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Preface

This study is part of a series of programmatic analyses on poverty-related issues by researchers at the World Bank. The general objective of the work within this program is to stimulate discussion within the government of Argentina, and also between the government and stakeholders, on ways to improve the welfare of the country’s poor through evidence-based policy.

The first phase of this research program addresses labor market informality. The World Bank team examined informality issues using existing data in close collaboration with the Labor Ministry and INDEC. In this context, the authorities designed and implemented a special module on informality as part of the Permanent Household Survey (EPH) in late 2005. The World Bank’s forthcoming report examines the trends in informality over time and explores the possible causes of the increase in informal salaried employment over time.

The second phase of this research program deals with rural poverty. This report represents a first step in this second phase. The work grows out of discussions with counterparts at the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries, and Food (Secretaria de Agricultura, Ganaderia, Pesca y Alimentos [SAGPyA]) and INDEC. Recognizing the dearth of information on rural areas, the World Bank team agreed to review knowledge on rural poverty and provide guidance on future data-collection efforts. A primary objective of this study is to raise the profile of the rural poor in Argentina. Profound gaps exist in the understanding of rural poverty in Argentina largely because of data limitations, in particular the EPH’s lack of coverage in rural areas. As a result, the rural poor have sometimes been neglected in policy discussions.

As a first step in highlighting the situation of the rural poor, this report takes stock of existing research, exploits previously untapped information from the 2001 Population Census, and presents findings from a new qualitative study on the subject.

For the future, it is crucial that the EPH be expanded to full national coverage. Roughly 38 percent of the country’s population, consisting of 4 million rural residents and another 12 million who live in smaller urban areas, lie outside the current reach of the survey. An expanded EPH would be valuable both for better evaluating existing programs and for helping the government design new programs and policies. Recognizing the challenges that expansion of the EPH would bring, the final chapter of this report explores the key technical issues involved.

As the government of Argentina moves forward with its consideration of how to best improve data on rural issues and address rural poverty, the World Bank stands ready to assist in supporting the next steps. This report is offered in the hope that will stimulate dialogue about and interest in addressing the nation’s invisible poor.
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Executive Summary

Many of the poorest Argentines are invisible in official statistics. Four million rural residents and another 12 million in small urban areas lie outside the reach of the Permanent Household Survey (EPH), which is the basis for poverty figures and most data on social conditions in the country. According to the best estimate, roughly a third of rural residents—more than a million people—live in poverty. The urban bias common to many countries has been accentuated by the lack of data on the rural poor. With little information on their condition, it is exceedingly difficult for policy makers to design policies and programs to help move people out of poverty.

The objectives of this study are to raise the profile of the rural poor in Argentina, to promote dialogue on rural poverty issues, to provide the best currently available information about rural poverty, and to offer a basis for discussions on how to expand household survey data collection to rural areas. Most previous work has been based on case studies or one-time surveys in a few provinces and consequently has been of limited use for drawing conclusions about rural conditions overall. This study does not directly address policy responses. Rather, it seeks to provide an analytical basis for understanding the conditions of rural life, with the ultimate goal of helping policy makers improve the welfare of the country’s poor through evidence-based policy.

The two main data sources on which this report is based—the 2001 Population Census and a 2007 qualitative study—both have limitations. On the one hand, the census information is dated, was collected during a period of economic crisis, and does not reflect the effects of government programs introduced since 2001, such as the Heads of Household Program and Plan Nacer. On the other hand, the qualitative study collected data for only a small sample of poor households and is not statistically representative. Although together the census information and the qualitative study present a valuable portrait of rural poverty, their shortcomings also highlight the need to expand the coverage of the EPH in order to generate an ongoing source of data on the population in all areas of the country.

The report is organized as follows: Chapter 1 profiles rural poverty based on the limited existing data, including the first in-depth analysis of rural poverty ever conducted with the 2001 Population Census. Chapter 2 presents findings from the new qualitative study of the rural poor conducted in the first half of 2007. Chapter 3 concludes with a discussion of methodology for rural poverty analysis, focusing on the issues related to expanding the EPH to full national coverage.

The Nature of Rural Poverty in Argentina

Poverty rates are significantly higher in rural Argentina than in the country’s urban zones. According to most recent comprehensive data available on the rural population from the 2001 Population Census, 32 percent of rural Argentines are poor, with poverty defined as having at least one unsatisfied basic need (UBN). In contrast, only 16 percent of Argentines in urban areas are poor in terms of UBN. Although just 11 percent of the population lives in rural areas, nearly one in five poor Argentines is a rural resident.

Across all available indicators of well-being, those living in dispersed rural areas are worse off on average than those living in rural towns. Rates of UBN are 36 percent for residents of dispersed rural areas versus 24 percent for those living in rural towns. In terms
of all available measures—education levels, housing quality, access to services of all types, and access to health insurance—there is a clear ranking by geographic area: The average urban resident is better off than the average inhabitant of a rural town, who is better off than the average Argentine living in dispersed rural areas.

There is tremendous regional variation in the welfare of rural residents. While the urban-rural contrast in UBN is stark, there are also large variations within rural areas across provinces. In the country’s five northernmost provinces—Salta, Chaco, Jujuy, Formosa, and Santiago del Estero—more than half of those living in dispersed rural areas have at least one unsatisfied basic need. These same five plus Corrientes have the highest incidence of UBN in rural towns. In contrast, fewer than 20 percent of those living in dispersed rural areas of Buenos Aires, Santa Cruz, and Santa Fe are poor in terms of UBN.

Although highly imperfect, the unsatisfied basic needs measure is the best available measure of poverty for rural areas of Argentina. While the UBN approach has been applied in a number of countries, it is vulnerable to a number of criticisms. Most importantly, the definitions of the components of the index are ultimately arbitrary and not tied to any clear conceptual notion of poverty. Both over time and space, a sense of what constitutes “basic needs” may vary greatly, yet the same definition is applied to all households. Nonetheless,
UBN indicators are widely used and are an acceptable alternative when neither consumption nor income data are available.

Although the absolute size of the overall rural population has been in continuous decline since the 1940s, the population of rural towns grew during the 1990s. Between 1947 and 2001, the size of the rural population dropped by one-third, while the urban population more than tripled. The rural population represented 11 percent of total population in 2001, the most recent census year, down from 13 percent in 1991 and 28 percent in 1960. As the rural population shrank during the 1990s, the absolute numbers of both poor rural residents and poor farms declined. At the same time there was a shift of population within rural areas. Dispersed rural areas lost 14.5 percent of their population over the last decade, declining to 2.6 million in 2001, while the population of small towns grew by 8 percent, reaching a total of 1.2 million. While the population of dispersed rural areas is in decline, it still represents 68 percent of the overall rural population.

The continuing long-term decline in the rural population is due mainly to migration, especially by women. Both rural dispersed areas and rural towns have large numbers of children and adolescents, which is indicative of continued high fertility rates in rural areas. But the population pyramids shows a huge drop off in the rural population of young adults. The sex ratio (number of women per men) shows striking differences by age group in dispersed rural areas. Among children under age 10, there are just slightly more boys than girls: 104 boys per 100 girls, reflecting the natural sex ratio at birth. But among children 15 to 19 years of age, boys outnumber girls by 117 to 100, and for those in their 20s and 30s...

---

**Figure 2. Long-Term Trends in Rural and Urban Population in Argentina**

![Graph showing long-term trends in rural and urban population in Argentina](image)

*Source: INDEC, National Population Censuses.*
there are 122 men per 100 women. These extremely high sex ratios most likely stem from higher emigration rates of young women. It may also reflect temporary migration of young men who come for agricultural work. The nature of this general imbalance is an important topic for future research.

In terms of employment (but not necessarily production), Argentine agriculture is dominated by small-scale producers—family farmers and farms with a small number of employees. Agriculture directly accounts for 64 percent of workers in dispersed rural areas. Among these, half are wage workers; the remainder is split between employers, independent workers, and family workers. The large majority of wage workers (64 percent) work on small farms that employ 1 to 5 people, and only 7 percent work on large farms that employ 40 or more people. The breakdown of agricultural employment is similar for rural towns.

Although agriculture is clearly dominant, the rural sector has a diverse economy that belies simple characterization as a monolithic farming society. Census data show that most people in dispersed rural areas do work in agriculture and related activities. Figures from a limited 2003 survey in four provinces confirm that in dispersed rural areas the poor and nonpoor receive the largest share of their total income—54 and 68 percent, respectively—from agricultural activities. However, in rural towns, only one in four are directly engaged in agriculture. The rest of rural town employment is spread across all sectors; community, social, and personal services employ the largest group.

An understanding of rural poverty in Argentina is complicated by the lack of data. The rural poor are invisible in many policy discussions due to the fact that they are not captured in the EPH. The few past studies of rural poverty in Argentina have been based on case studies or small-scale rural surveys in just a few provinces. Given the country’s tremendous intellectual resources, greater public availability of data could yield substantial dividends.
in the form of policy-relevant analysis. Two steps could lead to valuable new research on rural poverty. First, release of the public-use version of the 2004–05 Encuesta Nacional de Gastos de los Hogares (ENGH), the country’s first household survey with full national coverage, would allow for invaluable analysis of the current state of rural poverty and welfare. Second, future understanding of rural Argentina would be immeasurably advanced by the expansion of the EPH to full national coverage. Some of the issues surrounding this second step are considered in Chapter 3 of this report.

A focus on areas defined as “rural” by the official definition, although unavoidable with currently available data, obscures the many shades of grey on the urban-rural continuum that lie between dispersed rural areas and major urban centers. By official definitions, Argentina’s rural population consists of those who live in dispersed rural areas and in localities of up to 2,000 inhabitants. Under this definition, only 11 percent of Argentines live in rural areas, reflecting one of the highest rates of urbanization in Latin America. But by one alternative definition based on population density and proximity to a city, 44 percent of Argentines live in “rural” areas. The 38 percent of Argentines who live outside of metropolitan areas with populations of 100,000 or greater are not surveyed in the EPH. Those who live in towns with populations between 2,000 100,000 are not surveyed by the EPH, and in census tabulations they are not distinguished from the rest of the urban population. Consequently, they lie in a particular data blind spot. Future data collection should be designed to shed light on the situation in these areas.

A Qualitative Study of Rural Poverty in Argentina

A qualitative study was conducted in rural areas of four provinces in early 2007 to shed light on the lives of the rural poor. The study was intended to complement the available quantitative data presented in Chapter 1 of this report and to inform future data-collection efforts in rural area, such as the expansion of the EPH discussed in Chapter 3. Case studies in four provinces were conducted to produce a systematic analysis of variables that may explain the livelihoods and changes over time in the lives of the rural poor. The case studies were carried out in the provinces of Chaco, Jujuy, Mendoza, and Tucumán.

Description of Study

The qualitative study drew on key informants interviews, in-depth interviews, focus groups, and secondary sources. The key informant interviewees were expert observers of each provincial situation and provided detailed information before field research was undertaken. Focus groups were carried out in two different communities in each province and were composed of seven to eight people. Additional in-depth interviews were conducted with individuals identified as being poor in terms of unsatisfied basic needs.

The sample was selected so as to include a diverse set of individuals by geography, accessibility, demography, and productive activities. The selection of sampling areas was based on the history, productive profile, social diversity, and ethnic, institutional, and economic characteristics of the different areas of the provinces. Approximately 10 rural poor households were selected in each of four provinces—Chaco, Jujuy, Mendoza, and Tucumán—totaling 43 households.

It is important to recognize that while the study provides a good assessment of the variety of household types in these four provinces, the study was not designed to be statistically representative of the rural poor as a whole. Additionally, while comparisons between the qualitative study results and the 2001 Population Census figures can offer insights, one should recognize the two sources of information draw from two different points in time; the census was conducted nearly six years before this qualitative study,
under substantially different economic and social conditions. In particular, the census figures do not reflect the presence of social programs such as the Heads of Household Program and Plan Nacer, which have been introduced since 2001.

Findings from the Study

The families interviewed were generally large in size, and extended families were found to be common. There is a coexistence of diverse and elaborated family arrangements, including the following:

- children that are cared for by grandparents, or other relatives;
- several families living within a household, with separate expenses; and
- indigenous peoples’ households with more complex and extended family arrangements.

Permanent migration is a widespread phenomenon in the lives of the rural poor interviewed. The migratory process is conditioned by cultural, economic, and relational factors. Some of the key causes for migration include the search for employment or urban experience and the need for health care. The census data presented in Chapter 1 suggest that migration out of rural areas is common for young adults, matching findings from the qualitative study. Households interviewed for the qualitative study described how family ties are kept alive despite migration and they work as social and economic networks. Migrants send remittances back home, often intermittently. Migration is bidirectional, however, and a wide array of factors influence the decision to come back to the rural areas, such as inability to adapt or illness.

Rural labor activities of the poor who were interviewed can be categorized into three broad groups: employment, production for their own consumption, and market production. Many workers diversify among the three activities. In the first category, employment of rural poor households is often informal, and many workers are independent or unpaid family workers. Seasonal work is a widespread labor arrangement. Second, around two-thirds of the rural households interviewed engage in production for their own consumption. Those who engage in production for their own consumption have some access to land and are typically the less poor among the poor. Third, a typology of market producers shows three groups of households: (1) market-oriented households, (2) households with both market and domestic production, and (3) households in which production for the market supports the household economy even though income is earned working in various kinds of off-farm employment.

Among households in the study, access to health services is difficult and there is a high incidence of health problems. Rural residents interviewed indicated they generally do not have access to health insurance (not including programs provided through the public health care system, like Plan Nacer) and as a result, they are strongly dependent on the public health care system. This finding coincides with the census figures presented in Chapter 1 of this report, which show that in 2001 many rural residents lacked health insurance coverage. Among households interviewed for the qualitative study in 2007, a local health center is typically accessible for most basic health services, but it is necessary to travel to hospitals in nearby cities for more complex health care. The cost of transport is often a heavy burden for poor families. Lack of insurance also affects the access to medication that the families have to purchase themselves. Many childbirths occur at home, and reproductive health care access varies among provinces. Cultural values counteract sexual and reproductive health policies and limit the adoption of family planning. Moreover, there is a great risk of infection due to the lack of toilet facilities in the dwellings, Chagas disease, disability, or chronic health problems. Despite these difficulties, poor rural people have a positive attitude towards public health services.
The nutritional status of individuals is closely linked to the economic condition of the household. Diet is determined by the household’s capacity to buy and/or produce foods. Domestic production provides diet diversification and is therefore related to land access. School lunches are an important source of food for school children. Rural households have limited access to meats, milk, fruits, and vegetables, and a high rate of carbohydrates consumption often leads to a lack of nutrients. There are few differences in the diet between the indigenous and nonindigenous populations, although the former is more inclined to hunting.

Poor rural households interviewed in the survey receive partial social assistance coverage. Around half of the households interviewed have social protection benefits, although more qualify. There is a lack of knowledge about the social protection mechanisms among the rural poor. A large number of households interviewed benefit from programs such as Heads of Household, the Family Program, local health subsidies, and food rations offered by the municipalities as well as food provided to children who attend school. Among households in the study, indigenous populations were likely to benefit from social programs.

Housing conditions of interviewed households vary considerably, but many rural poor suffer from a serious degree of precariousness. Many families live in conditions of overcrowding (three people or more to a room). Distance is a constraint as houses are located far from hospitals, shops, and community facilities, which affects health and sociability. Also, adverse weather sometimes isolates rural households. The 2001 Population Census figures presented in Chapter 1 show that the poor housing conditions observed during the qualitative study are common in rural areas as a whole.

Among the characteristics encountered in several poor rural households interviewed are (1) an absence of stable working relations and fragile labor networks; (2) little or no access to land; (3) large and extended families; (4) low levels of schooling or illiteracy, with many adults who have not finished primary school; and (5) a heavy burden of health problems. For many of the extreme poor, improving nutrition is their first priority if more resources become available in the household.

**Measuring Poverty and Welfare in Rural Poverty Analysis**

This chapter considers questions of methodology for rural poverty analysis, with an eye towards the possible future expansion of the EPH to nationwide coverage. The EPH currently covers metropolitan areas with populations of 100,000 or greater, excluding smaller urban areas and also the areas officially classified as rural: dispersed rural areas and rural towns with less than 2000 inhabitants. The addition of these areas will raise several issues of sampling, data analysis, and survey operation. This chapter focuses in particular on issues associated with expanding the survey to rural areas.

Qualitative and quantitative evidence show that the rural sector cannot be considered homogeneous. In different regions of the country, the rural sector is characterized by different activities, income sources, and degree of integration with the monetized economy. There are also substantial differences within regions between rural towns and dispersed rural areas in the degree of integration in the economy and the choice of livelihood strategies.

A key technical area for discussion regarding an expanded EPH is the choice of welfare measure. Multiple studies show that the choice and definition of welfare indicator can substantially influence the results of poverty analysis. Own-consumption (of goods produced by the household), which is not considered as a source of income in urban household surveys like the EPH, is important for many rural households. As a result, it is crucial that rural poverty analysis take own-consumption into account. Consumption is generally preferred to income for purposes of poverty measurement. At the same time,
there is a fairly strong argument to be made for maintaining the use of the current income measure for urban areas. The current income measure has been used for the EPH since 2003, and it is broadly similar to the income measures applied in versions of the EPH going back to the early 1970s. Switching from an income measure to a consumption measure in an expanded EPH would complicate comparisons of poverty figures based on the new measure to those calculated with the historical data.

It is clear that income alone as collected by the urban EPH would be an inadequate measure of welfare of many rural households. This is because in rural Argentina, as in rural areas in most parts of the world, a substantial part of income/consumption consists of own-produced goods, that is, own-consumption. A welfare comparison based on the urban income measure, which does not include own-consumption, would understate the relative welfare of rural households.

Consequently, it is critical that own-consumption be included in some form in the questionnaire in an expanded EPH for rural areas. There are four main options: (1) collect complete consumption data for rural households only; (2) collect data on own-consumption (but not other consumption) for rural households only; (3) collect complete consumption data for all households, rural and urban; (4) collect data on own-consumption for all households, urban and rural. To allow comparability between urban and rural areas, it would be preferable to collect the same data in rural and urban zones (option 3 or 4). While for analysis purposes it would be optimal to collect complete consumption data in the entire country (option 3), this would require substantially expanding the length of the questionnaire and thus the cost of the survey. Option 4 would be less costly, and the resulting aggregate (urban EPH income plus own-consumption) could still be used for urban-rural comparisons.

How the poverty lines would be determined is a second key technical area for discussion regarding an expanded EPH. A number of factors enter this discussion. One element is the determination of the standard calorie basis used for the poverty line calculations. The incorporation of rural areas into the poverty calculations makes it necessary to consider whether the calorie basis should be determined based only on age and sex, or whether the intensity of individuals’ activities should be considered in addition, given that the structure of rural occupations is very different than that in rural areas.

How types and quantities of goods for the consumption food basket should be determined is an important issue related to the poverty lines. The question is what the reference group should be for the determination of the food basket. The addition of rural areas to the EPH will leave two options: (1) determine a new reference group for the country as a whole, or (2) establish separate reference groups (and therefore separate food baskets) for urban and rural areas. While there are pros and cons to both options, either option would be viable.

The price adjustments to income could be made using the national consumer price index (IPC), but that would require extending the coverage of data collected for the calculation of the IPC. An alternative solution would be to collect price data using community questionnaires in rural zones at the same time the household survey data are collected.

An additional question relevant to the determination of poverty is the method used to calculate the value of the total consumption basket, including both food and nonfood components. INDEC has in the past used the indirect method, following standard procedures followed by a number of countries. This involves using the value of the food basket (as known as the “food poverty line”) and the inverse of the Engel coefficient, as determined using an expenditure survey. Information from the 2004–05 Encuesta Nacional de Gastos de los Hogares (ENGH) can be used to calculate the relevant Engel coefficient for the same reference group used to determine the food basket. A less attractive variation on the approach is to take fixed values of the inverse of the Engel coefficient from another source, rather than determine them with a national survey.
The type of sampling that could be used when the EPH is expanded to full national coverage is a final key technical area for discussion regarding an expanded EPH. The most attractive option for INDEC would probably be to maintain the current sampling scheme for larger urban areas and implement a separate multistage sampling routine for new areas, with separate urban and rural strata. For rural areas, the exact form of stratification will depend on the particular objectives decided upon for the rural survey. If it is decided that estimates with high levels of precision for different rural regions are desirable, the stratification could be done at the regional level. It may also be desirable to stratify by type of rural area (e.g., dispersed areas and rural towns). The final decision regarding this matter will depend on the precise objectives of the new survey as well as the cost that different designs imply.
CHAPTER 1

Issues and Challenges for Rural Poverty in Argentina

By Gabriel Demombynes, Johannes Metzler, and Dorte Verner

Introduction

This chapter examines what is known about the state of rural poverty in Argentina. Poverty rates are significantly higher in rural Argentina than in that country’s urban zones. According to 2001 census data, 32 percent of Argentines living in rural areas have unsatisfied basic needs (UBN), compared to 16 percent in urban areas. Measured by UBN, the rural poor account for 19 percent of all poor people, although only 11 percent of all Argentines live in rural areas. Over the course of the 1990s, the absolute numbers of both poor rural residents and poor farms declined.

In part, the rural-urban wedge in Argentina has been the consequence of a skewed public investment distribution that disfavored rural people and policies that promoted domestic industry at the expense of agriculture for many years. The provision of education, health care, infrastructure, and antipoverty programs has long been inferior in rural areas. At the same time, the rural population suffered from high tariffs and import controls on agricultural inputs, which were combined with export taxes and quotas that were used to lower internal prices and encourage domestic processing.

The outward-oriented macroeconomic regime introduced in the 1990s accentuated competition and the requirements of efficiency and quality in production (Obschatko et al. 2006). In the wake of the devaluation following the 2001–02 crisis, agricultural production has increased; in particular, soybean production in 2005 reached output nearly double its level in 2000 (FAO, FAOSTAT). While data are limited on changes over time in the welfare of the rural population, some have suggested that the competitive pressures have impacted negatively on small landholders (Neiman 2000; Obschatko et al. 2006). Aparicio and Benencia (1999) and others have argued that modernization of entrepreneur agriculture has boosted productivity of agricultural workers but has not increased the demand for wage-laborers. This hypothesis is broadly compatible with the long-term decline in the rural population that continued during the 1990s.

Although the long-term drop in the demand for agricultural workers is most likely the reason for the shrinking rural population, the livelihood activities of rural Argentines are not limited to agriculture. Figures from a 2003 survey in four provinces show that rural poor and nonpoor do receive the largest share of their total income—54 and 68 percent, respectively—from agricultural activities such as farming and agricultural labor. But the rural nonfarm sector is also important for income and employment. Residents of dispersed rural areas receive less than 20 percent of their total income from the nonfarm sector. Remittances and transfers account for 27 and 19 percent of the poor and nonpoor’s total income, respectively.

The chapter is organized as follows: It begins with a discussion of the demographic trends. Second, it discusses what is known about the levels of rural poverty based on population and agricultural censuses. Third, it provides a profile of rural poverty, drawing from both the population census and a limited 2003 household survey. Finally, it surveys
the social programs that are available in rural areas, with an emphasis on the Heads of Household workfare program.

**Demographic Trends**

The absolute size of the rural population in Argentina has been in continuous decline since the 1940s. Between 1947 and 2001, the size of the rural population dropped by one-third, while the urban population more than tripled (Figure 1.1). The rural population, defined for census purposes as people living in either dispersed areas or in communities with populations under 2,000, represented 11 percent of total population in 2001, down from 13 percent in 1991 and 28 percent in 1960. As of 2001, rural Argentina was home to approximately 3.9 million people.

