Family and the dynamic of poverty in Argentina: a longitudinal study using the *Encuesta Permanente de Hogares*

María Marta Santillán Pizarro, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba – Universidad Católica de Córdoba, Argentina
Benoît Laplante, Institut national de la recherche scientifique, Canada

Introduction

During the last decades in Argentina a series of economic and political crisis have taken place and have produced a supported increase in the levels of poverty. Especially, through the 90s, the applied policies brought serious consequences to the country: increase of unemployment, working places without labour protection, increasing perceptions of vulnerability and insecurity facing poverty, increase of segmentation and social exclusion. In this way, at the beginning of 2003, the highest levels of poverty in the whole history of the country were found: 51.7% of poor population, simultaneously with an unemployment rate of 16.4%.

In this period, the Argentinean social structure changes. Research on poverty in the country has highlighted not only an increase in the number of poor, but also a larger social heterogeneity in the makeup of the poor population (Minujin, 1993, 1997). This fact is made evident by the co-existence of the "structural poor", defined through levels of deprivation, and the "new poor" that originate from middle to low-middle class groups. These "new poor" saw their income reduced with the rise in unemployment, under-occupation and the depreciation of the real value of their wages following the devaluation in 2002.

In spite of the general trend that includes a high proportion of household that falls down in poverty, some households have a dynamic situation to face poverty, since they

fall down and exit from it throughout the time. Studies that have been made in some countries show that the falling and exiting from the poverty are very frequent, and this dynamic depends on the opportunities offered by the State, the Market and the Society, and the opportunities found on their own capacities and socioeconomic profiles, characteristics and behaviours (Duncan, 1984; Bárcena Martín et al., 2004; Pérez Mayo et al, 2003).

One major interest of social demography is to know the demographic behaviours that favour this dynamic of poverty. Some authors stress that, from the beginning, poverty has been considered in interaction with population variables. In our times, the point is to know what type of relation operates between these variables, taking into account that in the last years significant changes have taken place both in the demographic reality and in the characteristics of poverty. This knowledge can be an important contribution for policies designing destined to reduce poverty (Rodríguez, 2006). This author emphasizes the growing worry in the last years about studying the effect that some demographic events occurred inside household can cause on the well-being of them. Such it is the case of births, deaths or dissolutions of unions. He named these events demographic shocks because of the possible impact that they could cause on the households economic situation.

As noted by Torrado (2004), the role of demographic factors in the creation and reproduction of poverty cannot be analyzed without taking into account the prevailing economic policies. When the goals of economic policies is increasing global welfare and distributing income through labour force participation and have some success at it, as was the case in Argentina through the end of the 1970s, the potential negative effects of

demographic factors (e.g. household size, household structure, the birth of a new child) on the hazard of becoming poor and of transmitting that condition to the next generation are neutralized. This explains why poverty levels remained relatively low until the mid-1980s. On the other hand, when economic policies have no other objective than sheer economic growth, as has been the case in Argentina over the last two decades, not only is there a noticeable increase in levels of poverty caused by dropping wages and rising unemployment, but demographic factors get back their ability to recreate conditions for economic deprivation and its intergenerational transmission.

Up to now, very few empirical studies have reliably demonstrated the way in which, in today's Argentina, demographic behaviours have become important in the dynamic of poverty. In this paper, we look, at the role that factors and demographic events had in this dynamic between 1995 and 2003, a period during which economic conditions changed dramatically, the poverty rate not only increased but did it at a faster pace.

In order to do so, we resort to the longitudinal analysis of data from a household survey; this approach enables us to estimate the effects of the demographic characteristics of the households on their hazard of becoming poor and exiting from poverty, and on estimating the effects of some demographic events on these hazards.

