

3.3 A further distinction between membership function: the economical perspective

A well-known classical economical classification divided index in two large sets of positive and normative indices. Positive indices are those ones with a completely objective definition (e.g. Theil index, Gini index...) On the other hand, indices are defined as normative if their definition is somewhere subjective (e.g. Atkinson index). This distinction, in our view, can be used for fuzzy indices, as well. As seen so far every single membership function has at least one parameters to be defined but not all of them have a mathematical algorithm to be defined and have to be chosen by the researcher.

Positive indices Equation 1 in the special case in which ($z_1 = \min(y_i)$) and ($z_2 = \max(y_i)$). Equation 6, Equation 7, and Equation 8 in all those cases the parameter (α) is chosen according so that the expected value of the membership function equals the head count ratio (i.e. the proportion of poor). Equation 3 as noted before the Zedini and Belhadj (2015) membership function have three different parameters a,b and c to be estimated through bootstrap techniques. Authors suggests to create a set of 100 membership function corresponding to 100 fuzzy sets. The first membership function will have $a=0$, $b = \hat{p}_1$ and $c = \hat{p}_2$; where \hat{p}_1 and \hat{p}_2 are, respectively, the bootstrap estimates of the first and second percentiles of the poverty predicate variable. For the membership function from 2 to 99 they suggest to use $a = \hat{p}_{j-1}$, $b = \hat{p}_j$ and $c = \hat{p}_{j+1}$ with $j = 2, \dots, 99$. The last membership function for $j = 100$ is defined with $a = \hat{p}_{99}$, $b = 0.5(\hat{p}_{99} + \hat{p}_{100})$ and $c = \hat{p}_{100}$. The final membership function is then obtained on the basis of the cardinality (presented in the previous section) approach and the divisive hierarchical algorithm.

Normative indices All the others (Equation 1, Equation 4 and Equation 5) are normative indices and, in our view only the index Equation 2 deserve for further attention. Authors, in this case suggests to set the values of (z_{min}) equal to:

$$z_{min} = (2 - \alpha)z^f$$

where α is the expected non-food shares of households, z^f is the food poverty line while the value of z_{max} correspond to the level of the total consumption per capita necessary so that the households can satisfy their basic food needs without sacrifice. This poverty line can be obtained by an iterative algorithm. Note as [20] allow the use of z_{min} and z_{max} specific by area. However, those thresholds require to the researcher to define the value for which households can satisfy their basic food needs without sacrifice. For this reasons we prefer to consider this index as normative index. In addition, given that the the membership function is defined exactly as for Equation 1 and that for this index we analyze a number of different thresholds we consider the two indices as the same one.

4 Simulation set-up: mean squared errors estimators, data, and measures of performance.

In order to estimate the mean squared error of a sample statistic the jackknife repeated replications and the bootstrap are two widely used tools in sample surveys. The main difference between those two is that the first one is definable only if all the sample information are available, e.g. primary selection unity and strata, while the second one is a simplified version which doesn't necessarily need the sampling information.

4.1 Non-parametric Bootstrap

The bootstrap is probably the most known re-sampling method to estimate the variance of a statistic. There are many extensions and variants of the bootstrap, which can be divide into parametric and non-parametric bootstrap. We focus on the non-parametric version of the bootstrap, which is the one that it is also provided with the excellent R-package Laeken ([7]). The procedure consists in sampling with replacement R samples of size M, then, for each bootstrap sample calculate a given statistic S_r . The variance of the bootstrap replicates is then used as an estimate of the unknown variance of the statistic of interest. The bootstrap variance estimator is based on the idea that the inference about a population from sample data an be modeled by re-sampling the sample data and performing inference about a sample from re-sampled data.

4.2 Jackknife Repeated Replications

Jackknife repeated replication provides a versatile and straightforward computational technique for variance estimation. Sometimes, the survey may be designed so that there exists information on strata, primary sampling units, and computational units. In this situation, the jackknife approach may be an invaluable tool to estimate the variance of a given sampling statistic.

[8] have extended this method for estimating variances for sub-populations (including regions and other geographical domains), longitudinal measures - such as persistent poverty rates and measures of net changes - and averages over cross-sections in rotational panel designs and also to fuzzy poverty measures. In the standard delete one-primary sampling unit (PSU) at a time Jackknife' version, each replicate is formed by eliminating one sample PSU from a particular stratum at a time and increasing the weight of the remaining sample PSU's in that stratum appropriately so as to obtain an alternative but equally valid estimate to that obtained from the full sample. Briefly, the standard jackknifing involves the following. Let S be a full-sample estimate of any complexity. We use the subscript i to indicate a sample PSU and h to indicate its stratum; $a \geq 2$ is the number of PSUs in stratum h .

Let $S_{(hi)}$ the estimate produced using the same procedure after eliminating primary unit i in stratum h and increasing the weight of the remaining $a_h - 1$ units in the stratum by an appropriate factor g_h . Let $S_{(h)}$ be the simple average of the $S_{(hi)}$ over the a_h sample units in h . The variance of S is then estimated as:

$$var(S) = \sum_h \left[(1 - f_h) \times \sum_i g_{(hi)} (S_{(hi)} - S_{(h)})^2 \right]$$

where $(1 - f_h)$ is the finite population correction, and it is approximately equal to 1 for samples in typical social surveys. While one may take factor $g_{(hi)}$ to be independent of the particular i in a given stratum h , [25] propose to use:

$$g_{(hi)} = \frac{a_h}{(a_h - 1)}$$

where $w_h = \sum_i w_{hi}$, with $w_{hi} = \sum_j w_{hij}$ as the sum of sample weights of ultimate units j in primary selection units i . This means that in each replication h_i , the weights for individual units are redefined and re-scaled as follows:

$$w_{hij}^1 = \begin{cases} w_{hij} & j \notin h \\ g_{(hi)} \times w_{hij} & j \in h, j \notin i \\ 0 & j \in h, j \in i \end{cases}$$

$g_{(hi)}$ is in line with the jackknife variance estimation for unequal probability sampling proposed by [26]. [8] introduce the following factor: $\left(1 - \frac{w_{hi}}{w_h}\right)$ as a correction factor for unequal probabilities, ‘reducing the contribution of observations which have higher π_i values (selection probabilities) and thus make smaller contributions to variance’. The inverse of this correction to selection probability is the corresponding correction to weight g_{hi} .