While the rural population continued to shrink during the 1990s, at the same time there was a shift of population within rural areas. Dispersed rural areas lost 14.5 percent of their population over the last decade, declining to 2.6 million in 2001, while the population of small towns grew by 8 percent, reaching a total of 1.2 million. The decline in the dispersed rural population from 1991 to 2001 amounts to 400,000 people (Table 1.1). Roughly one-quarter of this decline can be accounted for by the increase in the population of rural towns. The remainder is explained by migration to urban areas.1

Demographic developments in rural areas have not been homogeneous across provinces. The rural Northeast region experienced a net loss of population (12.1 percent)

---

![Figure 1.1. Long-Term Trends in Rural and Urban Population in Argentina](source: INDEC, National Population Censuses.)
### Table 1.1. Population in Argentina and its Regions, 1991 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total as % of total</td>
<td>Rural as % of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pampeana region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>12,594,974</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entre Ríos</td>
<td>1,020,257</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Pampa</td>
<td>259,996</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Córdoba</td>
<td>2,766,683</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Bs. Aires</td>
<td>2,965,403</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>2,798,422</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pampeana</td>
<td>19,440,332</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cuyo region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendoza</td>
<td>1,412,481</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>528,715</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis</td>
<td>286,458</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cuyo</td>
<td>2,227,654</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwest region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamarca</td>
<td>264,234</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jujuy</td>
<td>512,329</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rioja</td>
<td>220,729</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salta</td>
<td>866,153</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago del Estero</td>
<td>671,988</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucumán</td>
<td>1,142,105</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Northwest</td>
<td>3,677,538</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrientes</td>
<td>795,594</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaco</td>
<td>839,677</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formosa</td>
<td>398,413</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misiones</td>
<td>788,915</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Northeast</td>
<td>2,822,599</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patagonia region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chubut</td>
<td>357,189</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuquén</td>
<td>388,833</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Río Negro</td>
<td>506,772</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>159,839</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra del Fuego</td>
<td>69,369</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Patagonia</td>
<td>1,482,002</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>32,615,528</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

while the rural Northwest experienced population growth (1.4 percent). Some provinces, such as Mendoza, Catamarca, and Tierra del Fuego, experienced positive rural population growth rates of 4.5, 8.9, and 43.7 percent, respectively. This compares to Chaco and Santa Cruz, which experienced negative rural population growth rates of 24.3 and 44.8 percent, respectively.

Despite the shift from dispersed rural areas to small towns, the large bulk of rural residents—68 percent nationally—still reside in dispersed rural areas. The rural population is concentrated in dispersed rural areas within most provinces, as well. Figure 1.2 shows the rural population by province, broken down into dispersed rural and rural town residents. Only in Catamarca, La Pampa, and La Rioja provinces are the majority of rural dwellers in towns. The figure also shows that the provinces vary widely in the extent of their rural populations. The largest rural populations—as a percentage of provincial population—are in northern provinces: Santiago del Estero, Misiones, and Catamarca, each of which have more than one in four residents living in rural zones. The most urbanized provinces are Buenos Aires and those farthest south: Tierra del Fuego, Santa Cruz, and Chubut.

**Figure 1.2. Rural Populations as a Percentage of Total by Province, 2001**

![Bar chart showing rural populations as a percentage of total by province, 2001.]

Box 1.1. What Does “Rural” Mean in Argentina?

This report employs the official rural-urban classifications used by the Argentine government, which divides the population into three groups: urban, grouped rural (referred to as “rural towns” in this report), and dispersed rural. “Rural towns” are localities of up to 2,000 people. “Dispersed rural” refers to rural areas that do not qualify as localities. Under these definitions, 10.6 percent of the Argentine population lived in rural areas as of the 2001 Census. Among rural dwellers, most (68.0 percent) lived in dispersed rural areas, with the remainder in rural towns.

Official definitions of “rural” vary immensely across countries, as the figure below shows. Typically, governments apply criteria based on the nature of the administrative district or on the settlement’s population. But some countries also use criteria related to the presence of infrastructure and services such as paved roads, streetlights, schools, and medical clinics. Roughly speaking, most countries classify any settlement of more than 1,500 to 2,000 people as “urban.” The OECD, however, recommends that population density be the main criterion for determining urban versus rural status. Specifically, the OECD suggests that a threshold of 150 persons per square kilometer be used as the first step in defining rurality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population size</th>
<th>Population density</th>
<th>Service provision</th>
<th>% of primary activity</th>
<th>Administrative division</th>
<th>House agglomeration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela, R.B. de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 1.1. What Does “Rural” Mean in Argentina? (continued)

As part of background work for a World Bank study on rural development in the region, Chomitz, Buys, and Thomas (2004) calculated rural populations for countries in Latin America and the Caribbean using a consistent urban-rural definition across countries. In one case, they define rural areas as those municipalities that have population density of less than 150 persons per square kilometer and that are more than one hour travel time from the nearest city of 100,000 or more people. The figure below shows the proportion of the national population that is rural, using both official definitions and this consistent definition.

By official definitions, Argentina has one of the most urbanized populations in the region. However, using the internationally consistent definition, Argentina’s rural residents constitute 44 percent of the national population, just above the average of 42 percent for all of Latin America.

![Graph showing proportion of national population that is rural](Image)


This analysis does not indicate that the official definition for rurality in Argentina is incorrect. Rather, it serves to highlight the fact that the simple urban-rural dichotomy obscures the many shades of grey. Those areas in Argentina that are urban by official criteria but rural by the consistent definition are home to one-third of the national population. They are residents of towns that have more than 2,000 people but are in sparsely populated departments and lie far from the nearest city.

These areas are within a particular data blind spot. They are generally not surveyed in the Permanent Household Survey (EPH), the principal source of information about household conditions and poverty information in Argentina, which only covers urban areas with more than 100,000 inhabitants. But in the population census, they are defined as “urban” areas. Consequently, very little separate information exists on the state of poverty in semirural areas.

Chiefly due to data constraints, this report focuses on areas that are considered rural by the official definition. Future research, and in particular data-collection efforts, should also highlight the important of semirural areas.
Measuring Poverty

Income- or consumption-based poverty measures are the preferred basic indicators for poverty. Argentina’s main national poverty figures are based on income data collected in the Permanent Household Survey (Encuesta Permanente de Hogares [EPH]), which does not cover rural areas. For rural areas, a variety of imperfect alternative measures are available: Basic Needs Indicators based on the 1991 and 2001 National Population Censuses, the Poor Farms (Explotaciones Agropecuarias Pobres [EAP]) count from the National Agricultural Census, and income- and consumption-based poverty figures based on a one-time survey in particular provinces in 2003. While each of the alternative measures has substantial weaknesses, taken together they provide a partial portrait of poverty in the country. This section reviews poverty information from all three sources.

Unsatisfied Basic Needs Indicators

The unsatisfied basic needs (UBN) indicators are based on information gathered in the national censuses. Their primary attraction is that they can be calculated for all households nationally, making urban-rural comparisons possible. Households with unsatisfied basic needs are those that have at least one of the following conditions:

1. Crowded: households with more than three people per room.
2. Housing: households that live in a tenement house or precarious dwelling, excluding a house, apartment, or ranch.
3. Sanitation: households that do not have a toilet.
4. Education: households that have at least one school-age child (6 to 12 years old) who does not attend school.
5. Dependency: households that have four or more persons per employed person and whose head has not completed the third grade.

If a household falls into any of the five above categories, it is considered to have unsatisfied basic needs.

While the basic needs approach has been applied in a number of countries, it is vulnerable to a number of criticisms. Most importantly, the definitions of the components of the index are ultimately arbitrary and not tied to any clear conceptual notion of poverty. A sense of what constitutes “basic needs” may vary greatly both over time and space, yet the same definition is applied to all households. A number of Argentine authors have noted...
that this is a particular problem for urban-rural comparisons because Argentina’s UBN reflects an essentially urban concept of basic needs (Murmis 2001; Craviotti 2001; Gerardi 2001). For example, Craviotti (2001) noted that the indicator “measures poverty mainly in hospitable conditions, underestimating poverty measured by income or resource control.” Furthermore, he noted that “using this approach to the rural field has some limitations, conceptual and operative, which may be considered part of the urban bias present in the majority of the poverty measurement exercises done through this perspective.”

More broadly, situations that are classified as reflecting “unsatisfied basic needs” may not be perceived as such by the individuals in question. The household’s conditions reflect lifestyles, culture, tradition, and environmental conditions. Nonetheless, UBN indicators are widely used and are an acceptable alternative when neither consumption nor income data are available.

It is difficult to definitely evaluate how the UBN measure would compare to an income-based poverty rate, but one can consider particular cases wherein the two measures might be substantially different. Relative to an income- or consumption-based measure, the UBN dependency criterion probably overestimates poverty among rural residents. This is because retired residents living alone with less than three years of education are classified as having UBN by the dependency criterion, and education levels are very low among older rural residents. Likewise, the crowding criterion may overstate poverty among the rural indigenous populations that typically have large extended families sharing a dwelling.

Figure 1.3 shows a comparison of the UBN indicators for urban areas, rural towns, and dispersed rural areas. The first set of bars shows the national percentage of households

---

**Figure 1.3. Unsatisfied Basic Needs Indicators by Each Component**


**Note:** Definitions of UBN components are as follows:
- Crowded: more than three people per room.
- Housing: living in unsuitable housing.
- Sanitation: lack of bathroom.
- Education: at least one child age 6 to 12 not attending school.
- Dependency: four or more people per employed household member and household head with less than three years of primary schooling.
in each group that meets the basic UBN definition: A household is considered to have unsatisfied basic needs if it meets any of the five conditions. By this definition, a much higher percentage of rural than urban residents are poor. While only 16 percent of urban dwellers have UBN, 24 percent of those who live in small towns and 36 percent of those in live in dispersed areas have UBN.

Subsequent bars in the chart show the fraction that have needs unsatisfied in each of the components of the UBN, providing a sense of the source of the overall urban-rural contrast in UBN. The differences are most substantial for the components of crowding, sanitation, and dependency. In other words, rural households—and particularly those living in dispersed areas—are much more likely than urban households to live in crowded conditions, to not have toilet facilities, and to have a precarious economic dependency situation (i.e., a head with little education and few workers per household member).

While the urban-rural contrast in UBN is stark, there are also large variations within rural areas across provinces. Figure 1.4 shows the percentage of the population with

---

**Figure 1.4. Poverty According to Unsatisfied Basic Needs**


Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals with unsatisfied basic needs. For comparison purposes, the vertical dotted line shows the overall national level of UBN for urban and rural areas combined: 17.7 percent.
UBN for dispersed rural and rural towns by province. In the country’s five northernmost provinces—Salta, Chaco, Jujuy, Formosa, and Santiago del Estero—more than half of those living in dispersed areas have unsatisfied basic needs. These same five (plus Corrientes) have the highest incidence of UBN in rural towns. In contrast, fewer than 20 percent of those living in dispersed rural areas of Buenos Aires, Santa Cruz, and Santa Fe have UBN.

It is also possible to consider the evolution over time in the percentage of rural population with unsatisfied basic needs. As the rural population as a whole declined, so did the absolute number of rural households with unsatisfied basic needs, which dropped from 1,536,033 in 1991 to 1,230,408 in 2001. In relative terms, the fraction with UBN fell from 34 percent to 32 percent of the total. As Figure 1.5 shows, the share of rural population with UBN also fell within almost every province. Exceptions were Entre Ríos, Corrientes, and Jujuy.

Poor Farms
An alternative indicator for rural poverty is the count of Poor Farms (Explotaciones Agropecuarias Pobres [EAP]) based on data from the National Agricultural Censuses of 1998 and 2002, which provide information about the characteristics of farms. Conceptually, the Poor Farms (EAP) indicator is intended to identify farms with low or minimal levels of capitalization, low levels of financial and the almost exclusive utilization of family labor (Neiman 2000). In operational terms, a poor farm is one that fulfills the following four conditions:

**Figure 1.5. Proportion of Rural Residents with Unsatisfied Basic Needs by Province, 1991 and 2001**


*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals with unsatisfied basic needs.
6. It is managed directly on a daily basis by the farm’s owner;
7. it does not have a tractor;
8. it does not hire machinery services; and
9. it has no permanent, nonfamily workers earning a wage.

The Poor Farms (EAP) indicator has several clear drawbacks. First, as the name implies, the unit of analysis is neither the individual nor the household, but the farm. Because the population typically associated with farms may vary immensely over regions, it is impossible to interpret the Poor Farms index as a reliable measure of individual-level poverty. Second, the indicator does not cover rural households that do not work in agriculture. Third, households that work on large farms owned by others are also not considered by the indicator.

Table 1.2 shows the total number of farm residents captured in the Agricultural Censuses. According to the 2001 Population Census, the total rural population was 3.9 million, with 2.6 million of these in dispersed rural areas. The 2002 Agricultural Census, however, shows a farm resident population of only 1.2 million. Clearly, the Agricultural Census reflects the conditions of only a minority of the rural population.

The total number of farms classified as poor in the Agricultural Census fell from 163,245 to 132,672 between 1988 and 2002. During this same period, the total number of farms registered in the census fell from 421,221 in 1988 to 333,533 in 2002. It is unclear to what extent this represents undercounting in 2002 versus an actual decline in the number of farms. Regardless, the proportion of farms that are classified as poor has remained essentially constant at 39 percent (Figure 1.6). There was much variation at the provincial and regional level, with the proportion of poor farms growing in some areas and shrinking in others. In the Cuyo region, the proportion of poor farms grew from 27 percent to 35 percent. In contrast, Patagonia shows the opposite trend: The proportion of farms that are poor declined from 48 percent to 39 percent.

The UBN and Poor Farms indicators can be used together to provide a rough picture of regional patterns of poverty. Figure 1.7 shows a scatter plot by province of the percentages of farms that are classified as poor and the percentages of dispersed rural households that have unsatisfied basic needs. Both indicators show that rural poverty is highest in provinces

### Table 1.2. Farm Residents in the 1998 and 2002 Agricultural Censuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988</th>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Share</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/manager</td>
<td>265,841</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>202,423,16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family of owner/manager</td>
<td>810,155</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>589,947</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>371,369</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>441,219</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,447,365</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,233,589</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: The “other” category for 2002 is a grouping of nonfamily workers (161,080), other residents (278,060), and those with unspecified relationship (1,279).

The owner/manager is the productor, who is defined for purposes of the Agricultural Census as follows:

*Es una persona física o jurídica (sociedad, empresa, cooperativa, organismo oficial, etc.) que en calidad de propietario, arrendatario, aparcero, contratista accidental u ocupante, ejerce el control técnico y económico de la EAP; es decir, es quien adopta las principales decisiones acerca de la utilización de los recursos disponibles y asume los riesgos de la actividad empresarial.*
in the Northeast and Northwest regions, followed by the Patagonia and Cuyo regions. According to both sources, the Pampeana region has the lowest level of rural poverty.

Other information on rural poverty comes from the 2003 Rural Household Survey, conducted in dispersed rural areas of four provinces (see Box 1.3). Verner (2006a) calculated poverty figures using both income and consumption data in the survey. Income-based poverty measures show Chaco and Santiago del Estero to be the poorest provinces, followed by Mendoza, with Santa Fe having the lowest poverty rates (see Table 1.3). This ranking matches the ranking of the four provinces by UNB in 2001. However, the picture is different using consumption information. Consumption-based poverty figures place Santiago as the poorest of the four provinces, followed by Mendoza, Chaco, and Santa Fe.

A Poverty Profile for Rural Argentina

This section presents a rural poverty profile, drawing principally on the 2003 RHS and the 2001 Population Census. The patterns of poverty in dispersed areas of rural Argentina are common to much of the world: Larger households are poorer than smaller households, female-headed households are poorer than male-headed households, young households/household heads are poorer than average, the poor tend to work more in the informal sector, and a greater share of those engaged in agriculture are poor (Verner 2006a). However, poverty is by no means strictly an agricultural problem, as Wiens (1998) also noted in his analysis of the early and mid-1990s. The deepest poverty is among the poorly educated and young household heads with children. Without interventions to improve their opportunities and assets, their plight is likely to worsen. Labor market analysis suggests that education is key to increasing productivity, wages, and incomes for rural Argentines.
Box 1.3. The 2003 Rural Household Survey

The Rural Household Survey (RHS) was commissioned by the World Bank in 2003 in dispersed rural areas. The survey of 441 households was undertaken in four provinces: Chaco, Santa Fe, Santiago del Estero, and Mendoza, which together account for a third of Argentina’s rural population. The survey collected both consumption and income data.

Consumption data in the RHS includes consumption of own-produced goods, plus clothing, food, rent, gas, and so on. The consumption aggregate was developed using the “Guidelines for Constructing Consumption Aggregates for Welfare Analysis,” or LSM135. The income measure includes transfers, remittances, consumption of own-produced goods, labor income, and production income.

The RHS also includes information on demographics, employment, education, and health for all household members. A special module with agricultural production questions was applied to farming households. The survey was conducted with the aim of assessing the impact of Argentina’s 2001 crisis. Fieldwork for the RHS was conducted at the end of 2002 and the beginning of 2003. The survey was collected in the midst of a crisis and data therefore reflect the specific and peculiar situation in the rural population at that time. Due to the small size of provincial samples, disaggregated information from the sample should be analyzed cautiously.
Education

Education is widely recognized to be a key to poverty reduction. Increased educational attainment can improve the livelihoods of the poor and reduce the likelihood of becoming poor. More education is also a key factor in obtaining a higher income (see Verner 2006b). Furthermore, education is associated with fertility; that is, the more education a woman attains, the lower her fertility rate is. The dependency ratio is therefore lower and the likelihood of falling into poverty reduced because each year of schooling yields an increase in earnings. Therefore, that the rural residents in Argentina need to be brought up the educational ladder to escape poverty is a clear message.

Figure 1.8 shows the percentages of people living in poverty (in terms of unsatisfied basic needs) by area type and education of household head. Several patterns shown in the figure are noteworthy. First, people living with more-educated household heads are much less likely to be poor. Lack of a primary education, in particular, is strongly associated with poverty. Additionally, within each education group, those most likely to be poor are residents of dispersed rural areas. Essentially no one with a college-educated household head has UBN, while half of those with a head that has completed less than primary education are poor.

Among those with some education, urban dwellers and rural town residents look roughly similar in terms of their likelihood to be poor. But dispersed rural residents are more likely to be poor, regardless of education level.

A large fraction of those living in dispersed rural areas—42.8 percent—have not completed even primary education, and a mere 7.3 percent have complete secondary school, compared to 26.1 percent in urban areas. Table 1.4 shows the highest levels of education completed by area for Argentines age 15 and older. Education levels of those who live in rural towns are also low, though not as low as those living in dispersed areas.

The tabulation of UBN by education group (Figure 1.8) provides a rough qualitative sense of the returns from education (in terms of lower probability of having UBN) in rural areas. However, the fact that the more educated are less likely to be poor is probably also due in part to the fact that those who grow up in the poorest areas are those least likely to have access to education. Likewise, the low primary and secondary completion rates for those in dispersed rural areas undoubtedly reflect a lack of access to schools in remote

Table 1.3. Incidence of Poverty for Selected Provinces, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mendoza</th>
<th>Santiago del Estero</th>
<th>Chaco</th>
<th>Santa Fe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% poor, households</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% poor, individuals</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% indigent households</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% indigent population</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poverty by consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mendoza</th>
<th>Santiago del Estero</th>
<th>Chaco</th>
<th>Santa Fe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% poor, households</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% poor, individuals</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% indigent, households</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% indigent, population</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Verner 2006a based on RHS 2003.
areas in years past, at the time older Argentines were educated. However, access to primary education is nearly universal today, even for those living in dispersed rural areas. Census data show that even in dispersed rural areas, 95.5 of children ages 6 to 11 are in school, compared to 98.5 percent in urban areas (see Table 1.5). Attendance rates are much lower for children of secondary age, however. Just under half (49.1 percent) of children ages 15 to 17 in dispersed rural areas attend school, compared to 82.4 percent of their urban peers.

Another way to visualize differences in education across areas is by comparing school attainment profiles for young adults, that is, those who have recently completed their schooling. Figure 1.9 shows the percentages of the population ages 21 to 30 who have completed each grade level by area. Among this cohort, primary completion rates (sixth grade) are 93 percent in urban areas, 85 percent in rural towns, and only 72 percent in dispersed rural areas. There is a massive drop-off in school completion after primary school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.4. Maximum Level of Education Attained in Argentina (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Figures shown are for the population age 15 and older.
rates for those in dispersed rural areas; only 30 percent of dispersed rural residents in this age cohort have completed the seventh grade.9

The gap in educational attainment between urban and rural areas is not new. Figure 1.10 shows the average years of schooling by age group for those living in different areas at the time of the 2001 Population Census. Note that what is shown in this figure represents a combination of lower education levels in rural areas and the tendency of the more educated to migrate from rural to urban areas. With that caveat, it is clear that rural residents of all ages are less educated than their urban peers. Consider for example those Argentines ages 75 to 79 at the time of the 2001 Population Census, who were born in the early 1920s and educated in the 1920s and 1930s. Those in this age cohort living in dispersed rural areas have an average of 3.5 years of schooling, compared to 6.5 years for their cohort peers in urban areas.

### Table 1.5. School Attendance in Rural and Urban Argentina, 2001 (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>3–4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6–11</th>
<th>12–14</th>
<th>15–17</th>
<th>18–24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All urban</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All rural</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Figure 1.9. School Attainment Profile for Individuals Ages 21–30

Verner (2006a) showed that in data from the 2003 RHS, children ages 10 to 14 in the poorest income quintile are least likely to attend school. The big policy question is whether the lower participation of the lowest quintile is supply or demand driven. If the problem is related to lack of demand, a program such as Bolsa Familiar in Brazil may increase school attendance of the poor. Most regions do have schools, but the students’ travel time to reach the schools may be significant, particularly in Northwest and Northeast Argentina. Policies to improve access of the poor to secondary and higher education linked with improved quality of education and increased focus on technical skills should be one of the key pillars of the government’s rural poverty reduction strategy.

**Age Structure of Population**

Rural areas of Argentina differ markedly in terms of the age and sex structure of the population. This is readily apparent in Figures 1.11, 1.12, and 1.13, which show population pyramids separately for urban zones, rural towns, and dispersed rural areas. The urban pyramid shows the basic feature common to industrialized societies: a narrow base that indicates low fertility rates and a population with relatively few children. Both rural towns and dispersed rural areas, however, show wide bases that indicate a continuing high fertility rate.

The huge imbalance in the sex ratio is another important point that emerges from the population pyramid for dispersed rural areas. Among children 0 to 9 years of age, as in urban areas and small towns, there are just slightly more boys than girls: 104 boys per 100 girls. But among 15- to 19-year-olds, boys outnumber girls by 117 to 100, and for those in their 20s and 30s there are 122 men per woman. This probably reflects work-related migration. Young men are more likely to stay in dispersed rural areas or to move there for physical labor on farms, while young women have a higher propensity to leave due to fewer work opportunities.

Although definitive information on urban-rural migration is not available, the population pyramids strongly suggest that the decline in rural population is primarily due to migration. The high fertility levels (illustrated by the wide bases on the rural pyramids) would lead to a growing population in the absence of the migration from rural areas. The “pinching” seen in the rural town and dispersed rural pyramids for ages 15 to 34 suggests that young people of working age leave to seek opportunities in urban areas.
The poorest households in all areas—as measured by UBN—are those with the youngest and very oldest household heads (Figure 1.14). This “U-pattern” of poverty by age is seen in both rural towns and dispersed rural areas. In contrast, households in urban areas with young heads are much more likely to have UBN. This may be because social services are less likely to be available to the oldest rural residents. As noted elsewhere in this chapter, far fewer residents in rural areas pay into the social security system. As a result, in old age they are much more likely to have little or no means of support. In all areas, households least likely to have UBN are those with heads age 60 to 69.11

Rural households are larger on average, particularly in dispersed rural areas. Average household size is 3.56 in urban areas, 3.75 in small towns, and 4.00 in dispersed rural areas. Figure 1.15 shows unsatisfied basic needs by household size. As in most countries, the largest households are most likely to be poor. However, a large share of households with just one or two members are poor as well. The households that are least likely to be poor are those with three members, whether they be in dispersed rural areas, rural towns, or urban zones.

**Housing Conditions**

Next, this report considers the quality of housing in different areas, using the CALMAT index employed by INDEC. The index includes five levels, from highest to lowest quality. The figure shows clear disparity in housing quality across areas (Figure 1.16). While the majority of urban residents have housing in the highest-quality category, only 38 percent
of rural town residents have the same. In dispersed rural areas, few live in high-quality housing, and 37 percent live in dwellings in the two lowest-quality categories, indicating that they are built with “inadequately resistant or discarded materials.”

**Basic Infrastructure Services**

Basic infrastructure services contribute to higher well-being and productivity. Some services, such as potable water and sanitation, contribute directly to overall well-being and health status. Others such as electricity and telephones help households use their homes productively for income generation. Research reveals that access to basic services is highly correlated with a lower probability of being poor.