Definitions and hypotheses

A poor household is defined as a household whose income lies below the poverty line, while becoming poor means having the household income falling below the poverty line from a previous higher level. Conversely, getting out of poverty means having the household income rising up over the poverty line from a previous lower level. We use the

poverty line at the household level as defined by the INDEC. The poverty line is set according to the monetary value of a basic consumer basket of goods and services priced at minimum cost, proportional to the size of the household expressed in the number of "equivalent adults", as well as the monetary value of the items in the basket. In order to calculate the "poverty line", it is necessary to calculate the "indigence line", defined as the monetary value of a food basket at minimum cost. To establish the indigence line, the minimum nutritional requirements are calculated according to gender and age. A basic food basket is designed for each consumer unit — generally equivalent to an active male between the ages of 30-59, also considered as an "adult equivalent" — by which nutritional requirement equivalencies are established for other subgroups according to gender, age and level of activity.

A household is considered "poor" when the total income is inferior to the monetary value of the consumer basket, whereas a "not poor" household has a superior total income. The monetary value of this consumer basket takes into account variations in time, accounted for at the time of classification of households according to their economic condition.

The unit of analysis is the household and the dependent variable is defined as a household characteristic. However, rather than in households *per se*, we are interested in *families*. We thus limit the analysis to households in which the head of the household lives with a spouse and with or without children and to female headed single-parent households where the child or children are not married or living in a cohabiting union. Given that one of our main independent variable, as we shall see, is the addition of a new child to the household, we further restrict the analysis to households in which the woman

is aged less than 50. When studying the fall into poverty, the analysis is restricted to households whose total income and structure placed them above the poverty line when they entered the sample. Households leave the risk group by changing state when they fall below the poverty line; they leave the risk group without changing state when they leave the sample before having fallen below the poverty line or when they cease to meet our criteria, for instance when childless spouses do not live together anymore or when the last child of a female headed single-parent household leaves the household. Conversely, when studying the exit from poverty, the analysis is restricted to households whose total income and structure placed them below the poverty line when they entered the sample. In this case, households leave the risk group by changing state when they rise over the poverty line; they leave the risk group without changing state when they leave the sample before having risen over the poverty line or, as is the first analysis, when they cease to meet our criteria.

The demographic factors that have been related to the poverty in the scientific literature belong to the framework of the demographic transition and have stressed the strong link between fertility and poverty (Rodríguez, 2006; Filgueira and Peri, 2004).

Within the household, fertility is reflected in the number of children. Thus, a large number of children can operate as a factor that promotes falling into poverty and hinder getting out of it. Moreover, one might think that the effect of the number of children in the dynamics of poverty may be conditional on their age, considering that some of them can represent a greater burden (either through greater economic costs, or because they require more care).

More than the number of children at home, the birth of a child by itself can be a factor which puts at odds the economic stability of the household and accelerate its fall into poverty or delays the exit from it. As a rule, the total household income does not increase by the mere birth of a child, but on the contrary when a child is added to the household, the existing income has to be distributed among more members. Furthermore, the new child needs special care, especially by the mother, which affects her employment possibilities outside the home.

Given the current advance of Argentina in the path of the demographic transition (Chackiel and Martinez, 1993), one may we wonder how seriously fertility can be considered an important factor in the dynamics of poverty. Furthermore, over the last decades, Argentina has shown family conformation and organisation trends similar to those of developed countries: the number of consensual unions is increasing, as are voluntary dissolution of unions and extramarital births (Mazzeo, 1998; Torrado, 2003; Santillán and Street, 2005). We wonder if these new behaviour patterns could be generating new mechanisms in the dynamics of poverty. One might suspect that some events related to these patterns, such as the formation and dissolution of unions, play an important role in the dynamics of poverty by increasing the hazard of falling into poverty and reducing the hazard of getting out from it.

Our study covers a period during which the economic context of Argentina was anything but stable. Because the 1995-2003 period was characterized by an explosive increase in unemployment and by the fall of real wages after the end of the convertibility model, in late 2001, we expect that the hazard of falling into poverty will increase from the beginning to the end of the period we are studying. We also expect the hazard of

getting out of poverty to decrease over the period. We are also interested in checking whether or not the effect of the demographic factors will remain stationary throughout the period or will change as well.