4.3 Data and measures of performance

In order to compare all the fuzzy approaches introduced in Section 3, we explore two different scenarios by means of two different simulations. The two simulations share the same population \mathcal{P} . In order to avoid as much as possible the results to be dependent from authors’ source code, the population that we use is simulated using the R package `simPop` ([27]). We remind the reader to the package for full details on the simulation process although, in brief, the procedure uses a real sample of individuals¹ and reconstructs a synthetic population of individuals that have generated that sample. It starts by applying iterative proportional fitting ([28]) to obtain a calibrated survey sample from the observed sample, then through replications and statistical models for categorical variables it estimates a joint model of the variables in the survey and eventually it generates a synthetic population using simulated annealing. Once that we have the synthetic monetary measure in the population (i.e. the equivalised disposable income) we set up the two different scenarios.

The first scenario is that of a survey where the sample is selected following a simple random sampling without replacement scheme. This scenario is denominated as ‘‘SRS’’. The second scenario that we investigate is that of a more complex survey design that involves the definition of strata and primary sampling units mimic the usual sampling scheme used by Eurostat for the EU-SILC or HBS. As strata we use the NUTS 2 area while as PSUs the households ID. This scenario is denominated as ‘‘Complex’’.

Table 1 reports the sample size (n) for each area in the two scenarios and the size of the population (N). The sampling fraction is approximately 1% for each of the two scenarios

Table 1 – Sampled units under the two scenarios and corresponding population units

Area	n_{SRS}	$n_{Complex}$	N
Burgenland	33	6	2905
Carinthia	77	55	5546
Lower Austria	176	157	16232
Salzburg	113	124	14262
Styria	43	48	5344
Tyrol	110	128	12107
Upper Austria	65	100	7219
Vienna	162	187	17686
Vorarlberg	42	3	3756
Total	821	808	85057

We calculate for each individual in each sample his membership function according to the different functions that we outlined in Section 3. For the membership functions that require parameters to be

¹The package uses an anonymised version of the Austrian EU-SILC survey ([7])

specified we set arbitrarily (and without loss of generality) the parameters to some quantiles of the population distribution (see Table 2).

Table 2 – Membership functions and parameter settings in synthetic population (Y_p denotes the p -th quantile of the empirical distribution of Y).

Function	Parameters	Values
Belhadj (2015)	z_1	$Y_{0.01}$
	z_2	$Y_{0.99}$
	β	2
Cerioli and Zani (1990)	z_1	$Y_{0.001}$
	z_2	$Y_{0.99}$
Chakravarty (2019)	z_2	$Y_{0.50}$
Cheli and Lemmi (1995)	α	$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} 1(y_i \leq \tau)$
Betti and Verma (1999)	α	$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} 1(y_i \leq \tau)$
Betti et. al., (2006)	α	$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}} 1(y_i \leq \tau)$

A key fact that is important to remark here is that the comparison over all indices is done taking the average of the membership functions over the population as the true value. Therefore, the corresponding sample statistic that we consider is

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \times w_i \quad (9)$$

However, it is often the case that rather than estimating a value for the whole population, the interest is in producing estimates for given sub-domains². Therefore, Let H_{j^*} be the true area parameter in the j^* -th area and $\hat{H}_{j^*_t}$ its estimate in replicate ($t = 1, \dots, T$, with $T = 500$) using one of the previous defined fuzzy membership functions.

We evaluate each fuzzy approach in terms of bias, mean squared error and coefficient of variation. Let us start from the bias of the estimates. For each area the bias is defined as:

$$Bias_{j^*} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{H}_{j^*_t} - H_{j^*})$$

To evaluate the reliability of the estimates we use the Coefficient of Variation (CV) and the Coefficient of Variation of the Second order (CV_2), a robustified version of CV ([29]) which rely on the $([0, 1])$ interval. For the generic area j^* they are defined as:

$$CV_{j^*} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{MSE}(\hat{H}_{j^*_t})}}{\hat{H}_{j^*_t}} \quad (10)$$

$$CV_2_{j^*} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{CV_{j^*}^2}{1 + CV_{j^*}^2} \right)} \quad (11)$$

where $\widehat{MSE}(\hat{H}_{j^*_t})$ is the estimated Mean Square Error at the replicate t for the area j^* .

To evaluate the two variance procedures we also compare: Average True Mean Square Error (ATMSE), Average Estimated Mean Square Error (AEMSE) reporting also the bias of the MSE (BMSE)

²Sub-domains need not necessarily be geographical areas, even though it is was we explore in this paper.

$$ATMSE = \frac{1}{J^*} \sum_{j^*=1}^{J^*} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\widehat{H}_{j^*t} - H_{j^*t} \right)^2 \right\} \quad (12)$$

$$AEMSE = \frac{1}{J^*} \sum_{j^*=1}^{J^*} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{MSE}(\widehat{H}_{j^*t}) \right\} \quad (13)$$

$$BMSE = \frac{1}{J^*} \sum_{j^*=1}^{J^*} \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\widehat{MSE}(\widehat{H}_{j^*t}) - MSE(H_{j^*t}) \right) \right\} \quad (14)$$

where $MSE(H_{j^*t})$ is the true Mean Square Error at the replicate t .

5 Results

This section reports the results from our simulations separately for a simple random sampling of units of the synthetic population and for a complex sampling of the same units. For the first case, we report only estimates of mean squared error that use the bootstrap as the jackknife is designed to work with more complex designs.

5.1 Simple random sampling design

Table 3 reports the values of bias, CV and CV2 for all the areas and at national level for all the indices. We notice that regardless of the membership function considered each estimator is unbiased, or at least, the amount of the estimated bias is negligible. This is not a surprising results as we are considering estimator of the kind seen in Equation 9. Being unbiased estimators, we may proceed on by discussing the variance rather than using the more comprehensive definition of mean squared error. However, to keep consistency we shall keep on referring to the mean squared error.

As is possible to appreciate the bias is also very low in every areas, i.e. with every sample size, and for each indices. Figure 1 shows that even for the smaller domains the estimators are approximately unbiased. The major insights that emerge from the picture is that using Equation 1 the bias, although extremely contained is always negative, while for three distributional indices the figures are almost identical. Moving to the reliability of the estimates we note that CV (Figure 2) and CV2 decrease as the sample size increase. The CV2 which, in our view, is more interpretable tends to be quite high (> 0.16) only when the sample size is lower than 50. In particular, the [19] index is the ones with the lowest CV2, always (< 0.06) while [21] is that with the highest value. The distribution based indices performs almost identically both in terms of bias, CV and CV2. In the end, the Chackravarty (2019) index although based on an axiomatic approach, it attain slightly worse results in terms of CV and CV2.