Figure 1.17 summarizes access to public services by area. Unsurprisingly, access to public services is limited in dispersed rural areas. Because such services are typically provided by public authorities, in remote areas there may be no local government to provide such services, and providing such services would be expensive on a per-person basis. Despite these challenges, electricity and running water are available to 63 percent and 39 percent (respectively) of those living in dispersed rural areas. For all services, rural towns have access rates intermediate between urban and dispersed areas. Running water, electricity, and streetlights are nearly as common in rural towns as in urban areas.

Large differences exist in access to energy and electricity in rural Argentina. Energy and rural electrification contribute to the improvement of living conditions in rural areas. They facilitate social integration, contribute to increasing production value, and promote...
Figure 1.13. Population Pyramid for Dispersed Rural Population in Argentina, 2001


Figure 1.14. Unsatisfied Basic Needs by Age of Household Head

Figure 1.15. Unsatisfied Basic Needs by Household Size


Figure 1.16. Housing Quality Index by Share of Population in Different Areas


Note: The CALMAT index is shown.
Some houses, most of them in dispersed areas and small localities far from main roads, use diesel generators. Rural residents commonly use firewood or charcoal for cooking. In Chaco, Santiago del Estero, and other provinces, it would not take a great deal of effort to increase access to electricity because in many places the power line runs directly over the lot, but the dwelling is not connected to the grid. During field visits conducted by Verner (2005), rural dwellers mentioned that there is a one-time fee of Arg$750–1,100 to connect the household to the electrical grid.

The incidence of water access varies among rich and poor and among provinces. Overall, two-thirds of rural drinking water service is provided by neighborhood groups and cooperatives, and one-third is provided by official provincial and municipal agencies (World Bank 2004). If one considers that the provision of drinking water, sewerage networks, and electricity to a dispersed rural population would be particularly costly, efforts should first be aimed at the population in rural towns and in regions and provinces with the most acute level and highest density of poverty. At the same time, special programs should be defined, using appropriate technologies that improve the dispersed rural population’s access to water.

Social Services
Rural residents are substantially less likely to have access to basic social services. Only 33 percent of those in dispersed rural areas and 46 percent of those in rural towns have health insurance, compared to 54 percent of urban residents (see Figure 1.18). In addition, rural residents are much less likely to be paying into the social security system. Note that these insurance figures include both obra social programs and various forms of private insurance but do not include access to the public health care system. These figures also do not reflect government programs like Plan Nacer that have been initiated since the census data were collected in 2001.

Figure 1.19 shows social security contributions by area for all workers. In dispersed rural areas, more than half (52 percent) of all workers make no contribution to social security, compared to 37 percent of urban workers. These individuals—who are “informal workers” under a commonly used definition of the term—will not qualify for benefits in old age.

---

**Figure 1.17. Access to Infrastructure Services**

Employment

Rural Argentina has a diverse economy that belies simple characterization as a monolithic farming society. To be sure, the bulk of rural workers are in industries directly or indirectly related to agriculture. But the set of support activities covers a wide ground. Two-thirds (64 percent) of workers in dispersed areas do work in agriculture, ranching, hunting, forestry, or fishing (see Figure 1.20). A much smaller percentage (13 percent) work in community, social, and personal services, with the rest scattered among other sectors. In contrast, just a quarter (24 percent) of workers in rural towns are engaged directly in agriculture. The rest of rural town employment is spread across all sectors, with community, social, and personal services employing the largest group.13

Overall, the distribution of employment by type of employment arrangement does not vary so greatly between urban areas, rural towns, and dispersed rural zones (Figure 1.21). Just under half of all workers in all three areas are private sector salaried workers, and six percent in each group are business owners, with independent workers accounting for approximately 20 percent of workers in all three areas. The key differences across areas are that, as one would expect, there are few public sector employees in dispersed rural areas (9 percent of the total) and a large number of family workers (13 percent).

It is possible to paint a rough portrait of rural agriculture by considering employment arrangements of agricultural workers only. Agricultural employment in all areas is
Figure 1.19. Social Security Contributions by Area

Note: Figures calculated for all workers age 14 and older.

Figure 1.20. Sector of Employment by Area

Note: Figures calculated for all workers age 14 and older.
split between private-sector workers and independent workers, with a small group of family workers. The distribution of employment types is similar for agricultural and nonagricultural workers.

One can also consider the size of the farms where private-sector salaried agricultural employees work (Figure 1.23). In dispersed rural areas, the large majority (64 percent) work on small farms that employ 1 to 5 people, and much of the remainder work on farms with 6 to 39 people. Only 7 percent work on large farms that employ 40 or more people. Figures are similar for rural towns. Overall, it is clear that in terms of employment (but not necessarily production), Argentine agriculture is dominated by small-scale producers—family farmers and farms with a small number of employees.

Finally, it is possible to consider how poverty, measured by UBN, varies by sector of employment of household head (Figure 1.24). While households with unemployed heads
in dispersed rural areas have by far the highest level of poverty (53 percent), the variation for UBN across other sectors is surprisingly small. For the two main sectors in dispersed rural areas—(1) agriculture and other primary sector activities, and (2) community, social, and personal services—rates of UBN are roughly equal. Within small towns, households with heads working in the primary sector have the highest rates of UBN, apart from those with unemployed heads.

The sociological literature in Argentina has emphasized the importance of “plural activity” (income diversification) for rural households. As Craviotti and Gerardi (2002) pointed out, plural activity takes the idea of “having a foot on farming” and combining this activity with other labor placements. Although comprehensive data on rural activities are not available, a number of smaller studies in the economic and sociological literature emphasize the importance of nonfarming rural employment for rural household incomes in Argentina. These studies suggest that income diversification has become a preferred path for rural households (Manzanal 2006; Verner 2005; Craviotti and Gerardi 2002; and in particular the review by Neiman and Craviotti 2006). The sociology literature on the Argentine rural sector emphasizes that compared to the past, rural life is now more connected with urban and semiurban areas through work as well as through social, cultural, and political channels (Caracciolo and Foti 2003).

This literature distinguishes the poor who are purely farmers, roughly corresponding to those living on the “Poor Farms” defined in the agricultural censuses, from those with substantial other sources of income. Pure farm households are in a greater situation of vulnerability than those that have other labor income sources (Craviotti and Soverna 1999; Craviotti and Gerardi 2002). These households are usually families and have been sources of out-migrants (see Bardomá and Blanco 2006; Craviotti and Gerardi 2002).
Another category of households consists of those that combine farming with wage-earning employment by some of their members. Better-positioned households are the ones that have at least one member that has off-farm employment. In some cases it is this activity that finances the farm production in times of crisis and (Neiman, Bardomás, and Berger 2006; Gras 2006). Analysis based on two small-scale rural surveys (PROINDER 2005; World Bank) found that access to off-farm rural employment is highly related to a higher level of education (Craviotti and Gerardi 2002; Verner 2005).

The Need for Data: Poverty Monitoring and Evaluation of Rural Programs

The provincial and federal governments have a number of programs aimed at reducing poverty, many of which are important in rural areas. Various programs are run by the Ministries of Labor, Social Assistance, Education, Health, and Agriculture. Rural development programs are managed by the Ministry of Agriculture (SAGPyA), the Ministry of Production, and the National Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA). Apart from national-level programs, provinces also have their own rural development programs.

The Heads of Household Program is one nationally important program, which was launched as the main public safety-net response to the 2001–02 crisis. Analysis based on the EPH (in larger urban areas) has shown that the program helped alleviate extreme poverty. Very little is known about the program’s effects in rural areas and smaller urban areas, however, due to the lack of data.

This brief review of rural programs helps to highlight the need for better rural data. Without a regular household survey in rural areas, monitoring and evaluation of programs in rural areas is entirely dependent on administrative data and specialized surveys. While administrative data are important to government monitoring systems, their usefulness for evaluating programs is limited. Administrative data typically consist only of data on those who are enrolled in a particular program. Consequently, administrative data cannot be

---

**Figure 1.24. Percentage of Population with Unsatisfied Basic Needs by Sector of Employment of Household Head**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector of Employment</th>
<th>Dispersed rural</th>
<th>Rural towns</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, ranching, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, social, and personal services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, restaurants, hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance, real estate, corporate services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, storage, and communication services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of workers

used to evaluate the quality of the program’s targeting of those in need, which is often an issue of high importance to policy makers.

Specialized surveys can be useful but are expensive and often difficult to organize. Additionally, some information on outcomes for both program recipients and for those in a valid comparison (or “control”) group is the absolute minimum data needed to evaluate a program’s impact. It is rare to obtain such comparison group information from administrative data or a specialized survey. A regular household survey, on the other hand, can generate that kind of information.14 Expansion of the EPH to full national coverage could generate valuable new information on program coverage and impact in areas outside the large metropolitan areas currently covered by the survey. Chapter 3 of this report considers some of the technical issues relevant to expanding EPH coverage.

Notes

1 Note that this discussion does not take into account changes in population due to mortality and fertility, and a detailed demographic decomposition is not attempted in this report.
2 In some cases, these areas may be included in the outskirts of some urban zones surveyed by the EPH.
3 A sample of the 2001 Population Census is scheduled to be released by the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) project at the University of Minnesota in June 2007.
4 For this comparison between 1991 and 2001, figures are shown for rural areas as a whole within each province (rather than rural towns and dispersed rural areas separately) because more disaggregated UBN information is not available for 1991.
5 These figures are not available broken down by poor and nonpoor farms.
6 A comparison with the work of Gerardo (2001; see Figure 3) can be made for Mendoza province. Because the methodology was the same, as expected the values come very close (in spite of a year difference between each work field and that Verner only included dispersed rural areas).
7 To design the sample, a database with the fractions and radius of each department in each province was considered. In each fraction, a random weighted sample of 8 to 10 points was conducted, depending on the number of rural people in the province. Once the fraction and points sampled were identified, the final sample points were defined considering the number of rural inhabitants in each radius.
8 In Mendoza information was gathered between December 5 and 30, in Santiago del Estero between December 7 and 19, in Chaco between December 27 and January 15, and in Santa Fe between December 7 and 30.
9 Note that this shows school attainment for individuals 21 to 30 years of age using groups defined by where they were living at the time of the 2001 Census. Those who have emigrated from dispersed rural areas (or rural towns) to urban areas since they completed their schooling appear in the urban group.
10 The sex imbalance in dispersed rural area persists and is even more intense at higher ages, with 138 men per 100 women in their 50s. It is unclear why this should be the case.
11 The high UBN rates for households with very old heads is also in part a consequence of the definition of UBN. A household with no one currently working and a head who has not completed the third grade is considered to have UBN.
12 The CALMAT index defines and categorizes housing as follows:
   1. Housing built with solid/resistant and durable/adequate materials in floors, walls, and roofs and having all the necessary insulating elements and proper finish.
   2. Housing built with solid/resistant and durable/adequate materials in floors, walls, and roofs but lacking proper insulation or finish in at least one of the following: floors, walls, or roofs.
   3. Housing built with solid/resistant and durable/adequate materials in floors, walls, and roofs but lacking proper insulation or finish in floors, walls, and roofs; or else with tin or other metal plate or fiber-cement roofs and no finished ceilings; or with tin or other metal plate or fiber-cement walls.
   4. Housing built with inadequately resistant or discarded materials in either floors, walls, or roofs.
   5. Housing built with inadequately resistant or discarded materials in floors, walls, and roofs.
13 Note that while only 3.5 percent of urban residents work in agriculture, ranching, hunting, forestry, or fishing, these amount to 37 percent of all such workers nationally.
14 Challenges to convincingly estimate the impact of a program remain even when survey data are available. But much better estimates can be made when a survey is done repeatedly over time and especially when it includes panel data, which is the case with the EPH.
A Qualitative Study of Rural Poverty in Argentina

By Ignacio Llovet and Dorte Verner

Introduction

This chapter presents findings from a qualitative study of the rural poor. Case studies were conducted in four provinces to examine the conditions of the lives of the rural poor. The case studies were conducted principally through in-depth interviews with 43 rural poor households in the provinces of Chaco, Jujuy, Mendoza, and Tucumán.

Three general findings emerge from this work vis-à-vis previous literature on rural poverty in Argentina. First, a common theme in such studies is that poverty is a complex, heterogeneous, and multidimensional phenomenon (Neiman 2000; Manzanal 2006; Murmis 2001). Along the same line, some authors have suggested that income for many poor rural households comes from a variety of on- and off-farm sources (Neiman and Craviotti 2006). These views are supported by the qualitative work for this study, which found a wide variety of circumstances among the rural poor, who cannot be understood as a simple monolithic group.

Second, as previous studies have noted, there is an increasing economic, social, and cultural interrelation between the rural and the urban sector (Caracciolo and Foti 2003). Urban and rural areas are integrated through migration—which has long been a key feature of rural life—and by the newer phenomenon of cell phones, which have quickly become widespread in dispersed rural areas previously cut off from telephone communication.

Third, although some of the literature on rural Argentina has suggested that economic transformations over recent decades have resulted in a growing concentration of land ownership to the detriment of smaller and more vulnerable farmers, no evidence of such changes emerged in the study.

This chapter uses secondary sources, key informant interviews, in-depth interviews, and focus groups. The key informant interviewees were expert observers of each provincial situation and provided detailed information before field research was undertaken. Focus groups were carried out in two different communities in each province and were composed of 8 to 12 persons. Groups were structured around a set of simple questions. In-depth interviews were held with people who were poor as defined in this report. The sample was selected so as to cover a diverse population in terms of geography, demography, and productive activities (see Box 1.1 on methodology and sampling). Except where otherwise noted, general statements refer to the interviewed households and do not necessarily reflect the situation for the population as a whole.

The chapter is organized as follows: The first section addresses the methodology for the qualitative survey work, a subsequent section presents analyses of case studies and data, and the final section presents the key characteristics of the extreme poor and households in rural Argentina.
Methodology for Qualitative Survey

The areas for the survey were selected taking into account the ethnic, institutional, and economic characteristics as well as the history, productive profile, and social diversity of the different areas of the provinces. The specific departments were as follows:

- Chaco province: departments of Libertador General San Martín and General Güemes.
- Jujuy province: departments of Ledesmna, Cochinoca, and Tilcara.
- Tucumán province: departments Tafi del Valle, Simoca, and Graneros.
- Mendoza province: departments of Lavalle, San Rafael, and Malargue.

Roughly 10 rural poor households were selected in each of the four provinces—Chaco, Jujuy, Mendoza, and Tucumán—for an overall of 43 households. Selection of households was carried out with the support of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and government personnel with knowledge of each community. The decision to include a household in the sample followed two steps. First, the household was visually inspected to check if the household had at least one unsatisfied basic need (UBN). Second, after the interview was completed, an income evaluation was carried out to verify whether the household classified as poor. Rural indigenous households were included in each province.

In all instances the arrival at the household was made in the company of a local guide who facilitated the interview (see list in Annex 2.1). The interviewee was the male or female adult household head. Consent was obtained in order to take photographs and film the family group and the dwelling. The rural households in the final sample are presented in Annex 2.2.

Census data show that there is substantial variation in the levels of poverty (in terms of UBN) across the departments studied. The rate of UBN varies from a minimum of 25 percent in San Rafael to 57 percent in Güemes (Table 2.1). In 2001, 9 of the 11 departments had levels of UBN higher than the national average (31 percent), while only two departments—San Rafael (Mendoza) and Tafi del Valle (Tucumán)—had lower levels. Varied situations are found within each province. The greatest variance is found in Mendoza, with a 17 percent difference found between the departments of Malargue and San Rafael.

Sociodemographic Characteristics

This section presents analyses of the qualitative data and is organized in six subsections: family composition, migration, labor markets, health, social protection, and housing and infrastructure. An overview of findings is presented in Tables 2.2–2.4.

Family Composition

Within the set of poor households there is a complex range of family types and sizes. There are typical nuclear families such as that of 21-year-old Agüero who lives in Chaco in a hut with his wife and his only son. There are single-parent families such as those like Jovita from Jujuy who lives with her four daughters and 42-year-old Lidia who lives with two of her four daughters. There are also individuals living alone such as 48-year-old Rosa in Tucumán and Alberto, a 59-year-old indigenous man in Jujuy. Extended family connections are widespread. The household head may live with his or her children, parents, brothers and sisters, in-laws, nephews and nieces, and grandchildren. It is not clear whether or not the prevalence of large extended families is driven by cultural or economic factors.

In some cases, individual homes have been constructed very close to one another for different parts of the same family. For example, Rosa Ángela lives together with eight people—her mother, her child, two brothers, a sister, her brother-in-law, and two nephews—
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laboratory</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Rural population</th>
<th>% of economically active in agriculture-related activities, rural areas</th>
<th>UBN, rural areas</th>
<th>% of household heads who did not attend the formal education system, rural areas</th>
<th>% of household heads who did not finish primary school, rural areas</th>
<th>Indigenous peoples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaco</td>
<td>984,446</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Toba &amp; Whichis, Mocoví</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertador General San Martin</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Tobas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Güemes</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Tobas &amp; Whichis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jujuy</td>
<td>611,888</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Atacamas, Oraguacas, Aimará, Kollas, Guaraniés, Tupí, Quechuas, Chané, Diaguitas/Diaguitas Calchaquíes, Ocloya, Vilela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledesma</td>
<td>75,700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Guaraníes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochinoca</td>
<td>12,111</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Kollas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilcara</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kollas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tucumán</strong></td>
<td>1,338,523</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Diaguitas/Diaguitas Calchaquíes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graneros</td>
<td>13,063</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Diaguitas/Diaguitas Calchaquíes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simoca</td>
<td>29,932</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Diaguitas/Diaguitas Calchaquíes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tafi del Valle</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Diaguitas/Diaguitas Calchaquíes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mendoza</strong></td>
<td>1,579,651</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Huarpes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavalle</td>
<td>32,129</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Huarpes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael</td>
<td>173,600</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malargue</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: INDEC and World Bank staff analysis based on 2001 Population Census data.*
Table 2.2. Summary of Social Issues based on Qualitative Households Survey (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tucumán</th>
<th>Jujuy</th>
<th>Chaco</th>
<th>Mendoza</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # households</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous households</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration links</td>
<td>yes 3, n.a. 7</td>
<td>yes 4, no 2, n.a. 4</td>
<td>yes 7, n.a. 5</td>
<td>yes 2, no 2, n.a. 7</td>
<td>yes 20, no 4, n.a. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>informal 7, unemployed 3</td>
<td>informal 9, formal 1</td>
<td>informal 9, formal 1, unemployed 1, n.a. 1</td>
<td>informal 11</td>
<td>informal 36, formal 2, unemployed 4, n.a. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence production</td>
<td>yes 7, no 1, n.a. 2</td>
<td>yes 4, no 6</td>
<td>yes 10, no 2</td>
<td>yes 7, no 4</td>
<td>yes 28, no 13, n.a. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>yes 3, no 5, n.a. 2</td>
<td>yes 4, no 6</td>
<td>yes 2, no 5, n.a. 5</td>
<td>yes 3, no 8</td>
<td>yes 12, no 24, n.a. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns land</td>
<td>owner 2, community 1, not owner 6, n.a. 1</td>
<td>owner 4, not owner 3, n.a. 3</td>
<td>owner 3, community 2, not owner 7</td>
<td>owner 1, community 1, not owner 8, n.a. 2</td>
<td>owner 9, community 4, not owner 24, n.a. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childbirth at home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>IP 6</td>
<td>NIP 2</td>
<td>IP 1, NIP 3</td>
<td>12 (IP 7, NIP 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childbirth in hospital</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33 (IP 10, NIP 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic illness in HH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled in HH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use contraceptives</td>
<td>yes 2, n.a. 8</td>
<td>yes 6, n.a. 4</td>
<td>yes 4, no 1</td>
<td>yes 3, no 1</td>
<td>yes 15, no 2, n.a. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Protection</td>
<td>yes 7, n.a. 3</td>
<td>yes 3, no 2, n.a. 5</td>
<td>yes 4, n.a. 8</td>
<td>yes 6, n.a. 5</td>
<td>yes 20, no 2, n.a. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive pension</td>
<td>yes 3, n.a. 7</td>
<td>yes 2, n.a. 8</td>
<td>yes 2, no 10</td>
<td>yes 7, n.a. 4</td>
<td>yes 14, no 10, n.a. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food package</td>
<td>yes 1, no 1, n.a. 8</td>
<td>yes 3, no 4, n.a. 3</td>
<td>no 1, n.a. 11</td>
<td>yes 3, no 4, n.a. 4</td>
<td>yes 7, no 10, n.a. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to microcredit</td>
<td>yes 6, no 1, n.a. 3</td>
<td>yes 5, no 4, n.a. 4</td>
<td>yes 2, no 4, n.a. 6</td>
<td>yes 4, n.a. 7</td>
<td>yes 13, no 13, n.a. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared housing</td>
<td>most numerous: IP</td>
<td>most numerous: IP</td>
<td>IP 14, NIP 12</td>
<td>IP 15, NIP 14 &amp; 11</td>
<td>most numerous: IP minimal diff. in Chaco and Mendoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes 5, no 5</td>
<td>yes 7, no 3</td>
<td>no 11, n.a. 1</td>
<td>yes 2, no 9</td>
<td>yes 14, no 28, n.a. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running water</td>
<td>yes 6, no 3, n.a. 1</td>
<td>yes 5, no 5</td>
<td>yes 1, no 10</td>
<td>yes 5, no 6</td>
<td>yes 17, no 24, n.a. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar panel</td>
<td>buy 1, farm &amp; buy 9</td>
<td>buy 3, farm &amp; buy 4, buy &amp; relatives 3</td>
<td>buy 1, farm &amp; buy 10, n.a. 1</td>
<td>buy 4, farm &amp; buy 7</td>
<td>buy 9, farm &amp; buy 30, buy &amp; relatives 3, n.a. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food source</td>
<td>yes 5, no 1, n.a. 4</td>
<td>yes 4, no 4, n.a. 2</td>
<td>yes 1, no 3, n.a. 8</td>
<td>yes 2, no 2, n.a. 7</td>
<td>yes 12, no 10, n.a. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell phone</td>
<td>primary comp. 2, high school incomp. 1, tech. educ. comp 1, n.a. 6</td>
<td>illiterate 2, primary incomp. 6, primary comp 2</td>
<td>primary incomp. 3, primary comp 2, n.a. 7</td>
<td>illiterate 4, primary incomp. 2, primary comp 4, n.a. 1</td>
<td>illiterate 6, primary incomp. 11, primary comp. 10, high school incomp. 1, tech. educ. comp. 1, n.a. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>improve housing 4, educ. 1, water 1, market stand 1, formal job 1, pension 1, refrigerator 1, n.a. 3</td>
<td>improve housing 7, educ. 1, sustain grocery 1, n.a. 2</td>
<td>improve housing 5, food security 2, land 1, formal job 1, improve economic situation 2, recovering from the flood 1, n.a. 1</td>
<td>improve housing 7, food security 1, clothes 1, buy animals 1, n.a. 1</td>
<td>improve housing 23, food security 3, educ. 2, water 1, market stand 1, sustain grocery 1, formal job 2, improve economic situation 2, pension 1, clothes 1, buy animal 1, land 1, recover from flood 1, refrigerator 1, n.a. 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Tabulation based on fieldwork.