Data and method

The *Encuesta Permanente de Hogares* (EPH, "Permanent Households Survey") is a multi-purpose survey realized by the *Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos* (INDEC), the national statistical agency of Argentina. It has been conducted since 1973 in the major urban centres of the country and has been progressively extended so as to cover all urban centres and about 70% of the population of the country. The main purpose of the EPH is to gather information on socio-demographic characteristics, labour force participation, income and wealth distribution. The information gathered through the EPH is primarily used to estimate activity rates and unemployment rates as well as the proportion of households that are below the poverty line.

The EPH in the strict sense, only allows analyze data in a transversal manner and, more generally, Argentina lacks longitudinal data sources. However, the EPH uses a rotating panel design which allows the monitoring of households for up to a maximum of three observations periods over 18 months. Because of its use of a rotating panel design, the EPH is the only source of data survey maintained by the INDEC that can be used for longitudinal analysis.

We use data from 28 urban agglomerations. We rebuilt the paths of the households that may lead them into or out of poverty using the data from the four waves in which they were interviewed. We use the demographic and socio-economic characteristics that were registered and derive the relevant changes by comparing their

values from one wave to the next. This allows us to estimate the effects of the socio-economic characteristics and of demographic events on the hazard of falling into or getting or out of poverty.

We test our hypotheses using the strategy detailed in Laplante, Santillán and Street (2009). The effects of the independent variables on the hazard of becoming poor are estimated taking advantage of the rotating panel design of the EPH through the use of a modified form of Poisson regression. The resulting coefficients can be interpreted as hazard ratio from a conventional proportional hazard model.

Results

Descriptive

The sample was composed of 78,185 households from 28 urban agglomerations of which 77% are two-parent households, 13% are female headed lone-parent households and 9.3% are childless couples; 65.4% of the households were not poor when they entered the sample whereas the remaining 34.6% were poor at that time. The households who were not poor when they entered the sample are the group at risk of falling into poverty, while those who entered the sample being poor are the group at risk of getting out of poverty. As can be seen in Table 1, only 54.3% of the households entered the sample not being poor and left it the same state, without having fallen into poverty during the observation period; 27% of households remained poor, while 11.1% of the households fell into poverty and 7.6% managed to get out during the observation period.

Analytic

The mere fact of having children, regardless of their number, considerably increases the hazard of falling into poverty and decreases the chances of getting out of it

(Table 1). As could be expected, the effect of the number of children is actually conditional on their age. The hazard of falling into poverty does not increase with the number of children from a given age group, except for children aged 5 to 11 (Table 2, Models 4 to 7). On the contrary, the hazard of getting out of poverty decreases with the number of children from any given age group as long as children are aged less than 18 years (Table 5, Models 4 to 7).

We also looked into the effect of a birth on the dynamics of poverty. As writes Rodriguez (2006), this event is by itself a change in the structure of the household, and has associated economic (and non-economic) costs that may have consequences in the short or long term on the household economy. Our results show that a birth has indeed an important effect: broadly speaking, a birth increases twofold the hazard of falling into poverty. The birth of a child does not have such a clear effect on the hazard of getting out of poverty: coefficients seem to indicate that a birth decreases this hazard, but they are not statistically significant (Table 4, Model 1 and Table 7, Model 1).

It may be argued that demographic factors related to the demographic transition should lose their effect on the dynamics of poverty as a country progresses on the path of the demographic transition. However, as the effects of these demographic factors wither, some new demographic phenomena, related to what some authors, in the context of developed countries, have labelled the *second demographic transition*, may become of importance. These new demographic factors and their role in the dynamics of poverty arise as consequences of changes in values and occur as increase in the number of divorces, and therefore by the increase of lone-parent families, usually headed by women.