Table 3 – SRS simulation: Bias, Coefficient of Variation, Coefficient of Variation of second order

n_i	Belhadj (2014)	Ceroli and Zani (1999)	Chacravarty (2019)	Cheli and Lemmi (1995)	Betti and Verma (1999)	Betti et. al (2006)	Zedini and Belhadj (2015)
Bias							
33	0.0014	-0.0013	0.0005	-0.0002	-0.0002	-0.0006	-0.0685
42	0.0027	-0.0021	0.0000	-0.0012	-0.0012	-0.0018	-0.2522
43	-0.0000	-0.0008	0.0001	-0.0003	-0.0003	-0.0005	-0.1354
65	0.0014	-0.0016	0.0007	0.0006	0.0006	0.0008	-0.0347
77	0.0009	-0.0027	0.0017	0.0015	0.0015	0.0018	-0.0735
110	0.0005	-0.0020	0.0012	0.0011	0.0011	0.0012	0.0067
113	-0.0009	-0.0024	-0.0006	-0.0009	-0.0009	-0.0009	-0.0046
167	0.0012	-0.0024	-0.0001	-0.0003	-0.0003	-0.0003	-0.0548
176	0.0011	-0.0026	-0.0001	-0.0003	-0.0003	-0.0002	0.0079
821	0.0015	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	< 0.0001
CV							
33	0.1074	0.0450	0.1559	0.1607	0.1629	0.1791	0.4078
42	0.1145	0.0543	0.1494	0.1543	0.1557	0.1698	0.3243
43	0.0864	0.0355	0.1252	0.1277	0.1289	0.1432	0.3154
65	0.0820	0.0356	0.1335	0.1374	0.1391	0.1560	0.3191
77	0.0785	0.0342	0.1155	0.1170	0.1184	0.1322	0.2589
110	0.0598	0.0254	0.1014	0.0998	0.1011	0.1147	0.2621
113	0.0524	0.0237	0.0859	0.0838	0.0849	0.0957	0.2144
167	0.0496	0.0206	0.0692	0.0651	0.0658	0.0737	0.1500
176	0.0491	0.0204	0.0657	0.0600	0.0608	0.0679	0.1478
821	0.0220	0.0094	0.0323	0.0032	0.0034	0.0155	0.0164
CV2							
33	0.1068	0.0449	0.1540	0.1587	0.1608	0.1763	0.3776
42	0.1138	0.0543	0.1478	0.1525	0.1538	0.1674	0.3085
43	0.0861	0.0355	0.1242	0.1266	0.1278	0.1417	0.3008
65	0.0817	0.0356	0.1323	0.1361	0.1377	0.1541	0.3040
77	0.0782	0.0342	0.1147	0.1162	0.1176	0.1311	0.2507
110	0.0597	0.0253	0.1009	0.0993	0.1005	0.1139	0.2535
113	0.0523	0.0237	0.0856	0.0835	0.0846	0.0952	0.2096
167	0.0495	0.0206	0.0691	0.0650	0.0656	0.0735	0.1483
176	0.0490	0.0204	0.0655	0.0599	0.0606	0.0678	0.1463
821	0.0219	0.0094	0.0323	0.0032	0.0034	0.0155	0.0163

Figure 1 – SRS simulation: Bias of fuzzy indicators at area level. Areas sorted by increasing sample size





Figure 2 – SRS simulation: Coefficient of Variation of fuzzy indices at area level. Areas sorted by increasing sample size



Moving to the MSE estimation, Table 4 reports the values of the ATMSE, AEMSE and the ABMSE. Values for each areas of the ABMSE are reported in Figure 3. Not surprisingly the non-parametric bootstrap estimates have an ABMSE that approaches zero as the sample size increases. In general the values of the ATMSE is very similar to the ones of the ABMSE for every estimators. There are not remarkable difference in the performance of the bootstrap estimator between one index and another.


We also notice that for those areas that have low sample size (< 50) the variance is overestimated for all the index except that for one single area for the index defined by Zedini and Belhadj (2015). This is not necessarily a problem as the overestimation of variance can be considered as conservative. In the next paragraph, with the complex design simulation, we will verify what happens if the sample size is even lower and, in case of higher variability we will suggest ad-hoc methods to estimates those quantities in a reliable way.

Table 4 – SRS simulation: ATMSE, AEMSE and ABMSE.

n_i	Belhadj (2014)	Ceroli and Zani (1999)	Chacravarty (2019)	Cheli and Lemmi (1995)	Betti and Verma (1999)	Betti et. al (2006)	Zedini and Belhadj (2015)
ATMSE							
33	2.039E-06	1.621E-06	2.307E-07	3.956E-08	5.009E-08	3.385E-07	4.695E-03
42	7.089E-06	4.244E-06	2.489E-10	1.442E-06	1.557E-06	3.326E-06	6.361E-02
43	1.326E-09	5.782E-07	4.584E-09	1.051E-07	1.157E-07	2.676E-07	1.833E-02
65	1.976E-06	2.594E-06	5.131E-07	3.744E-07	3.920E-07	5.846E-07	1.204E-03
77	7.690E-07	7.426E-06	2.869E-06	2.104E-06	2.220E-06	3.221E-06	5.403E-03
110	2.230E-07	3.896E-06	1.389E-06	1.171E-06	1.188E-06	1.467E-06	4.502E-05
113	7.399E-07	5.966E-06	3.073E-07	7.268E-07	7.374E-07	7.462E-07	2.101E-05
167	1.466E-06	5.704E-06	3.239E-09	1.057E-07	1.062E-07	1.059E-07	3.007E-03
176	1.147E-06	6.649E-06	1.378E-08	1.222E-07	1.141E-07	5.382E-08	6.295E-05
821	2.186E-06	8.283E-08	4.468E-09	1.945E-07	1.943E-07	1.945E-07	1.914E-06
AEMSE							
33	4.181E-04	7.146E-04	9.198E-04	1.086E-03	1.119E-03	1.386E-03	1.366E-01
42	4.050E-04	8.389E-04	7.075E-04	8.273E-04	8.448E-04	1.033E-03	1.208E-01
43	2.416E-04	4.087E-04	4.606E-04	5.203E-04	5.303E-04	6.518E-04	8.858E-02
65	1.734E-04	3.753E-04	3.750E-04	4.256E-04	4.343E-04	5.294E-04	7.960E-02
77	1.747E-04	3.440E-04	3.271E-04	3.642E-04	3.720E-04	4.571E-04	6.644E-02
110	8.086E-05	1.740E-04	1.607E-04	1.695E-04	1.728E-04	2.122E-04	3.658E-02
113	6.699E-05	1.584E-04	1.440E-04	1.481E-04	1.517E-04	1.869E-04	3.111E-02
167	8.587E-05	1.409E-04	1.632E-04	1.589E-04	1.624E-04	2.065E-04	2.439E-02
176	8.784E-05	1.381E-04	1.590E-04	1.480E-04	1.524E-04	1.963E-04	1.637E-02
821	1.460E-05	2.740E-05	2.811E-05	2.948E-07	3.442E-07	7.102E-06	4.102E-04
ABMSE							
33	0.0004	0.0007	0.0009	0.0011	0.0011	0.0014	0.1319
42	0.0004	0.0008	0.0007	0.0008	0.0008	0.0010	0.0572
43	0.0002	0.0004	0.0005	0.0005	0.0005	0.0007	0.0702
65	0.0002	0.0004	0.0004	0.0004	0.0004	0.0005	0.0784
77	0.0002	0.0003	0.0003	0.0004	0.0004	0.0005	0.0610
110	0.0001	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0365
113	0.0001	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002	0.0002	0.0311
167	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0002	0.0214
176	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002	0.0001	0.0002	0.0002	0.0163
821	1.241E-05	2.732E-05	2.810E-05	1.001E-07	1.498E-07	6.900E-06	0.0013