Not all households discussed all issues. In cases where the total in a cell do not add up to the total number of households for the column (shown in the top row), the remaining households did not discuss the issue and are marked n.a. For example, consider the cell corresponding to subsistence production in Tucumán. Six households indicated they practice subsistence agriculture, and one indicated that it did not. The remaining two households in the province did not discuss the issue.

a. Some interviewees had more than one priority.
### Table 2.3. Summary of Focus Group Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of poverty in rural areas</th>
<th>J. J. Castelli, Chaco</th>
<th>Lules, Tucumán</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Resources are not being invested in an efficient way.</td>
<td>1. The demand for housing is being covered just by 10%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of resources and agricultural planning.</td>
<td>2. Microcredit between Arg$2,000–2,500.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Northern Chaco poorer than southern parts.</td>
<td>3. To produce one ha of strawberry you need to invest Arg$50,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Main production: cotton, livestock, goat, pigs, and timber.</td>
<td>4. Some years ago a family needed 10 ha to live, today it needs min. 70 ha.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception and visibility of poverty in rural areas</th>
<th>J. J. Castelli, Chaco</th>
<th>Lules, Tucumán</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Housing: (a) Poor building materials, serious degree of precariousness; (b) lack water for human consumption.</td>
<td>1. Housing: (a) Lack rural planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Infrastructure: (a) Lack access to electricity; (b) low coverage of health care; (c) poor roads; (d) lack public transportation in rural areas, (e) solar panels are more a problem than a solution because the supply of electricity is just enough for one or two light bulbs.</td>
<td>2. Infrastructure: (b) Lack access to electricity, and other services; 2) poor roads; (c) lack public transportation in rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The region is large and the population is dispersed.</td>
<td>3. Part of the region has dispersed population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant factors of the poverty situation</th>
<th>J. J. Castelli, Chaco</th>
<th>Lules, Tucumán</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rural-urban migration: (a) urban area offers electricity, water, education, social protection, health care, communication; (b) rural schools are depopulated; (c) higher cost of living in rural areas (i.e., more expensive electricity and fuel); (d) a farmer who cultivated 100 ha obtained around Arg$9,000/year (that producer has moved to the urban area).</td>
<td>1. Lack of job generation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social protection system and loss of work culture: (a) welfare dependency and increased poverty (some families prefer to get social assistance instead of working); (b) moving to urban areas may lead to a larger income (if one or two members of families obtain social protection, they can obtain Arg$15,000/year).</td>
<td>2. Capital concentration and technological changes: (a) one machine replaces around 800 people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Taxes: (a) rural producers pay the same tax as urban and producers in richer provinces.</td>
<td>3. Lack of technicians: (a) replacement of technical education for general education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subsistence production: (a) has partially disappeared.</td>
<td>4. Rural-urban migration: (a) especially youths; (b) urban areas offer electricity, water, education, social protection, health care, communication, labor opportunities; (c) rural schools have become depopulated, some schools are being closed due to the lack of students; (d) small producers have not enough land to cultivate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Market difficulties for small producers: (a) strong dependency on climate (dry area, around 900 mm rainfall per year in the north, floods); (b) the world market sets the cotton price; (c) large distances to ports.</td>
<td>5. Market difficulties for small producers: (a) intermediary sellers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. National policies do not protect small producers.

7. Poor health conditions: (a) Chagas disease; (b) tuberculosis; (c) child malnutrition; (d) adolescent pregnancy; (e) cultural barriers between IP and NIP; (f) lack of nutrition diversity (high consumption of meat); (g) alcoholism among men.

8. Family issues: (a) violence; (b) single parents (the husband leaves, the woman takes care of everything); (c) extended families; (d) child labor.

### Persistent poverty?

1. The poverty has increased.
2. Some people who came from Europe started working in agriculture and improved their economic situation, but they now receive pensions. Their sons do not continue to work in agriculture but work in the public sector.

### Actions aimed at reducing rural poverty

1. ProHuerta (INTA)
2. PROSAP
3. PROINDER
4. Plan Nacer
5. Heads of Household Program
6. Family Program
7. Food packages.

### Suggestions concerning how to solve or reduce rural poverty

1. Differentiated taxes in rural and urban areas.
2. Social protection programs should be differentiated: (a) today they are designed for urban areas; (b) it is easier to get social assistance in the city than in rural areas.
3. Implement microcredits.
4. Implement alternative production policies.
5. Implement differentiated cultivation.
6. Implement handicrafts production.
7. Improve the water infrastructure.
8. Construct aqueduct and design strategic water plan.
9. Train the small producers.

1. Poverty has increased.
2. Some Bolivian immigrants started working in agriculture and improved their economic situation due to hard work (harder than Argentinean rural poor), and they work in a cooperative way.

### Source:
Tabulation based on fieldwork.
Table 2.4. Summary of Focus Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of poverty in rural areas</th>
<th>Tilcara, Jujuy</th>
<th>Malargue, Mendoza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The rural poverty is below the poverty line.</td>
<td>1. Difficult to say if the poverty increased or decreased, but the people each time needs more and more resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of resources and agricultural planning.</td>
<td>2. Mainly subsistence production.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kolla culture prevalence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Poverty is not only a lack of resources, but cultural too. There is not a culture of entrepreneurship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Main production: small livestock, small horticultural production, handicrafts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception and visibility of poverty in rural areas</th>
<th>Tilcara, Jujuy</th>
<th>Malargue, Mendoza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Housing: (a) poor building materials, serious degree of precariousness; (b) lack of water for human consumption.</td>
<td>1. Housing: (a) poorly built roofs, toilets, and latrines; (b) no waste management; (c) lack of water for human consumption.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Infrastructure: (a) lack of access to electricity and water for irrigation; (b) poor roads; (c) lack of public transportation in rural areas (12–14 hours of mule transportation between communities); (d) solar panel, at least people have a bulb that gives light until midnight; (e) poor coverage of education and health care systems.</td>
<td>2. Infrastructure: (a) lack of public transportation in rural areas; (b) difficult access to health centers and grocery stores; (c) lack of access to electricity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The region is large and the rural area has mainly dispersed population.</td>
<td>3. The rural area has mainly dispersed population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant factors of the poverty situation</th>
<th>Tilcara, Jujuy</th>
<th>Malargue, Mendoza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rural-urban migration: (a) Especially youths; (b) urban areas offer electricity, water, education—but it is not culturally appropriated—social protection, health care, communication, labor opportunities; (c) rural schools have become depopulated, and some school are being closed due to the lack of students (a minimum of 122 students is required to have a school open); (d) some rural schools do not have teachers.</td>
<td>1. Rural-urban migration: (a) especially youths; (b) urban areas offer education; (c) higher costs of living in rural areas; (d) school-shelters show students better living conditions so when the youths return home they migrate; (e) high average age as consequence of migration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Market difficulties for small producers: (a) loss of markets; (b) strong dependency on climate (dry area, around 100–200 mm rainfall per year, floods); (c) lack of land title to obtain credits.</td>
<td>2. Taxes: (a) rural producers pay the same tax as urban and producers in richer provinces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. National policies do not defend small producers but give strong support to tobacco companies.</td>
<td>3. Market difficulties for small producers: (a) livestock attacked by wild protected animals (fox, puma, condor, guanaco); (b) drought; (c) lack of knowledge of global markets; (d) intermediary sellers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Poor health condition: (a) child malnutrition; (b) 80% adolescent pregnancy; (c) alcoholism among men 14 years of age and older.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Family issues: (a) extended families; (b) child labor; (c) violence; (d) single parents (the husband leaves, the woman takes care of everything).

6. Social protection system: (a) welfare dependency and increased poverty (some families prefer to get social plans instead of working).

7. Devaluation of Kolla culture.

4. Poor health conditions: (a) endemic diseases (i.e., brucellosis, parasitosis, diverticulosis); (b) lack of nutrition diversity (high consumption of meat); (c) drinking water contains parasites and excrements due to badly placed latrines.

5. Persistent cultural perceptions, resistance to changes: (a) “We should change their attitude, they are used to receive everything”; (b) Why improve toilet when there is a big field? (c) Why vaccinate animals?

6. Education system needs improvement.

7. Insecure situation related to lack of land titling and employment.

8. Lack of work culture.

Persistent poverty?

1. The poverty is persistent and has increased.

Actions aimed at reducing rural poverty

1. ProHuerta (INTA)
2. PROSAP
3. PROINDER
4. PSA
5. Manos a la obra
6. Plan Nacer
7. Heads of Household Program
8. Family Program

Suggestions concerning how to solve or reduce rural poverty

1. Implement a Kolla culture in school curricula.
2. Improve the people’s self-esteem.
3. Implement alternative production policies.
4. Train small producers to adapt to the Kolla culture.
5. Increase access to land for small producers to avoid migration to urban areas.

1. Implement policies promoting rural development.
2. Increase access to a land.
3. Train small producers to adapt to the rural culture.
4. Train in business administration.
5. Improve the articulation between national, provincial, and local governments and civil society.

Source: Tabulation based on fieldwork.
in a house that belonged to her grandmother and to which Rosa Ángela herself added new rooms to house all of the family members. In another case, 31-year-old Deolinda, an indigenous woman from Amaicha de Valle, and her 4-year-old daughter live in her parents’ house with her brothers due to a lack of resources to live elsewhere.

Aside from those cases in which a child inherits a home from his or her parents and must share it with all of his or her brothers and sisters, there are other situations in which one of the children forms his or her own family but continues to reside in the same home with his or her parents. For example, Alejandro, a 72-year-old man from Chaco, lives with his wife, daughter, and several grandchildren between the ages of 6 and 12 on a small parcel of land.

Household size among interviewed households ranged from 1 to 24. Half of all households interviewed have six or more members. The number of children can be quite high. For example, 67-year-old Rosa from El Impenetrable in the province of Chaco has given birth to 18 children. However, one can observe significantly lower fertility rates among younger women. Most families interviewed have at least three children, despite widespread awareness of contraceptive methods.

The linkages are also quite diverse among those who live together in a home. An extreme case is that of 28-year-old Angélica who lives in Tilcara, Jujuy. She shares a parcel and home with her four children, her mother, her brothers, and her nephews and nieces: 24 people in total (8 adults, 16 children). This also suggests a certain complementarity or division of labor with extended linkages within each household: Some work in the garden, others seek paid work, while others take care of the children.

Another case of a large household is that of Deolinda, a single 31-year-old indigenous woman who has a 4-year-old daughter and lives with her parents and her brothers (10 people in total). They are indigenous people native to the community of Quilmes, but they live in the community of Amaicha. Her father works in the fields, and she works as a domestic employee and produces handicrafts. Her brothers work in construction. Finally, there are cases in which parents leave their young children in the care of their grandparents, or cases in which children must take care of elderly parents. This is the case for Angela, who cares for her 90-year-old father.

In almost all cases, the interviewees identified as indigenous have many children and large extended families. Two examples are Pedro, an indigenous Toba from Chaco, and Marta, an indigenous Guarani from Jujuy. Pedro is 55 years old and lives with 14 people, including his wife, six of his seven children (between the ages of 3 and 21) and both a daughter-in-law and a son-in-law. Marta is 39 years old and lives with her sister, her seven children, and her partner (in a common-law partnership). Marta has four children of her own and does not have a husband. There is also the case of Angélica from Tilcara, Jujuy province. In her household, 24 persons—16 children and 8 adults—share a living space.

Migration

Migration is a widespread phenomenon in the lives of the rural poor. More than half of the families mention migration either in relation to themselves or to direct relatives. The degree of migration varies among families. In some cases, migration is particularly extensive. For example, 64-year-old Carlos from Chaco has eight sons. Two of his sons live in the vicinity of his house while the remaining six have migrated. Of the six sons who have migrated, two live in Resistencia, the capital of Chaco, and the remaining four live in Buenos Aires. Nearly all of Carlos’s daughters are employed as domestic workers. The story of Polo is similar. Polo is from Tucumán and is 64 years of age. His 10 brothers have migrated, and three of his five sons have migrated to Buenos Aires.

The destinations for migrants are often distant large cities and towns. The case of Alberto from Tambillo is illustrative of this point. His seven children have migrated to
cities at varied distances from Tambillo: Abra Pampa (30 km), San Salvador of Jujuy (150 km), Mendoza (1,500 km), and Buenos Aires (2,000 km).

The search for employment is a primary driver of migration. For women, the expectation is often to find employment as domestic workers while the men labor in the construction sector or in informal, temporary, low-skilled jobs. Migration related to the search for medical attention is also widespread. Several interviewees mentioned that they have at one time or another migrated to cities in order to receive specialized medical care. One of the daughters of the Nieva family of Chaco migrated to Buenos Aires in order to receive medical attention for an illness. In another case, 48-year-old Rosa from Tucumán lived in the city for many years so that her hemophiliac son could receive medical treatment.

The attraction of living in an urban environment also is factor driving migration. This is the case for Catalina, a 35-year-old indigenous woman from La Puna, Jujuy, whose children wanted to stay in Abra Pampa after they had finished their elementary schooling there and not return to Tambillo. As the census data presented in Chapter 1 of this report suggest, young people between the ages of 18 and 35 are more inclined to leave their rural homes. The sons of 72-year-old Alejandro from Chaco, for instance, had also migrated and now work as construction workers. Relatives who migrate generally send clothing or money to their families in rural areas, even though the frequency of remittances is often intermittent.

Some migrants have returned to rural areas; this was motivated by a wide array of factors such as illness or inability to adapt. This was the case for 29-year-old Nicanor from Chaco, who returned home after one year in Buenos Aires because he “didn’t find himself.” Rosa Ángela went back to her small town in Tucumán province after having migrated to Buenos Aires in order to take care of her mother, who had become very ill.

There is no shared concept of the meaning of migration. Some have affirmed that their reasons for migration stemmed from their search for better employment or for better education, while others emphasized that it had a negative impact on the household’s reproductive capacity. For example, Romina, a young woman who lives 25 km from her parents’ house in Libertador San Martin said, “I still miss it a little. I have to hold on, right? Because there isn’t anything in the countryside anymore. . . . Everyone is leaving the countryside. There is almost no help.” A horticulturist from Tucumán, who is also a member of a cooperative, said, “The idea is that there be no more devastation caused by the uprooting and migration of people, the idea is that everyone stays. . . . What we want is that there be no more uprooting for any reason, only in order to continue studying at the university or an agro-technical postsecondary school. Our idea is that everyone works here.” The interviews suggest that migration in one of four cases weakens linkages among family members. However, migration often functions as part of a social network in order to facilitate the sending of money and clothing back home.

As stated in one of the testimonies collected among members of the agricultural cooperative, the phenomenon of migration is also widespread in indigenous communities. Migration appears to affect indigenous and nonindigenous people in a similar way. The testimony of Alberto (from Tambillo in Jujuy province) is also illustrative of this phenomenon: All his children have gone to larger cities; some are in San Salvador de Jujuy, others are in Abra Pampa, and the two youngest are in Buenos Aires and Mendoza.

**Labor Markets**

Among the multiple ways of generating income, poor rural households combine various strategies and resources: wage and relatively stable work, informal and often low-skilled and low-wage temporary jobs, social benefits, and production for the market.

**Occupation.** Employment of rural poor household members has two principal features: They work either in the informal economy or in varied modes of economic insertion in the market economy. Informality is present in the form of self-employment as much as in paid
employment activities. Of those persons employed, only two are employed formally—one as a sanitary worker in Chaco’s health care system, and the other as a farmer at the National Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA) in Amaicha de Valle, Tucumán. The remaining cases are examples of informal employment. For example, Pablo, who has a rather stable job in an olive plantation in the Lavalle department of Mendoza; and Alberto, who is employed as a house gardener on the weekends in Tafí de Valle, Tucumán. Pablo and Alberto earn approximately half the salary of the two formal sector workers mentioned above. The sanitary worker is also self-employed or a self-employed worker as an artisan of Toba handicrafts, while Alberto works in the olive plantations during the harvest, for which he is paid per weighed unit that he harvests. The combinations of stable employment

---

**Box 2.1. An Example of a Case Study in Chaco Province**

Pedro, age 55, belongs to the Toba ethnic group and lives in the indigenous community located in Pozo del Toro, Chaco province. Pozo del Toro is 30 km from J. J. Castelli in a territory that was given back to the community by the provincial government.

Fourteen people live on his piece of land including his wife, six of his seven children, and their spouses. Many of the family members are there temporarily because of the harvest.

Pedro has lived in the house built by his father since 1985. The house was made of adobe, but he was eventually able to rebuild the house with bricks. This improved his quality of life because the adobe house needed to be rebuilt every year. The house is small (24 m²), so when the weather is fair he and his family sleep outside. The house lacks electricity, even though some community buildings such as the salon and church have it. According to Pedro, the cost of installing electricity in his home, although not expensive, is too much for a “small farmer.” The source of water is an old well.

Pedro, who defines himself as a small farmer, has 83 hectares that are part of the indigenous community’s 550 hectares of land. Pedro produces cotton and corn and raises pigs and goats. The main job of the adults, besides working on the family land and occasionally some temporary work, is cotton farming. It is seasonal work and pays Arg$0.30 per kilo. The entire family works during the harvest season. Pedro has one son who lives in J. J. Castelli, where he works changueando (doing small and precarious and temporary jobs). Some members of his family receive scholarships to attend high school, and his wife receives Plan Familias. Pedro also received assistance for farming four years ago. The provincial government provided him cotton seeds, and the Inter-American Foundation donated a tractor to the community. The family’s income comes from farming and from what is made during the harvest, besides occasional money that he receives from his son who lives in J. J. Castelli. Most of the money is used to buy food, gas for lighting, and clothing.

The elementary school is 4 km from Pedro’s house. It is necessary to go to J. J. Castelli to attend high school. All of Pedro’s older children have finished elementary education and have started high school, but the lack of resources and the scarcity of scholarships forced them to drop out. During the harvest season, those who attend school are absent. Plan Familias requires school attendance, and this has had a positive effect on the children’s schooling. With regard to health care, there is an ambulance in town for emergencies and a medical post, and a community member is a medical officer. Moreover, a doctor visits the community once a month. With the exception of one, all of Pedro’s sons were born in a hospital, and all have survived.

The diet of Pedro and his family is simple. Early in the morning they have *mate cocido* for breakfast and occasionally other food. Once in a while the children receive breakfast at school consisting of *mate cocido* with milk and something to eat. Lunch and dinner consist of noodles, potatoes, rice, and sometimes meat. The only means of conserving food is *charqui*, a form of jerky from dried and salted meat.

Pedro does not consider himself poor. He defines himself and his community as “small farmers.” His main priority is to expand his house.

*Source:* World Bank staff based on fieldwork.
with other forms of employment suggest that the income that each generates is insufficient. The importance of self-employment activities for these rural households may be explained by the precarity of the rural labor market.

With respect to the types of self-employment found in the population of rural households visited, the occupational categories of self-employed and contributing family worker are the most numerous (50 percent of households). The self-employed are rarely found in a pure form (that is, temporary rural workers with no other monetary income source but their seasonal activity), but instead combined with other modes of economic insertion. The case of Polo in Tucumán illustrates this point. Until last year, Polo bred goats to sell the meat while at the same time farming a small plot of land in the back of his house with his wife. Another example is Angela from Tafi de Valle who, with her husband’s support, produces agricultural goods in an irrigated garden for the market as well as for their own consumption. These modes comprise a typical combination in rural areas; the family not only consumes but is involved in direct production as well. Within these relations there is a production cycle directed at the market and a production cycle that is destined for domestic consumption. The relationship between the two cycles is flexible: When Polo’s wife passed away, Polo stopped the domestic production.

Temporary workers are present in half of the households visited. For example, Marta from Bananal, Jujuy, works in the tomato and green bean harvests, and she attempted to harvest tobacco for better pay but stopped due to the prolonged periods of time she had to spend away from home. Ernesto from Amaicha del Valle, Tucumán, worked until last year in the lemon harvest and now occasionally works in construction.

**Subsistence Production.** Subsistence production was taking place in 28 of 42 households interviewed, with variations in the type and the intensity of production. Half of the sampled households that are not involved in subsistence production are found in Jujuy. On the one hand, the lack of production is associated with extreme poverty, lack of access to land, and lack of the necessary materials to begin small-scale farming. One case in point is that of Agüero, a 21-year-old man who lives in the province of Chaco, works in coal production, and lives in a small home that he has borrowed. Another example is Paula, a 24-year-old indigenous woman from Jujuy who is extremely poor and cannot produce farmed goods because she lacks the space to do so. Angélica is a 28-year-old nonindigenous woman who lives with 24 others in her home on the outskirts of Tilcara, and who lacks sufficient resources to meet her food needs. In these cases the lack of access to resources such as land, animals, seed, and farming know-how determines the lack of production, although the need may be present. For indigenous as well as nonindigenous peoples, there are cases in which they adapt within this category.

The absence of subsistence agricultural production in some households is also associated with salaried employment that is relatively stable (albeit informal) and that, combined with some social welfare benefits, comprises the family income. For example, this is the case with Alberto, a 39-year-old indigenous man who does not own his land but works in a relatively stable job as a gardener; his wife is employed as a domestic worker. This is also the case of the indigenous sanitary worker from Chaco who obtains his food through cash exchanges or through barter.

**Market Production.** A small majority of rural poor households interviewed (23 out of 43) produce goods of some kind for the market. The degree of linkage that rural poor households have to the market varies, and in many cases the modes in which the market is accessed are hollow and border on conditions of dependency. In this sense, many market relations are fragile and ambiguous.

Many producers have received government assistance in order to further their economic activities. In some cases, assistance has been small and poorly organized (for example, the
distribution of materials and seeds). In other cases more comprehensive entrepreneurial
development strategies, such as PROSAP (Provincial Program of Agricultural Services)
and PSA (Farmers’ Social Program), were mentioned by respondents as having a positive
impact. Other government programs positively mentioned by some respondents are the
Banco Popular de Buena Fe, Pro Huerta, and DCI (funded by the World Bank). Various
municipal government programs were also mentioned.

There is considerable variation among produced goods. The principal products
mentioned in the interviews were (1) meats and livestock (generally cows and goats),
(2) dairy and vegetables, (3) food perishables such as drinks and sweets, (4) handicrafts
(principally textiles, ceramics, and pottery), and (5) cotton. Other produced goods mentioned
were plant-based coal, bricks, and bee products.

Variation is also found in the sophistication and complexity of production processes.
While in some cases simple primary goods are sold without any kind of processing, in
others there are much higher degrees of value added to goods that are commercialized.
There is a similar occurrence in retailing. While in some cases products are loosely sold
without much postproduction processing, in other cases there is more investment with respect to washing, bottling, pricing, or labeling.

Many families informally sell their products to passers-by or to known, frequent consumers. In other cases products are sold at nearby fairs that are periodically organized. With few exceptions, products are sold directly to their final consumers. Goods such as cotton and sugarcane are sold to intermediaries or large factories or mills. In some cases sales to tourists allow producers to increase their sales and thus their earnings.

Producers can be categorized in three types: (1) households in which the production of goods for the market constitutes the fundamental or sole source of income and that have benefited from public programs; (2) households that function as productive units with linkages to the market; and (3) households in which production for sale to the market supports the household economy while income is also earned from working in various types of employment outside the household.

Households in which the production of goods for the market constitutes the fundamental or sole source of income that have benefited by social infrastructure such as credit offered by agencies or programs. This model, which is highly exceptional within the sample, is illustrated by the testimony of Vázquez, a producer in the area of Huacalera near Tilcara, Jujuy province. Vázquez was part of a group that received assistance for five years from the PSA (Farmers’ Social Program). He had very favorable economic growth and currently produces vegetables for San Salvador in Jujuy and other regions in southern Argentina for which he contracts 10 temporary workers during harvest. Due to this financial progress, he has begun to build a house that he has yet to finish on the same land. One of the unforeseen consequences of his success has been that he has lost his eligibility as a beneficiary of the PSA. A similar example, but on a more modest scale, is that of Ángela from Tafi del Valle in Tucumán. With the support of the PROSAP, Ángela initiated small-scale production of dried fruits and vegetables using simple natural processes. This new economic activity plus the work that she performs on irrigated farms has provided her a much stronger connection with the marketplace.

Households that function as productive units with links to the market. In this type, the commercial linkages frequently are weaker, and the producer has less power to negotiate more favorable terms. One case, a livestock farmer named Martín from the area of Simoca near the town of Taco Ralo in Tucumán province, illustrates this type of market relation. Martín has a herd of goats; he sells the animals and also produces cheese. He earns Arg$30 per live kid, and four pesos per kilo of cheese. Although access to his farmland is difficult, buyers periodically visit him and check the prices of his products. His goats are also an important food source for his own nutrition. A variant of this type of agricultural production is illustrated by Rosa from Simoca, Tucumán province. Rosa produces sugarcane and sells it to a nearby sugar mill. She transports the harvested cane herself to the delivery point where she is paid what the buyer determines it is worth. She has found that she can more effectively combat price fixing via the production and direct sale of homemade sweets to the consumer. An artisan variation of this mode of production is illustrated by Catalina from Tambillo in Cochinoca, Jujuy province. Catalina has a herd of 150 sheep, 15 llamas, and goats. She produces wool that she spins and knits. Because of the supervision that her children need, she cannot leave her house very often and must wait for commercial intermediaries to pass by. Her income is complemented by the social assistance program Heads of Household that her husband receives and a small elderly subsidy that her mother receives.