We looked into this issue taking into account the type of household: couples without children, two-parent families (i.e. couples with children) and female headed lone-parent families. The hazard of falling into poverty for childless couples is a third of the hazard for two-parent families, controlling for the economic context as measured by the unemployment rate and the contrast between before and after the devaluation. The hazard of falling into poverty is greater for female headed lone-parent families than for two-parent families (Table 2, Model 1), but their hazard of getting out of poverty is similar to that of two-parent families (Table 5, Model 1).

Controlling for the socioeconomic condition of the household provides further insights (Tables 3 and 6). When the socio-economic condition of the household is favourable — adults have a high level of education, the head of the household has a job, and is entitled to some social benefits — the differences between the hazard of falling into poverty for lone-parent and two-parent households tend to disappear. However these differences increase when the socio-economic condition of the household are less favourable, i.e. when adults have a low level of education, the head of the household is unemployed, and is not entitled to social benefits (Table 3). In other words, the hazard of falling into poverty is more sensible to socio-economic condition for female headed lone-parent families than for other types of families. The hazard of getting out of poverty, which is similar for female headed lone-parent families and two-parent families before controlling for socio-economic condition, remains similar when controlling (Table 6).

Given that the hazard of falling into poverty is higher for lone-parent households than for two-parent households, it seemed reasonable to check whether this difference increase with the number of children, even though the number of children does not

increase by itself the hazard of falling into poverty for households with children. It would also seem reasonable to check whether the number of children has the same effect on the hazard of getting out of poverty for lone-parent households than for two-parent households. Results show that this is not the case, even when controlling for the age of the children (Table 2, models 4 to 7 and Table 5, models 4 to 7).

The effect of the birth of a child on the hazard of falling into poverty, however, varies across types of families: it is twice as great for lone-parent female headed families as for two-parent families (Table 4).

The effect of the dissolution of a unions is very strong, even when controlling the educational level of the household head: the breakdown of the union increases fourfold the hazard of falling into poverty (Table 4, Models 4 and 5), and make exiting out of poverty almost impossible (Table 7, Models 4 and 5).

We also looked into the effects of the current economic context and economic policies on the dynamics of poverty. As expected, the devaluation of late 2001 had a negative impact on all households. However, this effect has been stronger on childless couples and two-parent families than on lone-parent families, whose hazard increased by half the increase in the hazard of the former (Table 1, Model 8). The devaluation had the expected effect on the hazard of getting out of poverty: the devaluation reduced the hazard of getting out of poverty by half for two-parent households and by more than 75% for lone-parent female headed households (Table 4, Model 8).

Discussion

We are interested in the dynamics of poverty in Argentina in the period 1995-2003, and in particular, in the role that demographic events have and events have in the

generation and reproduction of poverty. For this reason, our analysis focuses on the effects of demographic events and demographic factors on the hazard of falling into and getting out of poverty. We estimated these effects controlling for or conditional on the socio-economic condition of the households and the prevailing economic context. We based our hypotheses on the premise that the demographic factors and event are a salient part of the dynamics of poverty in economic contexts which foster the concentration of income and social exclusion, whereas their action should be neutralised or offset in economic contexts which favour social inclusion.

As we explained earlier, given the economic turmoil that characterized Argentina in the period we study, we expected that the hazard of falling into poverty would increase from the beginning to the end of this. We also expected the hazard of getting out of poverty to decrease. We were also interested in checking whether or not the effect of the demographic factors had remained stationary throughout the period or would have changed as well.

Demographic factors play a role in the dynamics of poverty. As expected, having children increases the hazard of becoming poor and decreases the hazard of getting out of poverty; these effects vary according to the number of children. However, the number of children from different age groups has little effect on the hazard of falling into poverty, but a definite effect on the hazard of getting out of. This difference can be interpreted following Filgueira and Peri (2004: 54) who argue that the demographic transition is "a process that trickles down from the top to the bottom of the social pyramid through processes in which fertility and mortality reduce at different speed within different social strata" (our translation).