The mean squared error is contained for each method considered with values that are very close to zero. However, what is more important in sample surveys is the coefficient of variation of the estimates obtained. In fact, estimates from sample survey are usually considered reliable depending on how much is low/high coefficient of variation. [30] set as upper limit for the publication a CV equal to 0.166 which we draw in the Figure 2. In this case, we see that the indices that use the membership functions Equation 4 and Equation 5 are those that have higher CV but still can be estimated with high accuracy.

Figure 3 – SRS simulation: Bias of MSE estimator for the fuzzy indicators at area level. Areas sorted by increasing sample size



Regarding the estimation of the mean squared errors Figure 3 shows that - not surprisingly - this approaches zero as the sample size increases. We also notice that for those areas that have low sample size, i.e. < 50 , the variance is overestimated. This is not necessarily a problem as the overestimation of variance can be considered as conservative.

Figure 2 compares the coefficient of variation of each method and suggest that the method by [19] is the one that is estimated with higher accuracy (less than 20%). Other methods tend to be estimated with higher CVs especially for small areas. This means that from an official statistics perspective these estimates would not be publishable. However, we should keep in mind that the results above show that these high CVs may be an outcome of an over-estimation of the variance.

5.2 Complex-design

We repeat the same analysis show above assuming that the survey is carried out via a complex sampling design. We report results either for the bootstrap and jackknife estimators of the variance. The main point is to understand if the knowledge of the sample scheme, mandatory for the jackknife estimator, is necessary to obtain reliable estimates or if, is enough, to perform a faster and easier non-parametric bootstrap. As previously done we will start discussing the bias of the estimates, after which we will concentrate on the MSE estimation.

Table 5 reports the value of Bias, CV and CV2. Again, also in this scenario, the bias is very low for every index and clearly tends to 0 if the sample size increase (Figure 4). Two indices deserve for more attention. The Cerioli and Zani (1999) it is not always negative biased as in the previous simulation. Zedini and Belhadj (2015) is the index most affected by the sample size. This index tends to be unbiased with quite high sample size, i.e. > 50 , but can be severally biased for small sample size.

In this case, having to compare two different estimators for the MSE we have reported in Figure 5

both the CV for the bootstrap and for jackknife. Speaking, for the moment, only about the variability we note that the two MSE estimators are almost identical in the trends, as confirmed also by the CV2 reported in the table, but the jackknife estimates are greater than the ones obtained with the bootstrap. From Figure 5 it is, however, important to come to other two conclusions. First of all, the CV (CV2) becomes lower if the sample size increase for every estimator and that the Cerioli and Zani (1999) estimator is the one with the lowest CV. Again, as previously said, the Chackravarty (2019) performs very similar to the distribution based indices and worst than the Belhadj (2014) one.

Table 5 – Complex simulation: Bias, Coefficient of Variation and Coefficient of Variation of second order distinguished for bootstrap and jackknife estimates.