Households in which production for sale to the market supports the household economy even though income is earned from working in all kinds of employment outside the home. The characteristics of this secondary economic activity are: being of secondary importance to the family’s
income; absence or simplicity of production instruments; and occasional production. Aside
from spending most of their time outside the home, many members of the household
spend part of their time and energy on some activity that allows them to augment their
meager incomes. It is often the case that some household members work outside the home
while others who remain (due to unemployment or having to be caretakers) are in charge
of the production for subsistence or for the market. It is common within this category to
observe that the men leave for work while the women produce in the home. Handicraft
production is one of the linkages between the women’s production and the market. It is a
commonly occurring type to which handicraft production lends itself well. An example is
that of Jovita who lives outside of Tíncara and sells her knits to tourists during the season.
Her family sends her the wool from Abra Pampa, for which they pay Arg$4 to Arg$5 per
kilo. Her production process includes spinning, dyeing, and knitting. Since this income is
insufficient, she is also employed as a domestic worker two or three times a week in the
town and earns Arg$4 per hour. Her family gives her meat to help her with her meals.
Once a month the municipality provides her with a large bag of food that includes milk,
rice, flour, sugar, and pasta. Another example is Ceferina, from the surrounding area of J.
J. Castelli in Chaco province. Ceferina and her family construct bricks, have a large garden
and some animals (goats, turkeys, and milk cows), and farm a small area of cotton. Most of
their production is used for subsistence, although they occasionally sell animals. Ceferina’s
husband will receive social assistance until his eldest son comes of legal age, after which
they will have replace that income.

Health

There is almost a complete lack of health insurance coverage among the rural poor. This
principally is due to the extensive informal nature of their work. The result is a strong
dependency on the public health system. Despite these difficulties, the interviewees show
a positive attitude toward the health services they are offered. They seek to take advantage
of what the system has to offer: They vaccinate their children, they take them to periodic
health checkups in schools, and they seek a doctor in cases of illness.

Health problems are treated at different levels, depending on the seriousness of
the illness. For controls and treatments of the most common diseases, as well as specific
prevention campaigns (including vaccinations), there is often a basic health care center
nearby or a school that provides these basic health services. These places generally lack
permanent medical personnel, but a professional operates regularly and offers consultations,
treatments, and campaigns at specific times. One example of this is the family of Nicanor,
a young man from the Chaco province, whose children are checked once a month by a
nurse who offers her services at the school where she also lives. For more complex cases,
as well as for pregnancy checkups and childbirth, the interviewees travel to hospitals in
the closest cities. In complex cases, part of the family is forced to travel to larger cities. In
some cases, the family even moves in order to obtain necessary medical care. One example
of this is Rosa, a woman from the Taco Ralo area in Tucumán, whose son suffers from
hemophilia. In order to receive adequate medical care, the family had to move to Buenos
Aires where they lived for several years. In some cases, local people are trained to carry out
medical prevention programs. One example is of this is Santiago, an indigenous man from
Chaco who works as a sanitary agent, carrying out campaigns against diarrhea, dengue,
and tuberculosis.

The limitations of the public health system are only one part of the problem. Due to the
lack of health insurance, the costs of medicines must be borne by the family. When these are
not included in any list of freely distributed medicines, the family finds itself bearing the
full cost, without benefiting from the discounts normally provided by medical insurance.
When talking about particularly expensive prescriptions, the families take advantage of
personal contacts or government offices in order to obtain subsidies.
Transportation to health care centers implies significant costs, in terms of both money and time. The costs are even greater when there is a need to stay several days in the city due to the waiting time for a medical consultation. Probably due to the large distances and transport difficulties, a significant proportion of childbirths are still carried out at home. Traditional midwives in indigenous communities—such as those of the Tobas and Wichis—participate during childbirths performed at home. The presence of these midwives also contributes to the preservation of the traditional form of childbirth, such as upright childbirth.

The interviewed households generally have access to information about contraceptive methods, and health care centers in some provinces distribute contraceptive pills and insert...
intrauterine devices (IUDs). Although the existence of methods that promote contraceptive use is known, persistent behavior in personal relationships and family life are obstacles to its dissemination. Since the lack of information is not the prevailing factor, research is needed to explore the motivations that drive a young person to early pregnancy. In the mind of a young person, pregnancy and motherhood might mean entrance into a new phase of her life, greater independence, and social status. The mother is seen as the center of gravity in family life. This reality of the family or personal life collides with the norms of provincial health programs, which impose a minimum age for care provided to patients that leaves out young girls who become pregnant at the age of 11 or 12.

The triatomine insect that carries Chagas disease is a frequently mentioned health problem. Houses in poor condition in subtropical areas are attractive habitats for this insect. Some interviewees said that their houses have been invaded by this insect. Despite the prevalence of the insects and the availability of provincial health programs (for example, in Chaco), it is not common to observe individuals seeking medical help to determine if infection is present. The examinations are often performed as part of a general health checkup (for example, during pregnancy). Physicians speak of positive values of 20 percent to 30 percent in the rural areas of J. J. Castelli in Chaco.

The frequent shortage of sanitary installations increases the risk of infections. Homes commonly lack running water and/or flush toilets. Even though only one of the interviewees refers to illnesses such as diarrhea related to this issue, the poor sanitary conditions in which many of them live allow us to presume that the incidence of such illnesses is quite high.

Disability and chronic illness were frequently mentioned by interviewees. In 10 cases at least one family member has signs of mental health problems. For example, Rosa Ángela from Tucumán has in her care a mentally disabled niece who receives medication from the
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**Box 2.4. Chagas Disease**

Chagas disease (also called American Trypanosomiasis) is a human tropical parasitic disease. It is transmitted to humans and other mammals mostly by triatomine insects. Other forms of transmission are possible such as ingestion of food contaminated with parasites, blood transfusion, and fetal transmission.

Chagas disease affects 16 to 18 million people and kills around 50,000 people annually. Chronic Chagas disease remains a major health problem in many Latin American countries. The disease is distributed in the Americas, ranging from the southern United States to southern Argentina. The disease is almost exclusively found in rural areas. Depending on the special local interactions of the vectors and their hosts, other infected humans, domestic animals (such as cats and dogs), and wild animals (such as rodents, monkeys, ground squirrels, and many others) could also serve as important parasite reservoirs.

The insects suck blood at night by biting the faces of their victims. The insects develop a predominantly domiciliary behavior once they have infested a house; they usually hide during the day in crevices and gaps in the walls and roofs of poorly constructed homes. A mosquito net wrapped under the mattress will provide protection in these situations, when the adult insect might drop down from above, but one of the five nymphal stages could crawl up from the floor. They can arrive (by flying, for example) from plants or animals that are part of the infection cycle.

With numerous measures, some landmarks were achieved in the fight against Chagas disease: a reduction by 72 percent of the incidence of human infection in children and young adults in the countries of the Initiative of the Southern Cone, and at least two countries (Uruguay in 1997 and Chile in 1999) were certified free of vectorial and transfusional transmission.

*Source:* Based on Wikipedia.
social plan Plan Remediar, and two other children in the household also appear to have mental health problems. Raquelina from Mendoza has a child who attends a school for special needs. Also from Mendoza, Alejandra has two little girls with congenital disorders attending a school for children with special needs. Finally, Matías in Jujuy has not sent his son to school because his child has a “poor memory.” In some cases, they receive medical assistance or attend a school for special needs. In not a single case do the children have medical insurance. According to the criteria used, in three of the five cases there are conditions of extreme poverty (Raquelina) or close to it (Matías and Alejandra). With the exception of Rosa Ángela, who receives special assistance from the government due to the mental disability of one of her nieces, the rest receive no special monetary support.

**Food and Diet.** Although the interviewees express a clear dissatisfaction with their dwellings, they do not seem to be as critical of their diets. Most interviewees do not think of their diets as needing immediate attention, even though they often go without dinner and throughout the day eat only torta or tortilla (a type of grilled salted bread). Presently, undernourishment does not appear to be a widespread problem among sample participants. Rather, it seems to be a case of malnutrition due to lack of nutrients because their diets mostly consist of very few food items.

Access to foods is achieved through a variety of sources: (1) domestic production—many families obtain their food from homegrown fruits and vegetables and domestically raised animals; (2) welfare—some interviewees state that they occasionally receive boxes of food (milk, sugar, flour, rice, and pasta) that are distributed by municipal governments; (3) regular grocery shopping—most families purchase at least part of their food in a nearby convenience store or in shops located in cities in the region; (4) roaming vendors—a truck with vegetables drives through once a week; (5) the sale of domestic production (goats, horses, sheep, lambs, and so on) as well as of manufactured foods and products (flour); (6) hunting, seasonal fishing, and barter among “brothers”—of particular relevance in aboriginal households.

Domestically produced foods seem to be key in the diversification of the family diet; the best-fed families are those who produce at least a part of what they eat. This phenomenon has two possible explanations, which are not mutually exclusive. First, the foods that the interviewees claim to buy in local shops (flour, mate, pasta, and rice) are more often than not simpler than those acquired through domestic production. Through domestic production, these individuals could access the ingredients that they most lack and that are difficult to purchase because of their cost. In fact, domestic animals provide meat, milk, and eggs; fruits and vegetables are obtainable through domestic production at a lower cost. Second, domestic production is directly associated with land use: It is more common among people who can put into production the lands on which they live. Domestic production is more common not only among families who own land, but also among families who occupy public land. Producers also own animals. Both forms of property—land and cattle—are indicators of family assets and income, which in turn facilitate access to a better diet.

Staple foods in rural households in Argentina are mate cocido and mate with tortilla for breakfast and the afternoon break, soups, and stews with rice, noodles, potatoes, and more rarely some meat. Stews make an inexpensive meal, but they have a potential downside: Although they efficiently satisfy hunger pangs because many persons can eat from one pot, stews tend to have few nutrients.

A key deficiency among interviewees is the lack of means to conserve food. Only six claimed to have access to one such means, and of these four mentioned rather precarious ones (small Styrofoam boxes, ice blocks provided by relatives living close by, and use of a relative’s refrigerator). This situation negatively affects the sanitary conditions of
foods and means that the task of acquiring perishable foods is made more difficult due to the long distances between dwellings and shops. Those with no refrigeration devices at their disposal need to process meat in special ways to preserve it for longer periods of time.6

There are differences in nutrition among regions. In Jujuy, some of the key local persons commented that milk consumption stops after breastfeeding and is replaced by other nutrients specific to their culture. This has implications in terms of the food packages provided by the government. They do not consume the milk provided in the packages.

**Diet as Viewed by a Nutritionist.** The link between a deficient diet and the health conditions of the population is unavoidable because poor nourishment produces physical weakness and a certain vulnerability to illness. Undernourishment reduces the body’s immune system capabilities and contributes to the spread of infections (which in turn produce secondary malnourishment due to a reduced rate of nutrient absorption). A nutritionist in Bermejito, Chaco province, warns about the situation to which many families are subjected in this regard. Low consumption of meat and proteins and high consumption of carbohydrates and fat define a situation of malnutrition rather than undernourishment. “The general situation here is that 80 percent of the local population is malnourished.” Even though she lacks statistical information to back her claims, the nutritionist believes that her 12 years of experience in Sausalito allow her to clearly state that “the children who were well fed rarely had respiratory problems during the winter, while those who did not eat well had issues on a permanent basis.” These are children who suffer from the flu and upper respiratory congestion many times during the winter, which together with a weakened immune system may quickly lead to pneumonia.

Breastfeeding partly resolves these issues in very young children. However, they are given watered-down milk after the first year of life; issues such as diarrhea take longer to be dealt with, pneumonia and bronchitis become regular, and “a lot of energy is needed to deal with situations which could have been dealt with proper nutrition to begin with.” These problems are supplemented by the fact that many breastfeeding mothers suffer from anemia.

The nutritionist also states that detailed studies of the nutritional state of children are not available. However, she believes undernourishment is still a serious problem. She says that a poor intake of foods and nutrients makes people vulnerable and contributes to the spread of infectious diseases. One case illustrating this point is that of a patient receiving treatment for tuberculosis who fails to recover because he only has one meal a day. She believes a substantial part of the population suffers from hunger and offers the example of children who fall asleep midway through the morning at school due to a poor diet. “They will not say that they are hungry because the tortilla filled their tummies, and even though it was not enough the body gets used to the situation of a deficient diet.”

The population’s acceptance of these deficiencies as normal and inevitable stands in the way of recognizing pathologies when they become manifest. Examples include shorter-than-average heights among children, lower IQs,9 and the fact that children begin walking later (between 12 and 15 months of age). “No one will ask why their child is not walking. They will not inquire by the time the child is 12 months old. They will only inquire when the child is two years old.”

The following are some examples of a typical diet. Carlos, a 66-year-old cotton microgrower and day laborer, is a case of high consumption of meat. He buys flour, sugar, *mate*, rice, pasta, and oil from a local grocery store. He and his family drink *mate* in the morning, have a stew for lunch, drink *mate* in the afternoon, and eat a small dinner in the evening. They eat meat nearly every day and have a barbeque on weekends. Foods are kept refrigerated in a small Styrofoam container, which keeps the items from spoiling for a few hours.
Deolinda, an aboriginal woman from Tucumán, does not have dinner, stating “When there is enough, we eat chicken.” Breakfast and afternoon break consists of mate and bread, and lunch consists of stew with rice that occasionally includes goat meat when some is available.

The sanitary agent underscores that indigenous people in his community in Chaco enjoy hunting and eating animals from the monte—basically cows, carpinchos, and otter (nutria). During September and October—the fishing season—they eat plenty of fish. They also have some chicken for personal consumption. Because they do not produce food, they either buy or barter it with other “brothers.” For example, they may exchange pasta or flour for squash. Candy is obtained from the algarroba, and they complain that children prefer conventional sweets.

Catalina, an aboriginal woman from Jujuy, adds anche—a mix of water, semolina, cinnamon, lemon, and sugar—to the family diet of soup and stew. Catalina complains that she cannot obtain fruits or vegetables and is concerned that her children may not be getting them in sufficient quantities.

Social Protection

Many of the households interviewed receive some form of social assistance. They principally benefit from the Heads of Household Program, the Family Program, local health subsidies, and food rations provided by the municipalities, as well as food provided to children who attend school.

The coverage of social assistance services to poor rural households is fragmented. Half of the households in the sample do not receive any type of social program. The distribution between the beneficiaries of social protection demonstrates a geographic pattern and shows different coverage according to the provinces. The frustration of those who do not receive these social benefits becomes more severe because of lack of knowledge about social-protection mechanisms.

The members of households that have not benefited from any social assistance program express disappointment. This is the case of Nicanor, a 29-year-old seasonal and temporary worker with three children. He regrets not having a “plan familias.” Isabel, who is 33 years old and has 6 children between the ages of 2 and 13, and her husband, a piquetero (a person who cuts roads in order to claim benefits), benefited from a social plan that they apparently lost because of lack of political participation. Alberto, 39 years old with one child, works as a gardener earning a daily salary; he applied for a social plan but was told that he did not meet the requirements. Polo, 64 years old and with serious health problems that hinder him from working, depends on help from his children to survive. He is applying for a disability pension and declares that he never received any kind of social assistance. Mendoza is the only province where all interviewees receive some sort of social benefit (social plans or pension). In Tucumán, more than half of the interviewees receive social assistance, in Jujuy slightly less than half receive social assistance, and in Chaco one-third have no access to any kind of social benefits.

Of the entire sample, in 19 households at least one person in the household receives social plans (Heads of Household Program or the Family Program); seven receive food rations; four receive a pension and a social plan; one receives a health subsidy; and one obtains triple assistance stemming from his pension, a social plan, and foods from the church as partial payment for benefits or assistance.

A total of 14 interviewees receive a pension: the two mentioned previously who receive income combined with the family, and one who receives a disability pension. Of the 14, three are indigenous (two from Jujuy and one from Mendoza). One of them, Alberto, is 59 years old and worked for 27 years in a mine in Pirquitas, beginning at age 15. The company closed, and he only received a fraction of the payment for the last year’s work. Alberto developed a lung disease due to his years in the mine and receives an early disability pension of Arg$380 that he classifies as “a pittance.”
Housing

Housing conditions vary considerably in poor rural areas in Argentina. Some houses are built of brick and cement and have access to services such as water and electricity. Other houses can be characterized as unstable huts built in only a few days’ time with available materials such as adobe, straw, wood, and so on. In all cases, the rural housing of poor people has some degree of precariousness, including the house built for María by the provincial government in El Impenetrable, about 200 km west of Resistencia in Chaco province. Nearly all of the households interviewed built their own homes. Some received government assistance for construction, which generally consists of building materials. Interviewees commonly have on their land more than one building serving distinct purposes, such as living space, bathroom, kitchen, and storage room. Common deficiencies and problems are present in the houses of the respondents.

Most poor families live in conditions of overcrowding with three or more people in a room. This is the case of Nicanor, a young Chaqueño who lives in the single room of a precariously constructed hut with his wife and three children. Another example is that of Raquelina and her family in Mendoza, where three adults and eight children sleep in only one room.

Box 2.5. An Example of an Indigenous Case Study in Mendoza Province

Genoveva is 51 years old and married to Victoriano. They live in the village Asunción, where they were both born, and they belong to the Huarpe community Paulina Huaquinchi. The community consists of 32 houses, all owned by the community. Genoveva and Victoriano are presently fighting for the ownership of the land, and Victoriano has put up wire fencing around what they claim to be their territory.

Genoveva has given birth to 15 children, and 12 of them are alive today. She gave birth to only four of her children in the hospital; the others were delivered at home with the help of her mother. Genoveva had her first child when she was 16 years old.

There are 14 people sharing the housing of Genoveva. Two of the children have formed their own families and moved out, but they still live in Asunción. Out of Genoveva's 13 sisters and brothers, only one has migrated to another village. The house has six rooms and has electricity but no running water.

The children go to a school in the nearby village. The school provides breakfast, lunch, and dinner for the children. The school has recently begun to teach indigenous Huarpe culture to the students.

There is a clinic nearby that sees patients at least once a week. A doctor arrives every Thursday to see patients and another doctor visits once every two weeks. There are also nurses and other medical personnel living in the area. Genoveva was hospitalized due to chest surgery. The procedure was covered by the PAMI health coverage.

Part of the family’s income comes from the puestos, or livestock, of cows and some 40 goats that the household breeds and sells the manure and the offspring. Genoveva also breeds ducks, chickens, and rabbits for domestic consumption. She says that the income from the animals helps the household to manage.

Genoveva’s husband does temporary work outside the village repairing the stakes and tables in vineyards for which he is paid 40 pesos per day, working 12 hours daily. Genoveva’s husband says that the workers are frequently not paid. Genoveva receives the “Mothers Pension” of 500 pesos/month. She and her husband applied for the Heads of Household Program, but it was not granted to them. Genoveva does not receive any other type of social assistance from the government. Genoveva’s household is involved in agriculture production for consumption only.

Genoveva and her husband say that if they had additional income, they would buy more goats. They would like to be able to live by raising goats, but in order to do so they would need more than 100 animals.

Source: World Bank staff based on fieldwork.
The homes are frequently infested with the triatomine insects that transmit Chagas disease. These insects are often found in poorly built houses, where they inhabit the cracks in the walls and in straw rooftops. As a consequence, the dwellers of such houses are exposed to contracting Chagas disease.

Leaky ceilings are a frequent problem due to use of poor materials to build roofs such as sugarcane stalks, leaves, canvas, and plastic. Many houses become uninhabitable, especially in bad weather. For example, the roof of Alberto’s house in Tucumán leaks when there is a combination of wind and rain because he has not yet finished the roof.

The kitchens of most houses are not incorporated in the main construction. Houses commonly have wood stoves that are used for cooking. Very often, these buildings are out in the open to one side of the house and made with poor-quality materials. An example is that of Ceferina from Chaco. Ceferina cooks in a building outside of the house. It is very poorly built and has many holes. Ceferina told interviewers, “We need a kitchen because when it rains everything leaks, it’s terrible.”

The instability of houses is a serious problem that is noticeable throughout the interviews. The skill level of those who build the houses is very low. Insufficient know-how for
properly building houses may cause structural defects and threaten their stability. Many of these houses suffer from lack of proper maintenance. These factors together with harsh climate conditions may cause walls to collapse and may leave houses completely unusable. This is the case of Pedro from Chaco, who lives in a hut made of adobe. He had to reconstruct his house each year due to the rains that frequently brought it down. The problem was finally solved when he was able to build a house using rain-resistant bricks.

It is important to stress that the materials with which a house is built are less of a key factor than the skill level of the person who builds it. Many home constructions are very stable and solid due to the manner in which they were built. Raúl from Tucumán built part of his house using weak materials such as sugarcane stalks. However, the strength and stability of the house’s construction was better than average due to the skills employed to build it.

**Distance.** Distance is another issue in rural areas. Hospitals and shops are located far away from rural houses. This is the case in places where population density is low, such as Mendoza, Jujuy, and Chaco. Tucumán has higher population density and public services facilities are closer—more so in Valles Calchaquies and Simoca than in Graneros—although the present condition of roads does not always make commuting easier. If only physical distance is considered, attending elementary school is less difficult. This is also the case for primary health services that are usually located in small towns and parishes.

Purchases are often made wherein the transaction takes place a long distance away. Many of the respondents who produce some kind of commodity must sell it in the cities to which they must frequently commute. Commuting is not only uncomfortable and time-consuming, it is also costly. The cost of commuting is a considerable expense for these families. Another dimension of distance is the isolation that can be a consequence of climate changes. Some respondents have complained that they remain isolated when the weather is particularly harsh.

**Infrastructure**

A particularly important deficiency in poor peoples’ houses is the lack of access to adequate sanitary services such as running water and bathrooms with toilets and drains. Many families lack access to running water. This deficiency is often made up for in two ways: by carrying water from nearby sources such as pipes, pumps, or wells or from cisterns that collect rainwater. These cisterns can also be filled using water carried by trucks, which is generally a paid service. It is often the case that the containers and cisterns are in poor condition. The lack of a lavatory is a widespread issue in rural areas. Many respondents mention that their lavatory is located outside and away from the house and often in poor or precarious conditions.

Approximately 60 percent of all interviewed families lack access to electricity. The situation varies according to province: in Chaco the lack of access to electricity is very significant (only 3 of the 12 persons interviewed have electricity in the home; solar panels provide electricity to two of these). The situation is better in Tucumán (of those who spoke of the issue, six have access to electricity and three do not). In Jujuy and Mendoza, few appear to suffer from lack of access to electricity. In the latter two provinces, the installation of solar panels has been very significant. In Mendoza and Jujuy, of those interviewed who have electricity, nearly half obtain it through solar panels. Of the households with no access to energy, lighting is provided by kerosene lanterns.

A significant proportion of the respondents was making or was planning to make home improvements. Their aim is to resolve some kind of household deficiency. It is also common to find families who have built a new house for the entire family, or for only some of the members, to move into.
There are distinct types of home improvements: While some improvement efforts concentrate on the conditions of the buildings (construction of new rooms, improvement of existing rooms, improvements to the roof, changing of materials, and so on), others consist of improvements in access to services (solar panel installation, water pumps, cistern construction, and the like). Most home improvements are carried out by the home’s inhabitants and only occasionally with government assistance.

Home improvements, even if minor, may mean a significant improvement in the lives of the respondents and their families and may create multiple opportunities. For example, the installation of solar panels makes it possible to carry out activities until much later in the day; the installation of a cistern in good condition means the family can rely on abundant water supplies and in good condition; the construction of a strong roof that does not leak means a safe refuge from the harsh climate; the plastering and painting of walls makes it difficult for triatomine bugs to infest the home. The same can be said about larger infrastructure work; for example, the construction of hydroelectric dams increases the number of people with access to potable water and/or facilitates the development of productive projects that use irrigation.

Finally, home improvement appears in the interviews as the principal concern of the respondents. Of those respondents who stated their principal priorities, half mentioned the improvement of their homes, and as many as one-quarter mentioned their households and something else as a priority. The situation does not vary according to province. Among the four provinces, the great majority of those who stated their priorities said that their main priorities have to do with the improvement of household conditions where they live.

Most families interviewed lack access to a telephone. Not one household interviewed has a landline. Mobile telephone use is more widespread. Of the 40-plus total respondents, 12 said that they have a mobile phone.

Dispersed rural households use cellular phones mainly for practical purposes. The mobile connectivity culture that is an urban distinctive feature is absent in the rural milieu. Presently, rural households use mobile phones as a way to keep in contact with relatives who are far away either for working reasons or to reach those that migrated.

In the households visited, mobile phone use depends on the combination of three factors: availability of electricity to recharge batteries, money for prepaid phone cards, and net phone coverage. Those lacking electricity (powered or solar panel) depend on the willingness of neighbors to recharge batteries. Thus, mobile phone use is restricted in two ways. The most serious restriction is that cellular phones are not used when needed but only when all above factors mentioned coincide (prepaid phone card access, the ability to recharge batteries, and net coverage). However, it is very likely that mobile phone use will continue to spread among rural households.