By definition, the group at risk of falling into poverty is made of households which are not poor whereas the group at risk of getting out of poverty is made of poor households. These two groups at risk belong to different *social* groups and thus have different reproductive behaviour, even though, at the aggregate level, Argentina is far advanced in the path of the first demographic transition. The group at risk of falling into poverty is made of people who control their fertility, so that the amount of children is not a decisive factor of their hazard of falling into poverty. By contrast, the group at risk of getting out of poverty is made of poor households, among which fertility control is not widespread and the number of children does not depend primarily on the choice of the parents, so that the number of children does really reduce the hazard of getting out from poverty.

This said some of these effects vary according to the type of household. Controlling for the economic context, the hazard of falling into poverty for childless couples is a third of the hazard for two-parent families. The hazard of falling into poverty is greater for female headed lone-parent families than for two-parent families, although their hazard of getting out of poverty is similar to that of two-parent families. As expected, the new demographic phenomena, related to the *second demographic transition*, have become of importance as they foster a gap between lone-parent female headed families, nowadays mainly a consequence of union breakdown (or pure out of union birth) rather than from death of the spouse.

As expected, the economic context and the economic policies have an impact on the dynamics of poverty and this impact is stronger on households with less favourable demographic characteristics. The devaluation of late 2001 had a negative impact on all

households, but this effect has been stronger on childless couples and two-parent families than on lone-parent families. A possible explanation for this unexpected result could be the implementation of the so-called "social plans" by the federal government during this period. Most of the beneficiaries of these plans were households headed by lone women with children, which could have mitigated the effect of the devaluation on the hazard of falling into poverty for these households.

The demographic events we focused on, the birth of a child and the dissolution of a union, also play a role in the dynamics of poverty. The birth of a child most important effect is mainly on the hazard of becoming poor: a birth increases twofold the hazard of falling into poverty. The effect of the dissolution of a union is very strong: the breakdown of the union increases fourfold the hazard of falling into poverty, and make exiting out of poverty almost impossible.

In Argentina, the dynamics of poverty has traditionally been related to demographic factors typical of the demographic transition, such as the number of children. Our results show that although the presence and number of children are still part of the process, the structure of the family in its current categories— reflected in the contrast between childless couples (mostly by choice), two-parent families and lone-parent female headed families (mostly resulting from voluntary union dissolution) — is an important demographic factor in the dynamics of poverty and clearly related to the second demographic transition.

Obviously, female headed lone-parent households are at a disadvantage in the dynamics of poverty. This disadvantage is not limited to the fact that the lone mother has having to cope alone with the demands of paid work and care of children, but because, on

top of it, women still are in a situation of inferiority in the labour market. Thus, one can conclude by stating that while women may have won in autonomy through contemporary social transformations, the emerging forms of family fostered by these changes face new challenges related to the economic well-being. This is of special importance in a country like Argentina. In the developed countries in which the family transformations related to second demographic transition have been first identified, that is in primarily in Northern Europe, poverty is not a phenomenon that does particularly affects the new forms of family because these countries usually have advanced social protection systems (Filgueira and peri, 2004). In Argentina, there is no such social protection system and no real possibility of putting one in place, although the new conditions make even more urgent the need for such social programs. In other words, the scarcity of resources accentuates the vulnerability of the new form of families. As a consequence, the second demographic transition in Argentina seems bound to develop in a way that condemn new the most vulnerable forms of family to dire conditions.

Our use of longitudinal analysis allowed some progress in the understanding of the effects of some demographic factors end events linked to the vulnerability of the family. Obviously, our work has some limitations. We discussed some of them in the data and method section, but still some others need to be pointed out.

It is reasonable to suppose that the effect of a change in the structure of the household, such as union dissolution, on the hazard of becoming poor is conditional on the "distance" from the poverty line. The closer a "not poor household" is to the poverty line, the stronger the negative impact of union dissolution should be on its hazard of becoming poor. The female headed lone-parent family resulting from the separation of a

woman who is a physician and a husband who is a lawyer will probably remain not poor. The female headed lone-parent family resulting from the separation of a woman who cares at h0ome for her four children and a labourer in the building industry will likely become poor if the original two-parent family was not poor already. Ideally, we would have had estimated the effects of a changes in the household composition conditional on this distance. But this was not feasible.