n_i	Belhadj (2014)	Ceroli and Zani (1999)	Chacravarty (2019)	Cheli and Lemmi (1995)	Betti and Verma (1999)	Betti et. al (2006)	Zedini and Belhadj (2015)
Bias							
3	0.0065	-0.0115	0.0069	-0.0204	-0.0205	-0.0200	-0.9905
6	0.0324	0.0171	0.0411	0.0218	0.0220	0.0248	-0.6502
48	0.0007	-0.0044	0.0021	-0.0038	-0.0038	-0.0034	-0.2339
55	-0.0014	-0.0067	-0.0042	-0.0090	-0.0090	-0.0095	-0.1120
100	0.0004	-0.0059	0.0018	-0.0021	-0.0020	-0.0013	-0.1352
124	-0.0002	-0.0060	-0.0003	-0.0039	-0.0039	-0.0037	-0.0087
128	-0.0013	-0.0077	-0.0025	-0.0061	-0.0061	-0.0064	-0.0245
157	0.0049	0.0007	0.0045	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	-0.0839
187	0.0043	-0.0018	0.0029	-0.0024	-0.0024	-0.0025	-0.0203
808	0.0028	-0.0030	-0.0013	-0.0032	-0.0033	-0.0032	-0.0016
CV-Bootstrap							
3	0.4154	0.1921	0.4971	0.5649	0.5711	0.6189	2.5906
6	0.4014	0.1478	0.4427	0.5054	0.5085	0.5560	2.6096
48	0.1568	0.0630	0.2184	0.2289	0.2303	0.2540	0.5860
55	0.1257	0.0529	0.2008	0.2147	0.2166	0.2412	0.5362
100	0.1094	0.0477	0.1584	0.1685	0.1701	0.1867	0.3937
124	0.0804	0.0355	0.1269	0.1314	0.1325	0.1459	0.3306
128	0.0917	0.0381	0.1527	0.1581	0.1598	0.1784	0.4139
157	0.0745	0.0303	0.1005	0.1018	0.1027	0.1120	0.2357
187	0.0762	0.0313	0.0987	0.0975	0.0983	0.1071	0.2379
808	0.0420	0.0175	0.0595	0.0136	0.0132	0.0282	0.0569
CV-Jackknife							
3	1.7850	0.8024	2.1429	2.1684	2.1909	2.4199	14.7225
6	1.5131	0.5889	1.7172	1.7858	1.8055	2.0024	13.3466
48	0.2833	0.1232	0.4057	0.4372	0.4409	0.4791	1.7672
55	0.2142	0.1015	0.3704	0.4138	0.4174	0.4569	1.7402
100	0.1911	0.0899	0.2927	0.3355	0.3376	0.3638	1.2483
124	0.1302	0.0660	0.2135	0.2595	0.2598	0.2692	1.0694
128	0.1475	0.0718	0.2563	0.2967	0.2981	0.3169	1.2728
157	0.1285	0.0552	0.1815	0.2173	0.2174	0.2268	0.7200
187	0.1309	0.0517	0.1680	0.2043	0.2041	0.2100	0.6439
808	0.1151	0.0473	0.1592	0.0232	0.0212	0.0740	0.0892
CV2-Bootstrap							
3	0.3836	0.1886	0.4452	0.4918	0.4959	0.5262	0.9329
6	0.3725	0.1462	0.4048	0.4510	0.4533	0.4860	0.9338
48	0.1549	0.0629	0.2133	0.2231	0.2245	0.2462	0.5056
55	0.1247	0.0528	0.1968	0.2099	0.2117	0.2345	0.4726
100	0.1087	0.0476	0.1564	0.1662	0.1677	0.1836	0.3663
124	0.0801	0.0354	0.1259	0.1303	0.1314	0.1443	0.3139
128	0.0913	0.0380	0.1510	0.1561	0.1578	0.1756	0.3825
157	0.0743	0.0303	0.1000	0.1013	0.1022	0.1113	0.2294
187	0.0760	0.0313	0.0982	0.0970	0.0978	0.1065	0.2314
808	0.0419	0.0175	0.0593	0.0136	0.0132	0.0282	0.0543
CV2-Jackknife							
3	0.8724	0.6258	0.9062	0.9081	0.9097	0.9242	0.9977
6	0.8343	0.5075	0.8641	0.8725	0.8748	0.8946	0.9972
48	0.2726	0.1223	0.3760	0.4006	0.4034	0.4321	0.8703
55	0.2094	0.1010	0.3474	0.3824	0.3852	0.4156	0.8670
100	0.1877	0.0896	0.2809	0.3181	0.3199	0.3419	0.7805
124	0.1291	0.0658	0.2088	0.2512	0.2515	0.2600	0.7304
128	0.1460	0.0716	0.2482	0.2845	0.2857	0.3021	0.7863
157	0.1275	0.0551	0.1785	0.2123	0.2125	0.2212	0.5843
187	0.1298	0.0516	0.1656	0.2002	0.2000	0.2055	0.5414
808	0.1149	0.0472	0.1573	0.0226	0.0212	0.0738	0.0792

Figure 4 – Complex simulation: Bias of fuzzy indicators at area level. Areas sorted by increasing sample size





Figure 5 – Complex simulation: Coefficient of Variation for each index at area level. Areas sorted by increasing sample size




Eventually, we investigate empirically whether one of the two estimators considered (i.e. jackknife or bootstrap) is to be preferred over the other. Table 6 reports the values of ATMSE, AEMSE and ABMSE for every index and for each estimator. Figure 6 reports the Bias of the MSE estimators for each area. It is evident that with a sample size higher than 50 the two estimators performs almost identically for every index. The differences between the two are, therefore, to be found for those areas where the number is very low. In this situation, the bootstrap seems to perform better than the jackknife.

Table 6 – Complex simulation: ATMSE, AEMSE and ATMSE distinguished for bootstrap and jack-knife estimates.