**Aspirations, Conflict, and Discrimination**

This section addresses questions such as: to what do the poor aspire, and how does this differ across groups? The section on conflict addresses gender relations, land disputes, and eligibility for government services. Finally, the section on discrimination and social relations between the poor and service providers such as teachers and doctors.

**Aspirations**

The hopes and aspirations of the households interviewed can be characterized into two types: life conditions and work related. With respect to the first, the principal goal of the majority of those interviewed is to improve the conditions of the household. In only one instance, the case of Velasco in Tilcara, Jujuy—which incidentally registered the highest level of income within the sample—interviewers found aspirations geared towards
the completion of a house made of bricks. In the remaining cases, home improvement aspirations are geared towards partial repairs such as the repair of roofs, the construction of bathrooms, or the incorporation of basic furniture—for example, the acquisition of enough chairs for each member of the family (Lidia in Mendoza) or a closet to store the few articles of clothing that families may have that would otherwise hang in plastic bags on the door or walls (Modesta in Jujuy). In the case of households living in extreme poverty, the priority is to improve the frequency and variety of meals (Nicanor in Chaco). In three cases, goals are clearly linked to formal education and correspond to those households with higher income earnings and stronger connections to urban centers (Angela in Tilcara and Romina in San Martin).

The goals and aspirations related to work are diverse and range from the most basic to more complex—but not necessarily unlikely. For example, Agüero from Chaco is self-employed as a coal producer and dreams of salaried employment; Raul from Tucumán aspires to the collective acquisition of a tractor; and Alberto from Jujuy would like to start a commerce operation with a small food store. The last two examples correspond to cases of adults who have some more economic means than the average found in the sample. There are also intermediate goals and aspirations, such as those of Alberto from Tucumán, an adult of middle age with stable but informal work, which consequently impedes him from accessing credit from the institutional lending system.

Another type of aspiration that transcends the individual home exists in at least three cases, all of which are indigenous. They are aspirations that refer to the community and imply the improvement of the living conditions of the group to which the respondent belongs. For example, Matías from Jujuy aspires to the legal recognition of an indigenous association that serves to preserve local indigenous culture. In another case, a horticultural cooperative is promoted in order to improve the incomes and living conditions of its members and their families.

**Conflict**

Conflicts that emerge in households occur mainly in four areas: gender relations, access to services, property rights and land use, and labor relations. The social relations that rural poor establish in the fields of interfamily relations, linkages with governmental institutions, and economic relations have the potential to be modified and influenced by those aforementioned conflicts. The characteristics of the conflicts that have been presented are individual as well as collective.

Gender conflicts are tied to disputes within the couple, for example, stories of separation shared by women in Jujuy. The deterioration of the couple is attributed to problems associated with alcoholism, infidelity, and male aggression. These gender tensions reveal cultural changes and changes to the social framework of law administration. Other testimonies of older women living more remotely from the urban centers describe situations in which they were subjects of sexual subordination to multiple, successive partners and uncertain of their children's paternity.

There are conflicts related to the access of social, administrative, educational, and health services provided by the state. The administrative and technical management of the municipal government also provokes anger, such as in the case of Nicanor from Chaco, who has made complaints against the Civic Registry for not registering his children with the paternal name; and in the case of Alberto from Jujuy, who demanded the construction of river canals to avoid flooding; and in the case of Angela from Tucumán against the denial of markets for artisans. The educational system is a source of conflict due to the poor quality of food provided in the lunchrooms and the poor commitment of the teachers that live in remote areas, who shorten their workweek according to their personal needs. Finally, the health system does not provide fumigation of households to impede the infestation of the Chagas disease (Santiago, Chaco).
One area of significant conflict is that of land and property rights. There are at least three types of these situations in the sample. First, there are families that have been left homeless after the private plot of land that they occupied was put to other uses. These families have recently occupied small public plots of land in order to establish a house and a small farming area. This is the case of Humeres in Chaco, who demands a piece of land for himself where he can live in stability. Another source of conflict surrounds the use of communal land between various indigenous groups (Amaicha del Valle). The third source of conflict surrounds public land occupied by several generations to which they have no title, which consequently generates uncertainty, instability, and above all, fear.

In the area of labor relations, conflicts are presented that combine economic exigencies with ethnic identity. Such is the case with the community of Chané indigenous in Jujuy that refuses to pay the electricity bills due to claims that they receive very low wages and no benefits. Previously, the owner would cut the electricity from the community, although this no longer occurs.

**Discrimination**

The sampled rural households do not show signs of institutionalized discrimination. Instead, there are signs of informal discrimination. Such is the case of those households that
make references to ethnic discrimination. For example, Huarpe respondents relate that some community members modify their family name or do not speak in their native language in order to hide their indigenous identity (Genoveva and Victoriano in Mendoza).

Moreover, according to the testimonies acquired during focus group interactions, rural poor are perceived by external observers to have negative attributes such as laziness, ignorance of dietary needs, and promiscuity. While this does not necessarily implicate discriminatory practices, prejudice is present in the discourse.

**Extreme Poverty**

This section presents six key characteristics of the extreme poor and households in rural areas included in the sample. The priorities of extreme poor households are presented in the final section. “Extreme poverty” is defined as a condition of relative deprivation more extreme in comparison to the other rural poor households included in the sample, as judged by researchers in the field. Those conditions are related to work aspects, access to land, family size, education, social protection, and family priorities.

**Six Key Poverty Characteristics of the Extreme Poor**

**Lack of Stable Working Relations.** The poorest residents of rural areas have seldom been able to establish stable working relations, or if they have, these labor networks are very fragile. For example, Agüero, who is only 21 years old, mentions that he has had very different occupations (in a cold storage warehouse, as a baker, and so on). Most of his income derives from small coal production on his parcel of borrowed land. He obtains for free all the materials (mostly wood) and tools that he uses (oven, car, and plastic bags). Domingo, age 50, harvests cotton during the few months of its season. His main work consists of taking care of the home, which includes taking care of the livestock and some subsistence agriculture. Nicanor, age 29, works in various activities, none of which represents stable or dependable employment. Nicanor works in the cotton harvest for its duration (a month and a half to two months), then works temporary jobs on demand, principally in the maintenance of various farms. Dora’s husband is a farmhand but is currently unemployed. He lives far from his home where he works for two weeks at a time, working the 12-hour night shift and earning Arg$500. Dora keeps house, performing household chores and caring for a small garden. The husband of Paula (42) is a tractor driver and earns Arg$16 per day. Paula is the housekeeper. Isidro works in a cooperative and earns Arg$300 per month, but it is not a stable job. His wife, Modesta (36), works on their land. They have 40 sheep, 50 goats, and 16 llamas. Raquelina’s husband (36) is currently unemployed and usually works in temporary, low-skilled, precarious employment called changas. Raquelina receives the social welfare package ("family plan") that awards her Arg$200. It is not only that those who work in wage jobs do so informally, but in no case do these jobs (with the possible exception of Dora’s husband) constitute stable and dependable employment. On the contrary, the labor networks of these groups are extremely fragile. As a consequence, this has conditioned the respondents to employ labor strategies that give priority to working changas, and that in some cases (but not in all) is complemented by some kind of social assistance and by subsistence farming (see following).

**Lack of Land Ownership.** The extreme poor have limited access to land ownership and little access to areas for production. For example, Agüero and Nicanor live on borrowed land. Agüero lives with his wife and his only son in a borrowed house in exchange for taking care of a one-hectare parcel of land that surrounds his house. Nevertheless, the contractual agreement of this “loan” is extremely precarious. The case is similar for Nicanor, who is not the owner of the land that he inhabits. He had provisionally settled on it with the consent of the owner:
I am lucky that the man has never bothered me to work for him. Since he said to me that I should settle here, clean, and do my thing, he has never come to bother me. I have no reason to complain about that man. Until one day he might come and say, well, leave. I don’t have a reason to stay, see? And then, yeah, I won’t know where to go. If I’ll go and settle on the street, or we’ll see where they put me.

Alberto has lived for several years on a piece of land located at the side of the road, between the pavement and the wire fencing. There he has built a house and raises some animals. He lived on farmland in the past, but the owner sold it, which obligated Alberto and his family to move. Dora, on the other hand, has a small parcel of land that the municipality has given to her. Probably due to a lack of resources, she has still not been able to finish building her house. She lives in a house loaned to her by her grandparents, in a territory occupied by the community. Paula and her husband have built a house on a parcel of occupied land, but they do not own it. In the cases of Isidro and Modesta, it is not clear if they are the legal owners of the land that they inhabit or if it is land occupied by their community. Raquelina lives in a small house with her family, her sister, and her sister’s two young children. The land belongs to the army, and it appears that the household has been subjected to intimidation to abandon it. Extreme poor households live in constant fear of expulsion from where they reside.

**High Incidence of Poverty Among Indigenous People in the Sample.** Among the poorest rural residents interviewed, many were indigenous people. Four of the cases mentioned are indigenous Toba (Gabriela, Carlos and Juana, Paula, Isidro and Modesta, and Dora), while the other four are nonindigenous. In total, of the 43 selected case studies, 16 identify themselves as indigenous.

**Large Families.** There is a predominance of large families: Of the eight case studies selected, four have more than six children. Agüero (21) has one only child and says that for the moment he does not want to have more. In any case, both he and his wife are in the initial phases of their reproductive cycles. Nicanor has three children with his wife, and they are still within their reproductive cycles. Domingo lives with six of his wife’s children (between the ages of 8 and 24). Gabriela (36) has six children. Dora has four children and lives with her husband, the three youngest children, and her brother-in-law. The eldest daughter lives with her grandmother. Paulina has seven children, several of whom have already given her grandchildren. Isidro and Modesta have six children and are expecting their seventh. Raquelina has six children between the ages of 7 and 21.

**Lack Completion of Primary School.** None of the respondents has finished primary school, with the exception of Nicanor. The same is true for his eldest children, although all of his children younger than age 10 attend secondary school. For example, his three youngest attend primary school, while his three oldest started attending school but stopped after grade three. Alberto himself only attended school until grade two. Carlos (Toba) attended primary school but dropped out in grade four. Juana, also Toba, has never attended school and is illiterate. Nicanor finished primary school only; his children attend school. Dora’s children also attend school, although to do so the eldest had to move in with the grandfather because the school was very far away. The education of Paula’s children is quite different. The eldest daughter completed seventh grade, the second eldest studied for three years in secondary school; the next two completed seventh grade; her 12-year old son, her 9-year-old son, and her 6-year-old son are currently attending primary school. Isidro’s children also attend school, including the eldest daughter (age 17). Although she already has a daughter, she is in her second year of secondary school. The case of Raquelina would seem to be the most serious of this subgroup: Her young children attend school, but she is finding it difficult to continue to send them.
INTERVIEWER: Have you not received the social assistance plan jefes y jefas?
RAQUELINA: I had it but they gave me the “family plan,” and the “family plan” is Arg$200; and that’s not enough for us with several kids, all going to school, and I send them all to school. But I’m not going to send my children to school anymore because it seems crazy to me, I can’t afford it.

Social Assistance is Varied. Of these eight case studies of extreme poor households, three receive no social assistance whatsoever (Agüero, Nicanor, and Velásquez), while the other five receive some kind of government assistance. Among the five respondents who receive social assistance, Alberto’s wife and Gabriela receive assistance from the Heads of Household Program; Dora was given the land by the commune and also receives assistance from the Heads of Household Program. She receives large bags of food and is also a beneficiary of the ProHuerta program. Isidro receives social assistance and was also granted a microcredit of Arg$500 by the Banquito de Buena Fe. Raquelina is a beneficiary of Plan Familias.

Priorities of the Extreme Poor: Nutrition and Housing

Extreme poor households reveal that if they were to have the opportunity for more resources, food, housing, and clothing appear to be principal needs identified by the respondents. Among these, food and nutrition are what the respondents mention as the most urgent. For example, Nicanor (29) states that his principal priorities are food and nutritional security. Nicanor wants to be sure that his family will never go hungry. By the same token, Alberto (50) hints at two of the aforementioned priorities: the material improvement of his home and the improvement of his diet. When he is asked what he would do if he were to receive some extra assistance and how he would use it, he replies, “on the house, and on food.” Raquelina (36) states that her two priorities are to feed and clothe her children:

INTERVIEWER: If you had some more resources, some more money?
RAQUELINA: I would buy clothes and shoes for them.
INTERVIEWER: That would be the first thing that you would do?
RAQUELINA: That would be the first thing that I would do.
INTERVIEWER: And the second?
RAQUELINA: The second. The first thing I would do is buy them clothes, and the second thing I would do is buy them food. The important thing is that they eat.

Notes
1 “Poverty” is defined as the presence of at least one of the unsatisfied basic needs (UBN) indicators associated with the household condition.
2 According to the International Labor Organization, “Employees are considered to have formal jobs if their employment relationship is, in law or in practice, not subject to national labor legislation, income taxation, social protection or entitlement to certain employment benefits (advance notice of dismissal, severance pay, paid annual or sick leave, etc.).”
3 According to the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE), self-employed workers are those workers who, working on their own account or with one or more partners, hold the type of job defined as a ‘self-employment job’ and have not engaged on a continuous basis any ‘employees’ to work for them during the reference period.” It should be noted that during the reference period the members of this group may have engaged “employees” provided that this is on a noncontinuous basis.
4 Managed by the National Ministry of Social Development, which provides small microcredits to producing entrepreneurs.
5 Argentina’s health system has three components: (1) private health insurance; (2) obras sociales, which is insurance provided by employers or in specific circumstances by the government; and (3) the public system, which is free.
This process is called *charqueado*. Charqui is a way of preparing meat that consists of covering the meat with salt and drying it in the sun to ensure its conservation for long periods of time.

Although the concepts of “malnutrition” and “undernourishment” are often used interchangeably, the former is broader in scope.

This is about a reduction of learning and intellectual capacity that translates in a lack of memory, ability to focus, and poor school performance.

A carob tree carries a fruit whose flavor is similar to chocolate.

Programa Jefes de Hogar Desocupados (Heads of Household Program) is commonly known as Plan Jefes. Presently, the beneficiaries of this program are gradually being transferred to the Programa Familias por la Inclusión Social (Family Program for Social Inclusion). The Heads of Household Program was formed by the national government as a response to the economic crisis of 2001, compensating the income of unemployed heads of households with children under age 18, disabled children, or with a pregnant wife (Law No. 565/02). The program is implemented by the Ministry of Labor through local executors.

Programa Familias por la Inclusión Social (Family Program for Social Inclusion), commonly known as Programa Familias (the Family Program), is implemented by the Ministry of Social Development with the objective of “promoting social protection and integration of families in vulnerable social situations, through monetary and non-monetary assistance. Monetary assistance consists of a nonremunerative monthly payment. The amounts differ between Arg$155 for a family with one child and Arg$305 for families with more than six children. The requirements for the recipient are that the children be sent to school and undergo medical checkups. The implementation of nonmonetary assistance, which includes activities such as school support and development workshops for families and communities, is gradually being introduced in the municipalities.

In Argentina the retirement age is 65 for men and 60 for women, with a few exceptions for which there are different age limits.

In Chaco: Agüero (21), Nicanor (29), Domingo (50), Gabriela (36), Carlos (19), and Juana. In Tucumán: Dora (31). In Jujuy: Paula (42), Isidro (36). In Mendoza: Raquelina (36).

The level of schooling of Agüero, Dora, Paula, and Modesta is not known, although these data exist for their children.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology for the Analysis of Rural Poverty in Argentina

By Gabriel Demombynes and Leopoldo Tornarolli

Introduction

Argentina is the only country in continental Latin America with a household survey limited to urban areas. The EPH is the principal household survey in Argentina and has been carried out since the beginning of the 1970s by the National Institute of Statistics and Censuses (INDEC). The EPH covers 31 large urban areas, each with more than 100,000 inhabitants, which collectively represent 71 percent of Argentina’s urban population. Given that the urban population is approximately 89 percent, the EPH sample is representative of approximately 62 percent of the country’s population. The EPH was first collected in Greater Buenos Aires in October, 1974. Since then, INDEC has gradually extended the coverage of the survey to all large urban areas, including at least one in each of the country’s provinces.

Why has Argentina not previously expanded its survey to national coverage? The answer may lie in the high degree of urbanization of the country. Given that the country’s population is 89 percent urban, one could be tempted to believe that an urban-only survey would be sufficient to trace the evolution of social indicators and serve as a basis for policy. However, given the vast differences between urban and rural life detailed in Chapters 1 and 2 of this report, it is not the case that urban data are the proper basis for policy towards rural areas.

While there is some untapped potential to exploit existing data—specifically with the 2004–05 Encuesta Nacional de Gastos de los Hogares (ENGH)—unless a regular set of surveys with national coverage is conducted, it will be impossible to track the evolution of poverty and conditions more generally in rural areas. The favored approach would be to expand the EPH to complete national coverage. Because the EPH is currently an urban-only survey, expansion of its coverage raises a number of methodological and operational questions. This chapter seeks to inform the discussion about those questions based on past experience with rural surveys in Argentina and the experience of other countries across the continent.1

The chapter is organized as follows: In the first section, past rural surveys in Argentina are examined, with a focus on the technical and methodological aspects. The second section examines the broader experience with rural household surveys in other Latin American countries. The final section reviews the findings, focusing on the principal options for the design of an expanded EPH.

Past Rural Household Surveys in Argentina

Due to the lack of official periodic and systematic surveys that cover rural areas, analysis has relied on partial and/or fragmented information. These have included case studies,
surveys by the World Bank, one-time surveys by INDEC, and surveys by the Ministry of Agriculture, Cattle, Fish, and Nutrition (Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca, y Alimentación [SAGPyA]).

Case Studies

A number of studies have been conducted focusing on narrowly defined groups within rural areas. Cravio and Soverna (1999) carried out a systematic examination of such case studies of rural poverty conducted from the early 1980s through 1995. The studies differ widely in the type of information they use. Among the methods and sources employed in the studies are analysis of secondary information, censuses of particular populations, documents from workshops, informant interviews, fieldwork, and special surveys. Among the works reviewed are studies by public and private institutions, centers of investigation, nongovernmental organizations, and so on. All together, they represent an important sampling of the work carried out in the country up to that point on rural poverty. In total, they examine 48 studies that examine 45 different samples across 19 provinces.

The works are not perfectly comparable; this is due, among other reasons, to the differing objectives of each study, which in many cases are not to evaluate rural poverty per se. Additionally, they differ in their methodological approaches, both in their data-gathering techniques and information sources and in what they consider the unit of analysis. Some examine families or households, while others study farms. Additionally, the heterogeneity of the Argentine rural sector makes it practically impossible to compare different case studies, even when they share methodology. In general, the collection of cases studies serves to highlight the need for a national-level survey with comparable data across geographic region.

Encuesta de Hogares Rurales (Misiones and Salta). This survey, with characteristics similar to an LSMS-type survey, was carried out by SAGPyA in the provinces of Misiones and Salta. The provinces were selected as representative of their two respective regions (Northeast and Northwest), where rural poverty is highest according to census-based UBN measures. The survey used stratified random geographic sampling of the total rural population in both provinces.

The fieldwork for the survey was carried out between the months of May and July 1996. The survey questions referred to the 12 months previous to the survey and covered 597 households. It included information about all components of income, expenditure, employment, agricultural inputs, agricultural and nonagricultural activities, infrastructure, and social-cultural characteristics. The survey also collected all information necessary to calculate the unsatisfied basic needs indicator. Regarding the labor market, it included information on labor supply, salaries, and reservation wage of each potential worker. Unfortunately, no further information is available about the survey design, fieldwork, or other operational issues regarding this survey.

Encuesta de Niveles de Vida y Producción (Mendoza, Río Negro, and Santa Fe). The objective of this survey was to generate information about the social, economic, demographic, and work characteristics of rural households. The survey was carried out in the provinces of Mendoza, Río Negro, and Santa Fe during the months of May to August 2000.

The development of the questionnaire, the training of the teams, the supervision, the consistency checks, and the overall organization and operation of the survey were contracted to the consultant company CEIL-GADIS. The work was supervised by the Institutional Strengthening unit of the PROINDER, which is part of the Agricultural Development Department of SAGPyA.
Survey Design. The survey was conducted through interviews of households members included in a statistically representative sample of rural dwellings located both in dispersed rural areas and rural towns in the three provinces.

The sampling for the survey took place in two stages and was done separately for each province. The primary sampling units (PSU) were census segments from the 1991 National Population Census. In each province, 100 census segments were selected with probability proportional to the number of households in 1991. In the second stage, three dwellings within each segment were selected at random. Uninhabited dwellings were ignored, and in dwellings that held more than one household, all were interviewed.

Among the households engaged in agricultural production in the segment that were not included in the three-dwelling sample, a fourth household was selected. This household was asked a set of questions from a partial questionnaire on household demography and agricultural production only. The survey was designed this way because the percentage of households that were agricultural producers had been very low in the previous survey in Salta and Misiones. The idea behind this sampling regime was to increase the total number of agricultural producer households in the sample.

The final sample included 890 households: 306 from Mendoza, 295 from Río Negro, and 289 from Santa Fe. The different probabilities of household selection was adjusted for with sample weights that were determined based on the total number of households in the segment, along with the number of producer households and total number of households in the 1991 Population Census.

Additionally, a survey of informants was carried out in 20 rural towns in each province, chosen in a simple random sample among towns located close to or on the road to the segments selected in the sample. The town survey collected information on the infrastructure, services, production, employment, and problems of the communities in question.

Information Collected. The individual questionnaire collected information about the composition of the household, educational characteristics, health, and economic activity of the household members. The family questionnaire included 23 sections, but not all the households answered all sections. There were sections on dwelling characteristics, migration, household durable goods, agricultural and nonagricultural independent work, agricultural production, forestry activities, equipment, agricultural inputs, expenditures on agricultural and forestry activities, livestock, expenditures on livestock, household expenditures, savings and credit, purchases on credit, and other income.

Encuesta de Impacto Socioeconómico de la Crisis en Argentina (ISCA). This survey is representative at the national level, covering 28,000 households in different regions including rural towns with less than 2,000 inhabitants. Rural dispersed areas, however, were not included in the sample. The sample is not large enough to be representative at the level of each region of the country.

The survey was contracted to the consultant company Opinión Pública, Servicios y Mercados (OPSM) and paid for by the World Bank, during the months of June and July 2002, a few months after the political and economic crisis exploded at the end of 2001.

Survey Design. The ISCA is a survey of urban metropolitan areas and rural towns. The sampling approach differed for urban and rural areas. For urban areas, the sample was stratified by city size and region. Two criteria were used to select the localities: region and population stratum. The intent was to develop a sample representative at the regional level without ignoring the population strata of the localities. The criteria of membership in a stratum was determined by two criteria: First, a coverage criterion was used in order to maximize the population universe covered in the sample. For each one of the first two strata that consist of the largest cities, all cities were selected. Heterogeneity was a second
stratum criterion. Among the strata of localities with less than 100,000 inhabitants, a random selection was made. For this random selection, regional representation was taken into account in order to guarantee a sufficient number of cases to produce disaggregated information at the regional level.

For rural towns, localities were selected at random so as to produce a minimum level of regional representation. Given the number of cases produced by region, however, there were not enough to disaggregate at the regional level.

Sample Selection. The design combined multistage sampling, systematic samples, and simple random samples. Different areas were sampled using different criteria. In the capital, five stages were used to select the sampling point. The primary sampling units (PSU) were school districts, with sampling weights determined by the number of dwellings in the district. The number of dwellings visited in each district was proportional to the sampling weight. Within PSUs, secondary sampling units were census enumeration areas (fracciones censales). The radios censales were the third stage of sampling. A fourth stage of selection was conducted using groupings of city blocks (manzanas). Finally, within each grouping of city block, a single city block was selected at the beginning, and all dwellings within the block were surveyed.

In the Buenos Aires metropolitan area outside the capital, the PSUs were the neighborhoods (partidos). The subsequent stages were similar to those used in the capital. In other regions, the PSUs were the census enumeration areas (fracciones censales). Three additional substages of sampling were done using radios censales, grouping of city blocks (manzanas), and city blocks.