In the survey we use, income can change over time. We do not have data from an experiment in which income does not change and in which the only factor that would have an impact on falling into poverty or getting out of it would be a change in the household composition. If we had had such data, perhaps would have it been possible to estimate the effects of the independent variables conditional on income and thus, estimate the effect of union dissolution conditional on income. But this seemed hardly feasible with the data at hand.

Furthermore, being below or above the poverty line is measured as a function of the difference between household income and poverty; the hazard of falling into poverty or getting out of it in a given interval is measured as a function of the number of households which changed status during this interval. In other words, the hazard of falling into poverty or getting out of it is a function of the difference between household income and the line of poverty at each moment. There is an algebraic relationship between the hazard, which is the dependent variable, and the difference between household and the poverty line. This algebraic relationship exists at every moment including at time zero. This implies that, conceptually, the difference between income and the poverty line is, on one hand, part of the dependent variable and a possible cause

of the variation of the effects of the independent variables. There is no obvious way in which this problem can be resolved in a consistent manner.

Another limitation is that some of our results can be due to expected changes rather than to effective changes. For example, the absence of a significant relation between the birth of a child and getting out of poverty (contrary to what happens with the hazard of falling into poverty) could be due to the fact that the decision of having this child has been taken because of the expectation of economic improvement, say a raise in income. Furthermore, given that the income is a time-varying variable, this lack of an effect is perhaps due to the realization of economic improvements. The problem is that they there is no data enabling disentangling these issues. To do this correctly, we would need information on income on a monthly basis, information on then exact moment at which people *learned* they would get a new job, a promotion, a pay raise, and also the moment at which they decide to have a child, form a new couple or break their union. Unfortunately such data simply do not exist.

Finally, we have to stress that INDEC changed the design of the EPH in mid-2003. This change makes it impossible to extend the analysis further in time. In theory, new analyses could be done with the data gathered from mid-2003 and it would be interesting to do so.

References

Bárcena Martín, Elena, A. Fernández Morales, B. Lacomba, and G. Martín Reyes (2004). "Dinámica de la pobreza a corto plazo en España y Reino Unido a través de los datos del Panel de Hogares Europeo 1 y 2", en *Estadística Española*, 46(157): 461 -488.

Chackiel, Juan, and Jorge Martinez (1993). "Transición Demográfica en América Latina y el Caribe desde 1950". *Conferencia Latinoamericana de Población*. Ciudad de México.

Duncan, Greg (1984). *Years of Poverty, Years of Plenty: The Changing Economic Fortunes of American Workers and Families*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Filgueira, Carlos and Andrés Peri (2004). *América Latina: los rostros de la pobreza y sus causas determinantes*. Santiago de Chile: Cepal (Serie Población y desarrollo.)

INDEC (2003). *La nueva Encuesta Permanente de Hogares de Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos.

Mazzeo, Victoria (1998). "Comportamientos de la nupcialiad en la ciudad de Buenos Aires en el período 1890-1995". *Actas del Seminario Cambios demográficos en América Latina. La experiencia de cinco siglos.* UNC-IUSSP. Córdoba, octubre de 1998.

Minujin, A. ed. (1993). *Desigualdad y exclusión. Desafíos para la política social en la Argentina de fin de siglo*. Buenos Aires: Unicef-Losada.

Minujin, A. ed. (1997). *Cuesta abajo. Los nuevos pobres: efectos de la crisis en la sociedad argentina*. Buenos Aires: Unicef-Losada.

Laplante, B. Street, M. M. Santillán and M. C. Street (2009). "Household surveys as a source of data for event history analysis. The study of family related life events in Argentina using the Encuesta Permanente de Hogares", *International Sociology*, 24: 430-456.