n_i	Belhadj (2014)	Ceroli and Zani (1999)	Chacravarty (2019)	Cheli and Lemmi (1995)	Betti and Verma (1999)	Betti et. al (2006)	Zedini and Belhadj (2015)
ATMSE							
3	4.186E-05	1.315E-04	4.753E-05	4.171E-04	4.188E-04	3.989E-04	9.810E-01
6	1.051E-03	2.930E-04	1.692E-03	4.735E-04	4.847E-04	6.148E-04	4.228E-01
48	4.303E-07	1.923E-05	4.351E-06	1.448E-05	1.426E-05	1.133E-05	5.473E-02
55	1.849E-06	4.450E-05	1.770E-05	8.059E-05	8.133E-05	9.018E-05	1.254E-02
100	1.347E-07	3.524E-05	3.374E-06	4.345E-06	4.054E-06	1.740E-06	1.829E-02
124	2.862E-08	3.574E-05	9.058E-08	1.526E-05	1.507E-05	1.334E-05	7.606E-05
128	1.799E-06	5.899E-05	6.247E-06	3.711E-05	3.747E-05	4.096E-05	6.018E-04
157	2.429E-05	5.453E-07	1.984E-05	8.905E-08	1.048E-07	1.032E-07	7.037E-03
187	1.860E-05	3.279E-06	8.294E-06	5.851E-06	5.827E-06	6.439E-06	4.127E-04
808	8.078E-06	9.161E-06	1.720E-06	1.079E-05	1.079E-05	1.079E-05	1.021E-04
AEMSE-Bootstrap							
3	5.563E-03	1.011E-02	8.446E-03	8.914E-03	9.148E-03	1.122E-02	7.467E-01
6	7.901E-03	8.194E-03	1.084E-02	1.316E-02	1.339E-02	1.682E-02	7.176E-01
48	8.008E-04	1.269E-03	1.434E-03	1.608E-03	1.629E-03	1.985E-03	2.454E-01
55	3.936E-04	8.117E-04	7.921E-04	9.101E-04	9.228E-04	1.096E-03	1.872E-01
100	3.374E-04	6.618E-04	6.164E-04	7.227E-04	7.354E-04	8.768E-04	1.351E-01
124	1.591E-04	3.512E-04	3.152E-04	3.491E-04	3.541E-04	4.179E-04	7.326E-02
128	1.856E-04	3.837E-04	3.433E-04	3.799E-04	3.857E-04	4.539E-04	8.362E-02
157	2.015E-04	3.083E-04	3.610E-04	3.909E-04	3.988E-04	4.803E-04	5.692E-02
187	2.192E-04	3.250E-04	3.703E-04	3.828E-04	3.907E-04	4.774E-04	3.965E-02
808	5.431E-05	9.437E-05	9.381E-05	5.342E-06	5.000E-06	2.271E-05	1.901E-04
AEMSE-Jackknife							
3	1.027E-01	1.765E-01	1.569E-01	1.314E-01	1.347E-01	1.715E-01	2.412E+01
6	1.123E-01	1.301E-01	1.632E-01	1.643E-01	1.688E-01	2.181E-01	1.877E+01
48	2.615E-03	4.852E-03	4.952E-03	5.867E-03	5.968E-03	7.065E-03	2.231E+00
55	1.143E-03	2.988E-03	2.696E-03	3.381E-03	3.427E-03	3.933E-03	1.972E+00
100	1.030E-03	2.353E-03	2.105E-03	2.865E-03	2.898E-03	3.327E-03	1.359E+00
124	4.177E-04	1.215E-03	8.922E-04	1.362E-03	1.361E-03	1.423E-03	7.664E-01
128	4.803E-04	1.365E-03	9.663E-04	1.338E-03	1.341E-03	1.433E-03	7.907E-01
157	5.996E-04	1.022E-03	1.176E-03	1.780E-03	1.786E-03	1.968E-03	5.312E-01
187	6.472E-04	8.861E-04	1.072E-03	1.683E-03	1.685E-03	1.835E-03	2.906E-01
808	0.0004	0.0006	0.0006	1.5440E-05	1.2858E-05	1.2583E-05	2.002E-04
ABMSE-Bootstrap							
3	0.0055	0.0100	0.0084	0.0085	0.0087	0.0108	-0.2343
6	0.0068	0.0079	0.0092	0.0127	0.0129	0.0162	0.2948
48	0.0008	0.0012	0.0014	0.0016	0.0016	0.0020	0.1906
55	0.0004	0.0008	0.0008	0.0008	0.0008	0.0010	0.1747
100	0.0003	0.0006	0.0006	0.0007	0.0007	0.0009	0.1168
124	0.0002	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0004	0.0732
128	0.0002	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0003	0.0004	0.0830
157	0.0002	0.0003	0.0003	0.0004	0.0004	0.0005	0.0499
187	0.0002	0.0003	0.0004	0.0004	0.0004	0.0005	0.0392
808	4.624E-05	8.521E-05	9.209E-05	-5.454E-06	-5.794E-06	1.192E-05	1.010E-06
ABMSE-Jackkife							
3	0.1027	0.1764	0.1569	0.1309	0.1342	0.1711	23.1356
6	0.1112	0.1299	0.1615	0.1638	0.1683	0.2175	18.3474
48	0.0026	0.0048	0.0049	0.0059	0.0060	0.0071	2.1764
55	0.0011	0.0029	0.0027	0.0033	0.0033	0.0038	1.9591
100	0.0010	0.0023	0.0021	0.0029	0.0029	0.0033	1.3403
124	0.0004	0.0012	0.0009	0.0013	0.0013	0.0014	0.7664
128	0.0005	0.0013	0.0010	0.0013	0.0013	0.0014	0.7901
157	0.0006	0.0010	0.0012	0.0018	0.0018	0.0020	0.5242
187	0.0006	0.0009	0.0011	0.0017	0.0017	0.0018	0.2902
808	0.0004	0.0006	0.0006	1.5440E-05	1.285E-05	1.241Ee-05	1.102E-05

Figure 6 – Complex simulation: Bias MSE estimator for each index at area level ● bootstrap and ▲ jackknife. Areas sorted by increasing sample size



In those specific areas both the estimators tend, to overestimate the variance but the bootstrap performs better than the jackknife. The bootstrap is in-fact able to reduce almost to 0 the bias of the MSE also when the sample size is lower than 10. It is important to note that low sample size sub-domains should always be considered in this type of analysis. In fact, going back to what has been said above and to the results in Figure 5 we conclude that the bootstrap estimator of the MSE is to be preferred over the jackknife when the sample size is very low although for a size < 10 the estimates remain un-publishable (according with [30]) and specific small area estimation models should be considered.

5.3 Computational times

Here we will compare the effect of the two design over the obtained estimates comparing computational times. As shown previously the non-parametric bootstrap seems to perform better than the jackknife and this is also confirmed by the computational times. Table 7, in-fact, reports the computational times for both the designs. In particular reports the mean time needed to estimate MSE over the simulations' cycles. It is also reported the mean time useful to compute the national the MSE without considering sub-areas, that is, without requiring the algorithm to the split the population.

Times shows as, both the MSE estimator, are quite fast. Bootstrap is always faster than the jackknife, as expected. The distribution based estimator and the Zedini and Belhadj (2015) one are quite slower than the other because at each single loop of the MSE estimator need to rearrange the sample to compute the probability density function (distribution based) or to perform a bootstrap to obtain the value of a,b and c (Zedini and Belhadj, 2015). If sub-areas are not consider the computational times are considerably lower. Given the previous considerations and the computational times we believe that the the bootstrap is to be preferred to the jackknife in every situation.

Table 7 – Computational times (Seconds)

	Belhadj (2014)	Cerioli and Zani (1999)	Chacravarty (2019)	Cheli and Lemmi (1995)	Betti and Verma (1999)	Betti et. al (2006)	Zedini and Belhadj (2015)
Simple random sampling - Bootstrap							
Areas	$\simeq 2.00$	$\simeq 1.71$	$\simeq 1.77$	$\simeq 26.00$	$\simeq 41.79$	$\simeq 33.96$	$\simeq 187.96$
National	$\simeq 0.56$	$\simeq 0.33$	$\simeq 0.38$	$\simeq 18.96$	$\simeq 39.32$	$\simeq 31.14$	$\simeq 165.36$
Complex random sampling - Bootstrap							
Areas	$\simeq 1.90$	$\simeq 1.47$	$\simeq 1.45$	$\simeq 11.39$	$\simeq 9.30$	$\simeq 9.69$	$\simeq 45.85$
National	$\simeq 0.38$	$\simeq 0.20$	$\simeq 0.18$	$\simeq 7.36$	$\simeq 11.06$	$\simeq 9.22$	$\simeq 23.30$
Complex random sampling - Jackknife							
Areas	$\simeq 0.45$	$\simeq 0.41$	$\simeq 0.41$	$\simeq 98.88$	$\simeq 134.99$	$\simeq 115.45$	$\simeq 173.90$
National	$\simeq 0.23$	$\simeq 0.21$	$\simeq 0.19$	$\simeq 88.80$	$\simeq 129.15$	$\simeq 112.64$	$\simeq 164.51$

6 Robustness analysis

In this section, we analyze the robustness of the normative indices. The reader may have noticed that some fuzzy indices depends on certain parameters (i.e. z_1, z_2, β) that need to be specified. With this statement we refer to a choice of parameters that it is not estimated from data or set a-priori.