Information Collected. The survey included three modules. The first collected information about the dwelling, which was chiefly collected through direct observation by the enumerator. The second module collected information on demographics, employment, income, migration, education, medical coverage, and social security payments. The same module also included information on income: labor, nonlabor, and public and private transfers. The third module collected information about the use of savings, consumption patterns, and participation in social and community activities. This module also included questions about the mental and emotional state and future expectations of the person interviewed. The modules differed slightly for rural and urban areas.

Other Aspects of Interest. Certain operational aspects of the survey merit mention. All enumerators belonged to the permanent staff of OPSM and had extensive experience in social analysis. They attended training activities that included an instruction stage and a simulation stage. A pilot version of the survey was administered to adjust final details of the questionnaire. Before the fieldwork, route maps with detailed information on the locations of the dwellings to be visited were prepared for the enumerators.

Rural Household Survey (RHS). This survey was administered by the World Bank in 2003 in dispersed rural areas of four provinces: Chaco, Santa Fe, Santiago del Estero, and Mendoza. A total of 441 households were surveyed. This survey constitutes the first effort in the country to carry out a survey of this magnitude in dispersed rural areas.

The fieldwork was carried out between the end of 2002 and the beginning of 2003. Given that the survey was conducted in the middle of a crisis, the information reflects the conditions of households during an unusual period. In order to design the sample, a database with census enumeration units (fracciones censales) and subunits ( radios censales) was used. Within each census enumeration unit, 8 to 10 sample points were selected, depending on the number of rural inhabitants in each province. Once the census enumeration units and sample points were identified, the final sample was defined taking into account the number of rural inhabitants in each radio censal.
The survey collected information on consumption, including own-consumption. It also included detailed information on income, demographics, education, health, and employment of household members. A special module on agriculture was also used.

Encuesta a Pequeñas Explotaciones Agropecuarias (Catamarca). This survey was carried out by the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) in 2003.

Survey Design. The sampling universe for the survey was the list of farms enumerated in the National Agricultural Census of 2002. Farms were selected in a single-stage random sample, with stratification by geographic and farm area. The farms surveyed were greatly dispersed geographically, which was a disadvantage of this design that raised the costs per farm surveyed. Five farm-size strata were used. In the end, however, the fifth stratum—farms of over 100 hectares in size—was not used, as it was determined that their population did not correspond to the objective of the survey. All together, 7,056 farms were surveyed.

Sample Selection. Different sample selection procedures were applied to strata with farms of known size (in terms of area) and those with unknown size. For strata with farms of known size, the total farm size, taken from the preliminary database of the 2002 Agricultural Census, was used to determine the number of farms to be surveyed. A size of 208 farms per stratum was determined to be adequate. For the stratum encompassing farms of unknown size, a systematic sampling routine was used, and 40 farms in total were surveyed.

Other Aspects of Interest. With the sample of farms of unknown size, some problems in locating the farms emerged, due to the fact that such farms appeared on post-census maps as only a point, without any other references. Additionally, some of these farms were located in zones with difficult access. (During the 2002 Agricultural Census, interviews with those households were carried out generally at a community meeting, not at the farm itself.)

Although survey enumerators were generally assigned to interview households relatively near their own homes, where they were more likely to know the local terrain, only 6 of the 40 cases of farms of unknown size were located. As a result, after the survey, information for the remaining farms was partially filled in based on responses from the 2002 Agricultural Census. This experience may be relevant to possible problems that can arise in surveys in dispersed rural areas when detailed location information on surveyed farms/households is not available.

Rural Surveys in Other Countries of Latin America

This section reviews methodology and operational aspects of surveys in other Latin American countries, with an emphasis on experiences that may be relevant to rural survey work in Argentina.

Sample Selection

The regular household surveys conducted in Latin American countries coincide in most cases in regards to the method of sample selection. In general, the samples are stratified, multistage, random samples. The stratification is done before selecting the primary sampling units (PSUs). Give the large differences between urban and rural areas, it is unsurprising that explicit stratification between urban and rural areas is used in most cases. In many cases, stratification is also done differentiating between rural towns and dispersed rural areas, at the level of regions, or for urban and rural areas within regions.

Multistage sampling is typically used for two reasons. First, the lack of a complete listing of households at the national level makes it necessary to first select PSUs and then make a listing of households within the PSUs for the within-PSU sampling. Second, because
the households from a multistage sample are geographically concentrated, data collection is cheaper than it would be in the case of a simple one-stage sample.

Surveys in Latin America also coincide in the manner in which PSUs are selected within each stratum. Generally, the PSUs correspond to census enumeration areas (fracciones or censales). In most cases, the selection of PSUs is carried out using sample probabilities proportional to size. Using this method, the PSUs within stratum are selected at random, with probability of selection weighted by PSU size. In most cases, the weights are determined using the proportion of households in the stratum that are found in the PSU, according to census data. In some cases, the weighting is done based on the population (number of individuals) by PSU rather than the number of households.

Whatever the precise sampling regime used, it is important that the information used for the sampling be of highest possible quality. If the sample is drawn from a flawed sampling frame, the sample will reflect these inaccuracies. Normally, the sampling frame is based on the most recent census. However, in cases where there is a long interval between censuses, it may be necessary to update the information during the interim period.

For the elements of sampling following the selection of the PSUs, there are a variety of schemes used in different countries. Many use a two-stage sampling routine so that the households are selected at random within the PSU. In other countries, additional stages to the sampling are employed, such as a secondary sampling unit (SSU) within the PSU is selected. In these cases, the SSU is typically a geographic subunit of the census enumeration area used to define the PSU. In some cases, the form of multistage sampling differs by type of stratum. For example, the SSU for urban areas might be a city block, then households might be selected at random within the block. For rural areas, in particular dispersed areas, the SSU might constitute a grouping of households within the same general area, and the sample design might stipulate that all households within the rural SSU are interviewed. Owing to the high cost of travel in such areas, this is a common sampling scheme for rural areas. A variation on this approach is to sample households within PSU, but to interview a larger number of households per PSU in rural versus urban areas. Chile and Peru both use this method.

In general, for two-stage sampling, the final number of households visited is the product of the number of PSUs and the number of households visited per PSU. For a given number of total households visited, increasing the number of households visited per PSU (and thereby decreasing the number of PSUs) reduces the precision of estimations with the data. This reduction in precision may be worth the lower cost of collecting data this way.

Whatever the scheme used for the selection of the PSUs (and possibly SSUs), there is a selection of households at the final stage. For all the major household surveys in Latin America, this is done at random. If a comprehensive list of households is available, this selection can take place before field visits. Otherwise, the enumerators can construct lists of households during the field visits and select the households from those lists.

Operational Aspects

This section reviews issues surrounding the operation of household surveys in rural areas, based chiefly on experiences in other Latin American countries that are reflected in the enumerators’ manuals and other documentation. A number of operational questions come into play for rural household surveys. Broadly, these can be divided into those that are relevant before initiating the fieldwork and those that matter during the fieldwork.

Because traveling distances may be large in dispersed rural areas, a general concern that needs to be taken into account before beginning fieldwork is that the enumerators may find themselves having to confront unexpected situations when they are isolated and unable to communicate with supervisors. As a result, the enumerators’ handbook for rural areas needs to anticipate the wide variety of situations that may arise in rural areas in order to give enumerators proper guidance.
Another issue that arises in rural surveys is the importance that surveyed households have prior notice in some form of the arrival of the survey team. A personal and focused approach is preferable. This could take the form of cards or brochures mailed to households before the interview, to inform them about the purpose of the survey and its importance. This form of “preparing the terrain” is especially important in dispersed rural areas where visitors are rare and the presence of the enumerators could provoke suspicion. It is also advisable that the enumerators contact the local authorities when they arrive at a town. The local authorities can provide logistical support, an introduction to selected households, and information for the community questionnaire (if this is part of the survey).

An additional preparation step is to ensure that the enumerators have the most detailed cartographic information possible. If possible, this should include detailed census maps supplemented by whatever information is available on the locations of local schools, road, rivers, and so on. If a full listing of dwellings is available so that the selection of dwelling can be done before the field visits, the enumerator’s forms should list the precise location of the dwelling with street, number, telephone, and name of household head, if such information is available.

Just before beginning their fieldwork, the enumerators should check the information they have and carefully plan their route. Given the difficulty of finding locations in remote rural areas, Global Positioning Systems can be very useful for enumerators. They can potentially be used for a number of purposes: navigation by the enumerators, identifying the precise location of visited households, and measuring the surface area of farmland.

Once the fieldwork has been initiated, the enumerators’ time will have to be organized taking into account the fact that surveys in dispersed rural areas require more time than surveys in rural towns. Box 3.1 provides an example from Bolivia.

### Choice of Welfare Measure

A key technical challenge facing any household survey designed for poverty measurement is the choice of welfare measure. Usually, the welfare measure shown is either consumption or income. There is a strong consensus in the economic literature that consumption is preferred for a variety of theoretical and practical reasons.

### Box 3.1. Organization of the Encuesta de Hogares in Bolivia

In Bolivia, the survey work is carried out over the course of four weeks; the interviews within each PSU are performed by teams composed of four enumerators and one supervisor, with different schemes for towns and dispersed areas. In dispersed areas, each team visits three PSUs per week, with 12 dwellings per PSU. In towns, each team visits four PSUs per week, with eight dwellings per PSU.

In dispersed rural areas, on the first day in each PSU each enumerator lists all the dwellings and interviews three of them on the first day of work, so that together the four enumerators assigned to the PSU visit all 12 dwellings. On the second day, they complete any unfinished interviews from the first day and travel to the next PSU. They repeat this pattern for the third and fourth days, and then for the fifth and sixth days as well. On the final day of the week, they review the work done over the course of the week.

The pattern is different for towns and other urban areas. The first day is spent listing all the dwellings. In the four subsequent days, each enumerator visits two dwellings, such that each day a team completes the work corresponding to one dwelling. Any necessary follow-up visits are completed on the sixth day, leaving the seventh day for rest.
Current consumption tends to be a better measure of long-term welfare than current income due to the fact that households typically “smooth” their consumption over time by saving and dissipaving.

Consumption is less affected by seasonality than is income (this is closely related to the previous point). This can be particularly important in rural areas, where a large part of income is from agricultural activities that show strong seasonal patterns linked to the time of harvest and planting.

Consumption is an after-tax concept, but income is frequently reported before taxes; respondents may have trouble reporting their after-tax income correctly.

Income is difficult to measure for independent workers and household businesses. Many respondents in these categories find it difficult to specify their incomes net of costs. This can be a particular concern for agricultural households.

Households may be more inclined to honestly report their consumption than their income because income data are often collected for the purpose of leveling taxes. Consumption may consequently be less prone to underreporting.

Despite the consensus in the literature in favor of consumption, most countries in the region that annually calculate poverty statistics use some definition of income as the welfare measure. This is in part due to historical momentum and in part due to the greater time (and therefore cost) associated with collecting consumption data. The income measure typically includes all labor income as well as nonlabor income. In all cases, the measure is restricted to monetary income only.

Like Argentina, Chile uses monetary household income. One distinctive approach taken in Chile is that incomes as measured in the household survey are adjusted according to estimates in the National Accounts to correct for underreporting in household surveys.

In Colombia the practice has changed over time, but welfare is currently measured with income. Data are collected on monetary income as well as the value of own-consumption. Additionally, the rental value of housing property is imputed (as income). No adjustment is made according to the National Accounts, however. In some years, poverty estimates have been made based on consumption data as well.

In El Salvador welfare is estimated based on an income aggregate. The aggregate is strictly cash income and does not include own-consumption, transfers, or the rental value of property.

In contrast, Mexico uses income as the welfare measure, but income is defined broadly to include monetary income as well as own-consumption, payments-in-kind gifts, and the rental value of property. Paraguay also uses a broad income concept, which includes the rental value of property. It does not, however, include the value of own-consumption. Venezuela also uses income for its welfare measure but does not include own-consumption or the rental value of housing in the income aggregate.

Uruguay also uses a broad income concept. The country’s household survey was recently (2005) extended to rural areas. Although information is not available about the official methodology used to calculate welfare for rural households, the survey questionnaire includes questions on agricultural income and own-consumption of agricultural products.

Only a few Latin American countries now use consumption to measure poverty. In these cases, what is measured is typically household expenditure plus the value of own-consumption. Most of these are in Central America; among them are Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Panama. Peru is an additional case.

One special case is Honduras, which traditionally used a very restricted concept of income—just labor income—as its welfare measure. Later, the measure was expanded to add other forms of income, including own-consumption. Then, in 2004 the country switched to measuring welfare with consumption.
Another interesting case that is possibly relevant to Argentina is that of Bolivia, where different welfare measures are used for rural and urban areas. Income has long been used to measure welfare in urban areas, and when the household survey was expanded to rural areas, it was decided to continue to use the income measure for urban areas in order to maintain comparability over time. Consumption, however, was opted for as the better measure for rural areas, chiefly due to the seasonality of income.

Choice of Welfare Measure: Options for Argentina

What is the proper approach for welfare measurement in rural Argentina? Can income be a good measure of welfare in rural areas? The answer to this question depends on several considerations. Even within rural Argentina, there are grand differences; rural Argentina is by no means homogeneous. Within the rural sector, there are areas within the Pampeana region that are fully oriented towards integration in the world market, while there are areas in the Northwest where much of the rural population raises animals and crops for the households’ consumption. Within regions as well there may be large differences. Clearly, the degree to which income reflects the “true” welfare of the household depends in part on the degree to which the household participates in the monetized economy.

The seasonality of incomes is also a concern. It is likely that income varies substantially in all regions over the course of the year. Together with the other points raised this presents a strong argument in favor of measuring welfare with consumption in rural areas.

A key step in the determination of the appropriate welfare measure should be an analysis of the National Household Expenditure Survey (ENGH) carried out in 2004–05. The survey included questions on both income and expenditure for both rural and urban areas. Analysis with this survey would be valuable in helping understand the differences between income and consumption as welfare measures in Argentina, and for understanding how the dynamics differ between rural and urban areas.

If consumption is chosen as the welfare measure for rural areas and income is used for urban areas, the expanded EPH could have a different design for rural and urban areas. The consumption module could be applied only in rural areas, or it could be applied in both urban and rural areas, supplementing income data already collected. The decision will depend on operational questions, costs, and the precise objectives of the survey.

If income is used as the welfare measure for rural areas, by extending the current methodology used for urban areas to rural areas, it will be crucial to take into aspects of income that are particular to rural areas. First, the period of reference for collecting information data should be considered to take into account problems of seasonality. It may be preferable to use a 12-month recall period to avoid seasonality issues altogether. However, this would create problems of comparability with the income data collected used for urban areas. Additionally, the quality of information collected will almost certainly be lower when asking people to recall information over a 12-month period. One possible approach would be to collect income data using both the limited recall period currently used and also with a 12-month recall period.

If income is used as the welfare measure, it is also crucial that consumption of the household’s own production be taken into account. This could be done through a brief supplemental module that would be applied to all households (urban and rural) that reported consumption of their own production. Not taking into account such own-consumption would result in a serious underestimation of welfare levels for some rural households.

Determining Poverty Lines

Once the choice of welfare measure is determined, it is necessary to determine the minimum level of income/consumption needed to achieve a minimal level of welfare. This section considers the various components used to determine the poverty line.
**Consumption Basket.** The monetary cost of satisfying an individual’s basic needs is determined beginning with a basic consumption basket, or food basket. In general, the food basket is defined to meet minimum food requirements for calories, protein, nutrients, and so forth and correspond to the consumption patterns of individuals in the country. The value of the food poverty line is often referred to as the indigence line or the extreme poverty line.

The specific construction of the food basket involves various steps that differ somewhat across countries, although most are similar in several respects. In general, there are three options for the food basket: a basket defined in terms of the consumption patterns of the population, a minimum-cost basket to achieve basic nutrition requirements, or a “normative” basket constructed using ad hoc criteria. While suggested practice by the World Bank is the first of the three options, some combination of the three is sometimes used in practice.

**Energy and Nutrient Requirements for the Consumption Basket.** Most countries estimate calorie and nutrient needs based on international standards set by the UN, WHO, and FAO. Depending on the specific standards used, the requirements vary depending on the weight, height, age, gender, and levels of physical activity of individuals. In general, these are established for a country based on populations in groups identified by age, gender, and occupation.

The typical practice is to establish a single minimum energy and nutrient requirement for the entire population based on the age and gender population of the country. This is the case for Honduras, for example, which has estimated a requirement of 2,200 kcal per person per day on average. Similarly, Nicaragua has established a requirement of 2,187 kcal per person per day. This approach has some potential problems. First, it does not take into account differences in the energy required for different activities, which may vary across the country. If rural residents on average work jobs that require greater physical labor, their caloric needs may be higher. A second problem results from the fact that the age structure of the population may vary across different parts of the country. If rural households have many young children on average, their calorie requirements on a per-person basis will be lower. On the other hand, this effect may be reversed by the presence of large numbers of adolescents, who generally have higher calorie requirements than adults.

Some countries deal with the issue of varying calorie requirements by defining different requirement for different areas of the country. Bolivia assigns different calorie requirements for different cities and separate requirements for rural areas based on population structure and types of work activities. Colombia has different urban and rural requirements based only on different age structures in the populations. In Mexico, calorie needs are defined as higher in urban areas based both on population structure and type of activities. Paraguay has higher calorie requirements for rural areas based on both activities and population structure. Peru has higher requirements for urban areas based solely on different population structures.

Current practice in Argentina is to assign calorie needs by age and gender using a scale that attributes calorie needs of 2,700 kcal to a male between age 30 and 59 with moderate physical activity. The calculations result in average caloric needs of 2,241 kcal per person per day. This figure is slightly higher than per-person calorie requirements used by other countries in the region, such Chile (2,187 kcal), Mexico (2,220 kcal), Paraguay (2,194 kcal), and Uruguay (2,150 kcal).

**Foods in the Consumption Basket.** The next critical factor when applying the standard “cost of basic needs” approach to poverty lines is the choice of food basket that goes into the calculation of the poverty line. A wide variety of approaches are used across the world. The preferred method, recommended by Ravallion (1998), is to pick a fixed reference group in the rough neighborhood of the poverty line in the distribution, and then take the
average food expenditure basket of households in that group (using real food expenditures, adjusted for regional price differences). Most countries in Latin America use some version of this method, although there is variation in the specification of the reference group. Many countries complicate the calculation by using different reference groups for different areas or cities of the country. In Bolivia, for example, the group is the population in the fourth and fifth deciles of income per capita in La Paz, Cochabamba, and Santa Cruz; the sixth and seventh deciles in El Alto; and the fifth and sixth deciles (of consumption per capita) in rural areas. Colombia has a similar scheme that takes the poorest 25 percent of the population in terms of expenditure per capita and uses a different reference group for each city.

Chile uses a single reference group, which consists of those in the third quintile of expenditure per capita. The food basket calculation, however, is based on a family budget survey that is carried out only in the Santiago metropolitan area, so the consumption patterns that go into the basket are effectively limited to those from that area.5

The question INDEC will face is whether an expanded EPH should have different food baskets for different regions. Although many countries use this approach, it is not clear that this makes for an improvement over a single national food basket.6 A weighted average, single national basket will be a predominantly urban basket that might not have much relevance to the rural population. There is some risk that such a basket would put a high weight on items that are inexpensive in urban areas but expensive in rural areas. The alternative is to allow the baskets to vary between regions or between urban and rural areas. But if the baskets differ, the differences may reflect not just relative price differences but also differences in tastes. Urban residents may have more expensive tastes. If the baskets are allowed to vary, revealed preference tests should be used to test for taste differences.7

**Pricing Foods in the Consumption Basket.** A closely related issue to the choice of food basket is the pricing of the food basket. There are three options for the source of price data: the expenditure survey used to calculate poverty lines, the country’s consumer price index (CPI), and community surveys of price information collected at the time the main household survey is conducted.

The difficulty with the expenditure survey as a source of price information is that there are sometimes problems associated with confusion as to the type of food, the unit of measure, the period of reference, and so on. In the case of Argentina, expenditure information is not captured in the EPH, so this option is not available for ongoing calculation of poverty figures. The second option (using the CPI to adjust prices) is attractive, but CPI information is often not available for rural areas. The third option (using community surveys) is often a viable intermediate option.

Practices vary across countries. Bolivia uses community questionnaires in rural areas to gather price data. Mexico, however, uses the country’s CPI as its source of price information. Chile uses price data from the country’s CPI, which correspond to prices only in the Santiago metropolitan region. Similarly, Uruguay uses price data from the CPI, which is based on data collected in Montevideo only. Honduras also uses a CPI that reflects only urban prices. In Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Panama, implicit prices are calculated directly from the expenditure survey, using average prices at the level of department. Paraguay also uses implicit prices.

Colombia initially used implicit prices from its expenditure survey but later switched to using the CPI to value the food basket. Peru followed a similar path, switching from implicit prices in the expenditure survey to CPI prices.

In Argentina, a mix of methods has been employed to price the food basket. The price of the food basket was originally established using the Encuesta Nacional de Gastos de los Hogares (ENGH) of 1996–97, also taking into account regional variation in prices. Since then, the value of the food basket has been updated using the CPI for Greater Buenos Aires.
The implicit assumption is that while the levels of prices may differ across regions, the changes over time in the value of the basket are similar across regions.

**The Total Poverty Line**

The final step in determining the poverty line is to determine the nonfood share. This is done across Latin America using the same method by first calculating the share of food consumption in total consumption for a given reference population.

The share of food in total consumption is known as the Engel coefficient. To calculate the poverty line, the inverse of the Engel coefficient is multiplied by the value of the food basket (also known as the “food poverty line”). The resulting line is the moderate poverty line (or simply the poverty line.)

The approach varies across countries only in the specific reference group and the exact value of the inverse of the Engel coefficient. Operating under the assumption that food is a larger share of consumption for rural households, CEPAL recommends a value of 2 for urban areas and 1.75 for rural areas. Values used in different countries are shown in Table 3.1.

In Argentina, the inverse Engel coefficients were calculated with the 1996–97 ENGH and range from roughly 2.2 to 2.5. They are calculated separately for different regions of the country.

**Conclusions**

Expansion of the EPH raises a number of key methodological areas for discussion. This chapter has reviewed past rural surveys in Argentina and considered the experiences of other Latin American countries, as they may be relevant to the choices faced in Argentina.

One important issue is the type of sampling that should be used when the EPH sample is expanded to national coverage. INDEC could maintain the current sampling scheme for larger urban areas and introduce a separate multistage sampling routine for other areas,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>varies by region, 2.2–2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1.9–2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1.6–1.7</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2.5 (or 1.95)</td>
<td>2.25 (or 1.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1.96–2.08</td>
<td>1.56–1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>1.77–2.13</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Tornarolli 2007.*
with separate urban and rural strata. The exact form of stratification will depend on the particular objectives decided upon for the rural survey. If it is decided that estimates with high levels of precision for different rural regions are desirable, the stratification should be done at the regional level. It may also be desirable to stratify by type of rural area, for example, dispersed areas and rural towns. The final decision regarding this matter will depend on the precise objectives of the new survey as well as the costs that different designs imply.

A key technical area for discussion regarding an expanded EPH is the choice of welfare measure. Multiple studies show that the choice and definition of welfare indicator can substantially influence the results of poverty analysis. Own-consumption (of goods produced by the household), which is not considered as a source of income in urban household surveys like the EPH, is important for many rural households. As a result, it is crucial that rural poverty analysis take own-consumption into account. Consumption is generally preferred to income for purposes of poverty measurement. At the same time, there is a fairly strong argument to be made for maintaining the use of the current income measure for urban areas. The current income measure has been used for the EPH since 2003, and it is broadly similar to the income measures applied in versions of the EPH going back to the early 1970s. Switching from an income measure to a consumption measure in an expanded EPH would complicate comparisons of poverty figures based on the new measure to those calculated with the historical data.

At the same time, it is clear that income alone as collected by the urban EPH would be an inadequate measure of welfare of many rural households. This is because in rural Argentina, as in rural areas in most parts of the world, a substantial part of income/consumption consists of own-produced goods, that is, own-consumption. A welfare comparison based on the urban income measure, which does not include own-consumption, would understate the relative welfare of rural households.

Consequently, it is critical that own-consumption be included in some form in the questionnaire in an expanded EPH for rural areas. There are four main options for additional data that could be collected:

10. complete consumption data for rural households only;
11. data on own-consumption (but not other consumption) for rural households only;
12. complete consumption data for all households, rural and urban;
13. data on own-consumption for all households, urban and rural.