Perez Mayo, Jesús y Francisco J. de Miguel V. (2003) *La dinámica de la pobreza consistente en España*. Badajoz: Universidad de Extremadura.

Rodriguez, Jorge (2006). "América Latina y el Caribe. Pobreza y población: enfoques, conceptos y vínculos con las políticas públicas", *Notas de Población*, 83: 11-40.

Santillán Pizarro, María Marta and Street, María Constanza (2005). "Nupcialidad y familia en el curso de vida femenino. Un análisis biográfico". En *VII Jornadas Argentinas de Estudios de Población, tomo 1* (p. 47-70). Buenos Aires: Indec.

Torrado, Susana (2003). *Historia de la familia en la Argentina moderna (1870-2000)*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la Flor.

Torrado, S. (2004) *La herencia del ajuste. Cambios en la sociedad y en la familia*. Buenos Aires: Capital Intelectual.

Anexo

Table 1: ***Distribution of the households according to the state in which they enter and leave the sample***

State at the beginning of the observation	State at the end of observation		
	Not poor	**Poor**	**Total**
Not poor (Group at risk of falling into poverty)	42.454 (54,3)	8.679 (11,1)	51.133 (65,4)
Poor (Group at risk of getting out of poverty)	5.942 (7,6)	21.110 (27,0)	27.052 (34,6)
Total	48.397 (61,9)	29.788 (38,1)	78.185 (100,0)

Table 2: ***The hazard of becoming poor according to demographic factors and context (Poisson regression. Coefficients expressed as hazard ratios)***

Variable	**M1**	**M2**	**M3**	**M4**	**M5**	**M6**	**M7**
Type of household [*Two-parent family*]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Female headed single parent family	1.31*	1.33*	1.29*	1.51**	1.17	1.40**	1.47**
Childless couple	0.36***	0.33***					0.28***
Unemployment rate		1.06***					
Economic period [*Before devaluation*]		1					1
After devaluation		2.29***					2.81***
F.h. single parent family X Aft. devaluation							0.55*
Childless couple X After devaluation							1.61
Number of Child 0-4			0.99				
Number of Child 5-11				1.16*			
Number of Child 12-17					1.07		
Number of Child 18+						0.86	
F.h. single parent family X Number of Child [by age]			1.13	0.83	1.22	0.95	

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

Table 3: ***The hazard ratios of becoming poor according to type of household and its socioeconomic characteristic (Poisson regression. Coefficients expressed as hazard ratios)***

Variable	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6
Type of household [*Two-parent family*]	1		1		1	
Female headed single parent family	1.48***		0.96		1.05	
Childless couple	0.41***		0.43***		0.54	
Education of head of household [*Less than secondary*]	1					
Secondary	0.76					
Some post-secondary or tertiary	0.33***					
Completed post-secondary or tertiary	0.14***					
Type of hhold and Education of head [*Two-parent family. less than secondary]*		1				
Two-parent family. secondary		0.63**				
Two-parent family. some post-second.		0.29***				
Two-parent family. comp. post-second.		0.12***				
F.h. single parent. less than secondary		1.35				
F.h. single parent. secondary		0.97				
F.h. single parent. some post-second.		0.45***				
F.h. single parent. comp. post-second.		0.12***				
Childless couple. less than secondary		0.15***				
Childless couple. secondary		0.32***				
Childless couple. some post-second.		0.08***				
Childless couple. comp. post-second.		0.04***				
Number of income earners *[1 Inc. earner]*			1			
Household without Income earner			30.7***			
Household with 2 Income earners			0.23***			
Household with 3+ Income earners			0.09***			
Type of hhold and Número de perceptores [*Two-parent family. 1 Inc.earner*]				1		
Two-parent family. 2 Income earners				0.23***		
Two-parent family. 3+ Income earners				0.10***		
F.h. single parent. 1 Income earner				0.86		
F.h. single parent. 2 Income earners				0.31***		
F.h. single parent. 3+ Income earners				0.05***		
Childless couple. 1 Income earner				0.40***		
Childless couple. 2 Income earners				0.05***		
Benefits[*Without benefits*]					*1*	*1*
At least one benefit					0.37***	0.32***
All benefits					0.31***	0.36***
F.h. single parent X At least one benefit						2.31
F.h. single parent X All benefits						0.45*
Childless couple X At least one benefit						0.38
Childless couple X All benefits						0.05***