Therefore, to decide which fuzzy index is preferable or usable to report is non-trivial. One should choose the index that is most robust, meaning the one that is least sensitive to changes in the sources of uncertainty. To have a reliable and consistent index, one should undertake robustness analysis followed by classical statistical inference. Robustness analysis involves checking the ordering of two or more areas under alternative choices over the parameters specification of the index. In particular, we focus the indices that has a membership function defined as normative with the aims to point out the role played by the arbitrary constant. The robustness check is done at national level and at the area level.

At national level, the MSE of the indices is analyzed, at the national level, to figure out if in what extent the choice of the parameter can influence the variability. In other words, if the quality of the estimates, according to the guidelines of [30] changes with respect to the chosen parameters.

At area level, the order of the estimates are checked with the methods of “correlation coefficients for ranks” ([31]). These methods test if an ordering of more than two areas remains the same when the value of some parameter is altered. The robustness of a ranking is evaluated by calculating a rank correlation coefficient between the initial and the alternative rankings. In this section the reported results are only those regarding the Complex simulation (results for the SRS are almost identical and available under request).


6.1 Are the coefficients influent on the MSE value?

Figure 7 shows clearly that the MSE of the sample average of the membership function in Equation 4 is sensitive to the choices of the thresholds. In particular, setting high values of z_1 will usually decrease the variance of the estimator while the opposite happens for small values. Note that from Equation 4 the portion of the plane (z_1, z_2) to be considered is that of the points $\{(z_1, z_2) : z_2 \geq z_1\}$. Regarding the role of the parameter β , it seems to take the role of inflating the variance is the upper region of the plane.


The same considerations apply to Equation 1 although for this membership function the mean squared error surface has a much more regular shape. For what regards Equation 5 instead, the mean squared error seems to be not dependent on the choice of the threshold as long as the threshold is sufficiently large.

These pictures also suggest another important aspect to consider when estimating fuzzy measure, that is, a mis-specified selection of the thresholds that depending on the surface of the mean squared error may result in severe biases. Suppose that z_1^* and z_2^* are the true values ($b = 1$ without loss of


Figure 7 – MSE of Belhadj (2014).




(A) $\beta = 1$



(B) $\beta = 2$



(C) $\beta = 4$



(D) $\beta = 10$

Figure 8 – MSE of Cerioli and Zani (1999)





Figure 9 – MSE of Chakravarty (2019)



generality) and that $MSE(z_1^*, z_2^*)$ is the corresponding MSE. Suppose that z_1' and z_2' are the values specified by the researcher (again, $\beta = 1$ without loss of generality) and that $MSE(z_1', z_2')$ is the corresponding MSE. The difference between the two MSE may be not-negligible in some portions of the z_1', z_2' plane.

6.2 Correlation coefficients for ranks

Suppose there are j^* areas, and two set of ranks, r and r^* for two different specification sets of parameters regarded as the initial and alternative specification. Also, consider r_{j^*} and $r_{j^*}^*$ as the ranks of the area j^* for the two different specification sets of parameters in the same membership function. The alternative specification may entail a change in the set of the α – cut parameters or in the β parameters. According with [32] we use the Kendal and the Spearman correlation coefficients. The former is useful for those situation where the sample size is small and there are many tied ranks. Table 8 reports the mean values of the two correlation coefficients for the three index. In the first table the value β of the Belhadj (2014) index is equal to 2. For Cerioli and Zani (1999) and Chacravarty (2019) indices we use as benchmark the indices computed with the parameters in Table 2. The values for both the correlation indices tends to decrease fast except for Cerioli and Zani (1999). In particular the Belhadj (2014) index seems to not be robust. The same conclusions arise also from Table 9. In this table, in-fact, the value of the correlation are computed for the Belhadj (2014) index for fixed z_1

and z_2 , according with Table 2, and changing the value of β , again, this index seems to be not robust.

Table 8 – Correlation coefficients for ranks changing z_s ' parameters

Index	Correlation	Parameters								
		$Y_{0.02}$	$Y_{0.03}$	$Y_{0.04}$	$Y_{0.05}$	$Y_{0.06}$	$Y_{0.07}$	$Y_{0.08}$	$Y_{0.09}$	$Y_{0.10}$
Belhadj (2014), $\beta = 2$	Kendal	0.78	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.56	0.50	0.50	0.56	0.50
	Spearman	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.83	0.73	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.67
Cerioli and Zani (1999)	Kendal	0.94	0.94	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89
	Spearman	0.98	0.98	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97

Index	Correlation	Parameters								
		$Y_{0.30}$	$Y_{0.35}$	$Y_{0.40}$	$Y_{0.45}$	$Y_{0.55}$	$Y_{0.60}$	$Y_{0.65}$	$Y_{0.70}$	$Y_{0.75}$
Chacravarty (2019)	Kendal	0.94	0.89	0.83	0.78	0.78	0.72	0.67	0.67	0.67
	Spearman	0.98	0.95	0.90	0.88	0.88	0.87	0.78	0.78	0.78

Table 9 – Correlation coefficients for ranks for Belhadj index changing β

Index	Correlation	Parameters: β								
		$\beta = 1$	$\beta = 3$	$\beta = 4$	$\beta = 5$	$\beta = 6$	$\beta = 7$	$\beta = 8$	$\beta = 9$	$\beta = 10$
Belhadj (2014)	Kendal	0.91	0.89	0.83	0.78	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.67	0.67
	Spearman	0.99	0.97	0.93	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.83	0.83

7 Conclusions

This paper has addressed the issue of estimating fuzzy poverty indices. Starting from a real sample of individuals, we simulated a synthetic population of individuals and started sampling from that population to address the issue of estimating uncertainty of fuzzy poverty indices. We first investigated the bias of sampling statistics as well as the bias of the estimation of their mean squared error by simple random sampling of individual from the population. In order to not loose touch with realistic survey that usually involve stratification and more complex designs we repeated the analysis to allow also for this more realist scenario.

We noticed that if we use the sample mean of the sampling estimate of the membership function we obtain unbiased estimated with low coefficient of variations. Also, for those methods that require parameter specification we draw the surface of the mean squared error for different values of the parameters. This has borrough many points of reflection as our simulations show that a mis-specification of the parameters can lead to severe distortions when estimating the mean squared errors. Also it has shown that accurate estimates of fuzzy indices can be just the result of poor specification of parameters.

At least two points of reflection emerge from these considerations. The first is of a theoretical kind, that is, we treated these parameters as unknown values in the population of individuals that are fixed and unknown to researcher. Although this is a necessary working assumption to discuss about bias in estimation procedures, the fact that these could be unknown parameter of a population is something that has not been discussed extensively in the literature. The fact that these parameter are set arbitrarily without a statistical procedure for their estimation based on maximum likelihood or other methods make difficult to draw a comparison without making assumptions of the kind above and on which sampling measure to estimate.

Regarding this last point, we focused our study assuming as sample statistics the average of the membership function. Although the mean is a solid statistical estimator, not all the methods discussed originally suggest this measure. The lack of consistency between the various approaches suggested in the literature and here reported had us make the choice of the sample mean for two reasons, one statistical, and the second because it is the most used statistic in the methods considered. For this

reason, our result shall not be intended as an assessment of only the original papers but considering the fact that we had to make a common ground of comparison.

Anyways, we believe that some kind of baseline is needed in this field of research and we hope that we made a step in this direction with this work.

References

- [1] Achille A Lemmi and Gianni Betti. *Fuzzy set approach to multidimensional poverty measurement*, volume 3. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [2] Gianni Betti and Achille Lemmi. *Advances on income inequality and concentration measures*, volume 102. Routledge, 2008.
- [3] Gianni Betti and Achille Lemmi. *Analysis of Socio-Economic Conditions: Insights from a Fuzzy Multi-dimensional Approach*. Routledge, 2021.
- [4] Nanak Kakwani. Statistical inference in the measurement of poverty. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, pages 632–639, 1993.
- [5] Eric Graf and Yves Tillé. Variance estimation using linearization for poverty and social exclusion indicators. *Survey Methodology*, 40(1):61–80, 2014.
- [6] Jean-Yves Duclos, David E Sahn, and Stephen D Younger. Robust multidimensional poverty comparisons. *The economic journal*, 116(514):943–968, 2006.
- [7] Andreas Alfons and Matthias Templ. Estimation of social exclusion indicators from complex surveys: The r package laeken. *KU Leuven, Faculty of Business and Economics Working Paper*, 2012.
- [8] Gianni Betti, Francesca Gagliardi, and Vijay Verma. Simplified jackknife variance estimates for fuzzy measures of multidimensional poverty. *International Statistical Review*, 86(1):68–86, 2018.
- [9] Gordon M Fisher. The development of the orshansky poverty thresholds and their subsequent history as the official u.s. poverty measure. *United States Census Bureau*, 1997.
- [10] Gordon M Fisher. The development and history of the poverty thresholds. *Soc. Sec. Bull.*, 55: 3, 1992.
- [11] Robert Allen. Poverty lines in history, theory, and current international practice. 2013.
- [12] Alan Gillie. The origin of the poverty line. *The Economic History Review*, 49(4):715–730, 1996.
- [13] Ba Sa Rowntree. *Poverty: A Study of Town Life*. London, Macmillan., 1901.
- [14] Richard Jolly et al. The world employment conference: The enthronement of basic needs. *Development Policy Review*, 9(2):31–44, 1976.
- [15] Bruno Cheli and Achille Lemmi. A'totally'fuzzy and relative approach to the multidimensional analysis of poverty. 1995.
- [16] Lotfi A Zadeh. Fuzzy sets. *Information and control*, 8(3):338–353, 1965.
- [17] George Klir and Bo Yuan. *Fuzzy sets and fuzzy logic*, volume 4. Prentice hall New Jersey, 1995.

- [18] Enrica Chiappero Martinetti. Capability approach and fuzzy set theory: description, aggregation and inference issues. *Fuzzy set approach to multidimensional poverty measurement*, pages 93–113, 2006.
- [19] Andrea Cerioli and Sergio Zani. A fuzzy approach to the measurement of poverty. In *Income and Wealth Distribution, Inequality and Poverty: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Income Distribution by Size: Generation, Distribution, Measurement and Applications, Held at the University of Pavia, Italy, September 28–30, 1989*, pages 272–284. Springer, 1990.
- [20] Besma Belhadj. A new fuzzy unidimensional poverty index from an information theory perspective. *Empirical Economics*, 40:687–704, 2011.
- [21] Asma Zedini and Besma Belhadj. A new approach to unidimensional poverty analysis: Application to the Tunisian case. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 61(3):465–476, 2015.
- [22] Besma Belhadj. Employment measure in developing countries via minimum wage and poverty new fuzzy approach. *Opsearch*, 52:329–339, 2014.
- [23] Gianni Betti and Vijay Verma. Measuring the degree of poverty in a dynamic and comparative context: a multi-dimensional approach using fuzzy set theory. In *Proceedings, iccs-vi*, volume 11, page 289, 1999.
- [24] Gianni Betti, Bruno Cheli, Achille Lemmi, and Vijay Verma. Multidimensional and longitudinal poverty: an integrated fuzzy approach. *Fuzzy set approach to multidimensional poverty measurement*, pages 115–137, 2006.
- [25] Vijay Verma and Gianni Betti. Taylor linearization sampling errors and design effects for poverty measures and other complex statistics. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 38(8):1549–1576, 2011.
- [26] Yves G Berger and Chris J Skinner. A jackknife variance estimator for unequal probability sampling. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 67(1): 79–89, 2005.
- [27] Matthias Templ, Bernhard Meindl, Alexander Kowarik, and Olivier Dupriez. Simulation of synthetic complex data: The R package simpop. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 79(10):1–38, 2017.
- [28] W Edwards Deming and Frederick F Stephan. On a least squares adjustment of a sampled frequency table when the expected marginal totals are known. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 11(4):427–444, 1940.
- [29] Tarald O Kvålseth. Coefficient of variation: the second-order alternative. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 44(3):402–415, 2017.
- [30] Statistics-Canada. 2005 survey of financial security - public use microdata file, user guide. published by authority of the minister responsible for statistics Canada. Technical report, 2007.
- [31] Sabina Alkire and Selim Jahan. The new global MPI 2018: Aligning with the sustainable development goals. 2018.
- [32] Omar Noha and El Hage Sleiman. Sama. Testing the robustness of the revised multidimensional poverty index for Arab countries. *United Nation Bureau Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia*, 2021.