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

Table 4: ***The hazard of becoming poor according to type of household and demographic events : births and dissolutions of union (Poisson regression. Coefficients expressed as hazard ratios)***

Variable	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5
Birth	2.14*	1.94	2.14*		
Type of household [*Two-parent family*]		1			
Female headed single parent family		1.24*			
Birth X *F.h. single parent family*		1.9*			
Education of head of household [*Less than secondary*]			1		1
Secondary			0.66**		0.70*
Some post-secondary or tertiary			0.26**		0.27***
Completed post-secondary or tertiary			0.11**		0.10***
Union Stability *[stable two-parent family]*				1	1
Union Dissolution				4.61***	4.34***
Stable Female headed single parent family				1.21	1.41**

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

Table 5: ***The hazard of getting out of poverty according to demographic factors and context (Poisson regression. Coefficients expressed as hazard ratios)***

Variable	M1	M2	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
Type of household [*Two-parent family*]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Female headed single parent family	0.95	1.61	0.88	1.04	0.95	0.77	1.09
Childless couple	2.08***	9.61***					2.22***
Unemployment rate		0.99					
Economic period [*Before devaluation*]		0.51***					0.51**
After devaluation							0.46*
F.h. single parent family X Aft. devaluation							0.85
Number of Child 0-4			0.68***				
Number of Child 5-11				0.62***			
Number of Child 12-17					0.74***		
Number of Child 18+						0.95	
F.h. single parent family X Number of Child [by age]			0.95	0.81	1.06	1.55**	

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

Table 6: ***The hazard of getting out of poverty according to type of household and its socioeconomic characteristic (Poisson regression. Coefficients expressed as hazard ratios)***

Variable	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5
Type of household [*Two-parent family*]	1	1	1	1	1
Female headed single parent family	1.28	1	1.1	1.19	1.12
Childless couple	2.80**	2.74***	1.17	3.24***	3.33***
Education of head of household					
[*Less than secondary*]	1				
Secondary	1.64*				
Some post-secondary or tertiary	2.80***				
Completed post-secondary or tertiary	3.72**				
F.h. single parent X some post-second.	0.71				
F.h. single parent X comp. post-second.	0.7				
F.h. single parent X comp. post-second.	0.64				
Childless couple X secondary	0.82				
Childless couple X some post-second.	0.49				
Childless couple X comp. post-second.	0.65				
Number of income earners		1.38*	1.81***		
F.h. single parent X Number of income earners			0.96		
Childless couple X Number of income earners			1.82**		
Benefits[*Without benefits*]				***1***	***1***
At least one benefit				1.91	1.2
All benefits				1.61	1.91***
F.h. single parent X At least one benefit					2.81
F.h. single parent X All benefits					1.11
Childless couple X At least one benefit					0.67
Childless couple X All benefits					0.87

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001

Table 7: ***The hazard of getting out from poverty according to type of household and demographic events : births and dissolutions of union (Poisson regression. Coefficients expressed as hazard ratios)***

Variable	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5
Birth	0.76	0.78	0.76		
Type of household [*Two-parent family*]		1			
Female headed single parent family		0.82			
Childless couple		0.87			
Education of head of household			1		1
[*Less than secondary*]					
Secondary			1.38		1.37
Some post-secondary or tertiary			2.30***		2.34***
Completed post-secondary or tertiary			3.24***		3.23***
Union Stability *[stable two-parent family]*				1	1
Union Dissolution				0.06***	0.06***
Stable Female headed single parent family				0.75*	0.72*

* p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001