To allow comparability between urban and rural areas, it would be preferable to collect the same data in rural and urban zones (option 3 or 4). While for analysis purposes it would be optimal to collect complete consumption data in the entire country (option 3), this would require substantially expanding the length of the questionnaire and thus the cost of the survey. Option 4 would be less costly, and the resulting aggregate (urban EPH income plus own-consumption) could still be used for urban-rural comparisons.

A second key technical area for discussion regarding an expanded EPH is how the poverty lines would be determined. A number of factors enter this discussion. One element is the determination of the standard calorie basis used for the poverty line calculations. The incorporation of rural areas into the poverty calculations makes it necessary to consider whether the calorie basis should be determined based only on age and sex, or whether in addition the intensity of individuals’ activities should also be considered, given that the structure of rural occupations is very different than that in rural areas.

Another important issue related to the poverty lines is how types and quantities of goods for the consumption food basket should be determined. The question is what reference group should be used to determine the food basket. The addition of rural areas to the EPH will leave two options: (1) determine a new reference group for the country as a
whole, or (2) establish separate reference groups (and therefore separate food baskets) for urban and rural areas, and perhaps regionally. Either option would be feasible.

In either case, income/consumption figures should be deflated by a regional price index, in order to take into account regional variation in the acquisitive power of earnings. The price adjustments to income could be made using the national consumer price index (IPC), but that would require extending the coverage of data collected for the calculation of the IPC. An alternative solution would be collecting price data using community questionnaires in rural zones at the same time the household survey data is collected.

An additional technical area for discussion relevant to the determination of poverty is the method used to calculate the value of the total consumption basket, including both food and nonfood components. INDEC has in the past used the indirect method, following standard procedures followed by a number of countries. This involves using the value of the food basket (as known as the “food poverty line”) and the inverse of the Engel coefficient as determined using an expenditure survey. Information from the 2004–05 Encuesta Nacional de Gastos de los Hogares (ENGH) can be used to calculate the relevant Engel coefficient for the same reference group used to determine the food basket. A less attractive variation on the approach is to take fixed values of the inverse of the Engel coefficient from another source, rather than to determine them with a national survey.

Notes

1 This chapter is based on the background paper “Metodología para el Análisis de la Pobreza Rural: Experiencias en Argentina y América Latina y Sugerencias para Trabajos Futuros” prepared by Leopoldo Tornarolli of CEDLAS, Universidad Nacional de la Plata. The paper includes a rich review of household survey practices across Latin America. In the interest of brevity, only the material most relevant to expansion of the EPH is included in this chapter. Readers are referred to the complete background paper for more detailed information.
2 Some analysis based on the RHS is presented in Chapter 1 of this report.
3 A more detailed description of the sampling can be found in Annex 2.
4 See Deaton and Zaidi (2002) for extended discussion of this issue.
5 More details on the approaches used in different countries can be found in the background paper.
6 See Lanjouw (1998) for more discussion on this point.
7 See Ravallion and Lokshin (2006) and Arndt and Simler (2005) for examples of such tests.
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Table A.1. Poverty According to Unsatisfied Basic Needs by Province (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural towns</th>
<th>Dispersed rural</th>
<th>Whole province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pampeana Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires Province</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Buenos Aires</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Pampa</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Córdoba</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cuyo Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendoza</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwest Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamarca</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jujuy</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rioja</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salta</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago del Estero</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucumán</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrientes</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaco</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formosa</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misiones</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patagonia Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chubut</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuquén</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Río Negro</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra del Fuego</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Argentina</strong></td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source*: World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note*: Figures shown are percentage of individuals with unsatisfied basic needs.
Table A.2. Poverty According to Unsatisfied Basic Needs by Education of Household Head (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No/incomplete primary education</th>
<th>Complete primary/ incomplete secondary education</th>
<th>Complete secondary/ incomplete tertiary education</th>
<th>Complete tertiary education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals with unsatisfied basic needs.

Table A.3. Poverty According to Unsatisfied Basic Needs by Age of Household Head (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals with unsatisfied basic needs.

Table A.4. Poverty According to Unsatisfied Basic Needs by Size of Household (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 and more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals with unsatisfied basic needs.
Table A.5. Unsatisfied Basic Needs Indicators (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>One or more UBN</th>
<th>UBN 1</th>
<th>UBN 2</th>
<th>UBN 3</th>
<th>UBN 4</th>
<th>UBN 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals.
Definitions of UBN components are as follows:
Crowded: more than three people per room.
Housing: living in unsuitable housing.
Sanitation: lack of bathroom.
Education: at least one child age 6 to 12 not attending school.
Dependency: four or more people per employed household member and household head with less than three years of primary schooling.

Access to Services

Table A.6. Access to Public Services (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existence of . . .</th>
<th>Regular garbage removal</th>
<th>Public transportation</th>
<th>Public phones</th>
<th>Cloacas</th>
<th>Running water network</th>
<th>Electricity network</th>
<th>Street lighting</th>
<th>Natural gas network</th>
<th>Paved streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

Table A.7. Access to Water (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Within building</th>
<th>Outside of building but within lot</th>
<th>Outside of lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>85.25</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>68.14</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>37.78</td>
<td>42.01</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>81.27</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals.
### Table A.8. Source of Water for Drinking and Cooking (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Public net</th>
<th>Drilling with motorized pump</th>
<th>Drilling with manual pump</th>
<th>Well with pump</th>
<th>Well without pump</th>
<th>Rain water</th>
<th>Transport from cistern</th>
<th>River or canal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

### Table A.9. Health Insurance (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Health insurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

## Living / Housing

### Table A.10. Type of Housing (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>House type A</th>
<th>House type B</th>
<th>Hut-shanty (mud, soil)</th>
<th>Hut-shanty (waste material)</th>
<th>Hut type A</th>
<th>Hut type B</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Room(s) in dwelling</th>
<th>Room(s) in hotel</th>
<th>Room not built for habitat</th>
<th>Mobile home</th>
<th>In the street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.
### Table A.11. Quality of Material of Housing (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CALMAT I</th>
<th>CALMAT II</th>
<th>CALMAT III</th>
<th>CALMAT IV</th>
<th>CALMAT V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

The index shown is the CALMAT index. Housing is categorized as follows:

1. housing built with solid/resistant and durable/adequate materials in floors, walls, and roofs and having all the necessary insulating elements and proper finish.
2. housing built with solid/resistant and durable/adequate materials in floors, walls, and roofs but lacking proper insulation or finish in at least one of the following: floors, walls, or roofs.
3. housing built with solid/resistant and durable/adequate materials in floors, walls, and roofs, but lacking proper insulation or finish in floors, walls, and roofs; or else with tin or other metal plate or fiber-cement roofs and no finished ceilings; or with tin or other metal plate or fiber-cement walls.
4. housing built with inadequately resistant or discarded materials in either floors, walls, or roofs.
5. housing built with inadequately resistant or discarded materials in floors, walls, *and* roofs.

### Table A.12. Rooms Per Person (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Up to 0.5</th>
<th>0.51–1</th>
<th>1.01–1.5</th>
<th>1.51–2</th>
<th>2.01–3</th>
<th>More than 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

### Table A.13. Contractual Housing Situation (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owner of house and land</th>
<th>Owner of house only</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Loaned housing</th>
<th>Work provided housing</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.
Table A.14. Sanitation (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Toilet with connection to sewage line</th>
<th>Toilet with connection to septic system</th>
<th>Toilet with connection to blind well</th>
<th>Toilet without connection, or no toilet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

Table A.15. Possession of Assets (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possession of . . .</th>
<th>VCR</th>
<th>Cable television</th>
<th>Microwave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

Table A.16. Kitchen (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With kitchen sink and running water</th>
<th>With kitchen sink, no running water</th>
<th>No kitchen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

Table A.17. Possession of Refrigerator (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fridge with freezer, or freezer only</th>
<th>Fridge without freezer</th>
<th>Neither fridge nor freezer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.
### Table A.18. Primary Fuel Used for Cooking (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gas from network</th>
<th>Gas from tube</th>
<th>Gas from cylinder</th>
<th>Wood or coal</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.*

*Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals.*

### Table A.19. Possession of Washing Machine (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Automatic washing machine</th>
<th>Manual washing machine</th>
<th>No washing machine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.*

*Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals.*

### Table A.20. PC and Internet Connection (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PC with internet connection</th>
<th>PC without internet connection</th>
<th>No PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.*

*Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals.*

### Table A.21. Phone Access (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Landline and cell phone</th>
<th>Only cell phone</th>
<th>Only landline</th>
<th>No phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.*

*Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals.*
### Population Statistics


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1991</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Urban as a share of total</td>
<td>Rural towns as a share of total</td>
<td>Dispersed rural as a share of total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Urban as a share of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Buenos Aires</td>
<td>2,965,403</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,776,138</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra del Fuego</td>
<td>69,369</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>101,079</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires province</td>
<td>12,594,974</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13,827,203</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>159,839</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>196,958</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chubut</td>
<td>357,189</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>413,237</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>2,798,422</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3,000,701</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuquén</td>
<td>388,833</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>474,155</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Córdoba</td>
<td>2,766,683</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3,066,801</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jujuy</td>
<td>512,329</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>611,888</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis</td>
<td>286,458</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>367,933</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>528,715</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>620,023</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Río Negro</td>
<td>506,772</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>552,822</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salta</td>
<td>866,153</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>1,079,051</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendoza</td>
<td>1,412,481</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>1,579,651</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entre Ríos</td>
<td>1,020,257</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1,158,147</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucumán</td>
<td>1,142,105</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>1,338,523</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rioja</td>
<td>220,729</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>289,983</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Pampa</td>
<td>259,996</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>299,294</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrientes</td>
<td>795,594</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>930,991</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamarca</td>
<td>264,234</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>334,568</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaco</td>
<td>839,677</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>984,446</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formosa</td>
<td>398,413</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>486,559</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misiones</td>
<td>788,915</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>965,522</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago del Estero</td>
<td>671,988</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>804,457</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Argentina</strong></td>
<td>32,615,528</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>36,260,130</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

#### Table A.23. Household Number and Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>9,118,875</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>326,037</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>651,331</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Argentina</strong></td>
<td>10,096,243</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.
Table A.24. Literacy Rate (Percent)

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

Table A.25. Years of Education Completed (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals among the entire population in 2001.

Table A.26. Years of Education Completed for Individuals Ages 21–30 (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals among those ages 21–30 in 2001.

Table A.27. Average Years of Education by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(continued)*
### Table A.27. Average Years of Education by Age Group (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>55–59</th>
<th>60–64</th>
<th>65–69</th>
<th>70–74</th>
<th>75–79</th>
<th>80–84</th>
<th>85–89</th>
<th>90–94</th>
<th>&gt;95</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

### Table A.28. Residence 5 Years Ago (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence 5 Years Ago</th>
<th>In this locality or area</th>
<th>In this province, in a different area</th>
<th>In another province</th>
<th>In another country</th>
<th>Not yet born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

### Table A.29. Born in Argentina (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born in Argentina</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>95.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

### Table A.30. Relation to Household Head (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation to Household Head</th>
<th>Head of household</th>
<th>Partner of head</th>
<th>Child/stepchild</th>
<th>Son-/daughter-in-law</th>
<th>Nephew/niece</th>
<th>Parent/parent-in-law</th>
<th>Other family</th>
<th>Other non-family</th>
<th>Domestic servants and family</th>
<th>Resident of collective institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census.

*Note:* Figures shown are percentage of individuals.
Table A.31. Gender Distribution (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

Table A.32. Marital Status (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Legally separated</th>
<th>Widow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

Table A.33. Living Together with Spouse/Partner (Percent)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures shown are percentage of individuals.

Work Related

Table A.34. Industry (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture, ranching, hunting, forestry, fishing</th>
<th>Mining, stonework</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Electricity, gas, water</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table A.34. Industry (Percent) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commerce, restaurants, hotels</th>
<th>Transport, storage, and communication services</th>
<th>Finance, insurance, real estate, corporate services</th>
<th>Communal, social, and personal services</th>
<th>Unspecified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank staff calculations based on 2001 Census

Note: Figures calculated for all workers age 14 and older.

Table A.35. Occupational Categories (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public sector salaried worker</th>
<th>Private sector salaried worker</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Independent worker</th>
<th>Family worker with salary</th>
<th>Family worker without salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Figures calculated for all workers age 14 and older.

Table A.36. Occupational Categories Within Agricultural Sector (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public sector salaried worker</th>
<th>Private sector salaried worker</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Independent worker</th>
<th>Family worker with salary</th>
<th>Family worker without salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Figures calculated for all workers age 14 and older.
Table A.37. Size of Firm or Establishment of Salaried in Agriculture (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1–5 people</th>
<th>6–39 people</th>
<th>40 or more people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Figures calculated for workers in agriculture age 14 and older.

Table A.38. Type of Profession (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Operational</th>
<th>Not specified</th>
<th>Insufficient information</th>
<th>Question ignored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Figures calculated for all workers age 14 and older.

Table A.39. Size of Firm or Establishment Where Employed (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1–5 people</th>
<th>6–39 people</th>
<th>40 or more people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Argentina</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Figures calculated for all workers age 14 and older.

Table A.40. Social Security Contributions (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Payment via wage discount</th>
<th>Direct payment</th>
<th>No payment</th>
<th>Not receiving wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural towns</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed rural</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Figures calculated for all workers age 14 and older.
Contact Persons List for Field Activities and Focus Group Members

**Chaco Province**

*Liberatador General San Martín (city located 150 kilometers north of Resistencia)*

Silvia Vargas, veterinarian and local deputy of the Secretary of Agriculture for rural programs, was the contact person. She led me on for the interview of two persons living 15–20 km away from San Martín: one a male day laborer (Nicasio), and the other a female (Isabel Navarro) married to a smallholding farmer (*minifundia*). In the same area there are indigenous communities (*tobas*) and the so-called *banquíneros* (landless nonindigenous population living on the side of the roads). Both *tobas* and *banquíneros* might well be included in the interviewees’ sample.

*Machagay (city located 140 km west of Resistencia)*

There is a high density of smallholdings in the area. Mr. Cosme González, regional deputy of the Provincial Settlement Institute (*Instituto de Colonización de la Provincia*), was the contact person. Two interviews were conducted: one with a smallholder in process of retirement (Carlos), and the other with a 21-year-old landless microscale charcoal producer.

**Resistencia**

Meeting with Mario Olivero, undersecretary of Rural Development (Chaco province). Olivero presented his office view on the socioeconomic classification of Chaco’s rural population. Mr. Olivero stated his willingness to provide operational support to the fieldwork. Accordingly, Javier Kiakowski (Rural Development officer) was designated as the local liaison in J. J. Castelli. Kiakowski will be in charge of coordinating our interview activities in the area as well as inviting community key person to the focus group. A vehicle will also be provided.

**Chaco province**

*Juan José Castelli*

A focus group was held in the Communitarian Integrative Center (*Centro de Integración Comunitaria [CIC]*) of the city. Laura Fetter (Regional Coordinator of the Livestock Program of the Ministry of Production), José Luis Steman (Priest, Catholic Church), Avelino Milar (Chief of the Regional Educativa IV Chief), Daniel Pértile (Microregion Manager, El Impenetrable), Alejandro Moreno (President of the Asociación de Profesionales del Campo del Impenetrable Chaqueño [APCICCh]), Luis Zago (veterinary surgeon, Ministry of Production), Julio Berg (journalist), Pedro Infeld (health care doctor, local hospital), Norma Blanco (social worker, coordinadora CIC, J. J. Castelli), and Marcelo Mijalchuk (Manager Cooperativa Agropecuaria de General Güemes) took part in the group.
Five in-depth interviews were held with rural families, with the support of the Under-Secretary of Rural Development staff, engineer Kiakowski, and a colleague. The interviews took place in a radius of 40 km around J. J. Castelli.

**Villa Río Bermejo**

A focus group was held at the city council premises where a joint provincial-local work team has its headquarters. The group was composed by Iris Vegas (social worker), Claudia Fernández (nurse), Melinda Gómez (nurse), Héctor Romañuk (health care doctor), and Paula Mosto (nutritionist).

**General San Martín**

Four in-depth interviews were held in rural households with the support of veterinary surgeon Silvia Vargas, consultant for the National Agriculture Secretary. The visits were delayed because of constant rain. An interview was held with key informant Mario Benítez, technician, and member of the Regional Norte Council (interinstitutional network of provincial level).

**Jujuy Province**

**Tilcara**

A focus group was held at the premises of MINKA, the nongovernmental organization (NGO) committed to craftsmanship training. Father Ernesto (parish priest), Fernando Gaspar (Office of Political Affairs, City Council of Tilcara), Natalia Perez, (social psychologist, MINKA), Gabriela Pellegrini (social worker, FOPAR), Ernestina Vilca (coordinator of a food program at the elementary local school, Villa Florida), and Marga Cabana (director of MINKA) were part of the group.

Two in-depth interviews were held in the surroundings of Tilcara and two interviews with key informants: Mr. Velázquez (agricultural producer in Huacalera) and Mrs. Inés Olleta (school teacher at Tres Cruces, a small rural town located between Tilcara and Abra Pampa).

**Abra Pampa**

Interviews with key informant were held with Eugenia Gutierrez (Social Development Office of the City Council), Margarita Zerpa (in charge of the social plans Juventud y Niñez of the city council), and Restituta “Ñusta” Gutierrez (communitarian leader of Tambillo).

Two in-depth interviews were held in the surroundings of Abra Pampa.

**Tambillo:** Interviews with key informants were held with Mrs. Balbín (kindergarten teacher in charge of the local school) and Norma (Primary Health Agent). Also, two in-depth interviews were held.

**San Salvador de Jujuy:** An interview with a key informant was carried out with engineer Mario Bonillo, Professor of Agricultural Production, National University of Jujuy, Agriculture Faculty.

**Yuto:** A focus group was held at the regional hospital facilities. The following persons took part: Clara Gómez (Mayor of Yuto City), Timoteo Ochoa (Social Development office, City Council of Yuto), Amalia Navas (Head Director of San Miguel Hospital), Ana Mercedes Vivanco (pediatrician), Karina Escobar (in charge of Plan Nacer), Oscar Guaymás (Primary Health Indigenous Agent), Josefina Ramírez (M.D., Supervisor Primary Health Care), Susana Guanca (teacher, School 253), Gonzalo Pérez (biochemistry, San Miguel Hospital Laboratory).
Three in-depth interviews with rural families were carried out located in a radius of 25 km around Yuto (two in Bananal and one in km 12).

**Tucumán Province**

*San Miguel de Tucumán*

Interviews were held with key informants Engineer Luis Fernández (coordinator, PROSAP) and engineer Ricardo Rodschild (Agriculture Social Program).

*Famaillá*

An interview was held with key informant engineer José Luis Morandi (Regional Director Santiago del Estero—Tucumán, National Institute of Agricultural Technology [INTA]).

*Lules*

A focus group was held with Eduardo Rodríguez (Director of Lules Hospital), Raúl Asares (agronomist), Mauricio Gramajo (Primary Health Agent), José Risso (General Coordinator, City Council of Lules), Father Daniel Nieva (parish vicar priest), Javier Viana (PROSAP), Mario Mallón (President of the Bolivian Association), Cristobal Vargas (Cooperativa 6 de Agosto), Daniel Diaz (CADIF), and Alejandro Le Fort (Agriculture Social Program).

*Tafi del Valle*

Two in-depth interviews and one key informant interview (members of an agricultural cooperative) were held.

*Amaicha del Valle*

A focus group was carried out on the premises of the city council, with the participation of Isabel Martinez (technician, Unidad de Minifundio, INTA), Deolinda Gonzalez (craftsperson), Gustavo Maita (craftsperson, indigenous community Quilmes), Héctor Quinteros (Chief, indigenous community Amaicha del Valle), Roberto Fornaciari (high school teacher), and Roberto Prado (Community Commissioner).

Five in-depth interviews were held in isolated and hard-to-access areas with the logistic support of local INTA officials.

**Simoca:** Three in-depth interviews were held with the logistic support of the local Extension Agency of INTA. One key informant interview was held with engineer Cosme Cusumano.

**Taco Ralo** (small town located in Graneros department 119 km south of Tucumán city): Three in-depth interviews were held and one key informant interview with the support of zoo technician Silvina Saldaño.

**Mendoza Province**

*Mendoza city*

Interviews were held with key informants Diego Fernandez (Institute of Irrigation), Daniel Pizzi (PROSAP, Provincial Ministry of Economy), Guillermo Ander Egg (Agriculture Social Program), and Paula Eisenchloss (consultant on agricultural development).

*Lavalle department*

Two in depth interviews were held, one in the area of drying, the other in the area of irrigation.
San Rafael city
A focus group was held at the local Red Cross office. The following persons took part: María del Carmen Varona (nutritionist), Ana Atencio (nun, Child and Old People Residence, Rama Caída), Liliana Martín (counseling in rural schools), Elsa García (nurse), Héctor Domínguez (health care doctor, Health Center 118), Fernando Barrera (health care doctor, Health Center Caña da Seca), María Cristina Blasco (social psychologist), Antonio Attala (Coordinator of Prevention and Assistance of Catastrophes), and Jorge Herrera (entrepreneur).

Nihuil
Two in-depth interviews were carried out.

Punta de Agua
Three in-depth interviews were held and one key informant interview (Francisco López, goat expert, livestock provincial program).

Malargue city
A focus group was held at the local hospital. The following persons took part: Natalia Quiroga (Social Development Area, Malargue City Council), Father Ramiro Saenz (Catholic parish priest of Malargue), Pablo Rojas (Protestant minister, Temple Monte Sinai), Alfredo Martínez (Head Director of the Primary Health Area), Leonor Livadioti (pediatrician), Norma Pagés (nurse), Silvana Santistéban (social worker, Malargue City Council).

El Sosneado (Malargue department)
Three in-depth interviews were held and two key informants interviews (sanitarian staff). The Provincial Ministry of Economy, PROSAP, provided logistic support.
Table B.1 Sampling Units Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Education attainment</th>
<th>Welfare/ pension plan</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>House holding</th>
<th>Owns land</th>
<th>Water accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agüero</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>charcoal maker</td>
<td>borrowed house</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>cotton microgrower, day laborer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>cotton picker, self-consumption crops</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicanor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>primary school complete</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>cotton picker, self-consumption crops, day laborer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>primary school complete</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>handicrafts, public health agent, hunting, gathering</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>community ownership</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>primary school incomplete</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>self-consumption crops, day laborer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>primary school incomplete</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>self-consumption crops, day laborer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceferina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>primary school incomplete</td>
<td>pension plan</td>
<td>brick maker, cotton microgrower, day laborer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieva family</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>logger, cotton microgrower, handicrafts</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>rainwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>pension plan</td>
<td>livestock, honey production, sewing</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>rainwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>cotton grower/ cotton picker, self-consumption crops</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>community ownership</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tito</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>day laborer, petty livestock, selling logging rights</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Type of ID</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Source of Income</td>
<td>Housing Status</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>primary school incomplete</td>
<td>pension plan</td>
<td>small livestock producer</td>
<td>inheritance/self-built</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>primary school incomplete</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>small livestock producer</td>
<td>inheritance/self-built</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>running water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovita</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>primary school incomplete</td>
<td>food package</td>
<td>maid, knitter</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>running water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matías</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>primary school incomplete</td>
<td>food package</td>
<td>fruit picker</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>primary school incomplete</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>fruit picker</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>running water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angélica</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>primary school complete</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>running water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isidro and Modesta</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>primary school incomplete</td>
<td>food package</td>
<td>bricklayer, small livestock producer</td>
<td>self-built (in process)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>running water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>fruit picker</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velazquez</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>primary school complete</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>vegetable grower</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>running water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusta</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>social plan/pension plan</td>
<td>small livestock producer</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>running water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tucumán province**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Type of ID</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>Housing Status</th>
<th>Sanitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Ayala</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>gardener</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>primary school complete</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>vegetables grower, producer of dehydration vegetables and fruits</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deolinda</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>high school incomplete</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>handicrafts, monthly farm laborer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>community ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>day laborer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dora</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>social plan/food package</td>
<td>self-consumption, day laborer</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Education attainment</th>
<th>Welfare/pension plan</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>House holding</th>
<th>Owns land</th>
<th>Water accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tucumán province</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>primary school complete</td>
<td>pension plan</td>
<td>small livestock producer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polo</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>self-consumption, dairy producer, small livestock producer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raúl</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>social plan/pension plan</td>
<td>sugarcane grower, day laborer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>dairy goat producer, self-consumption</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>rainwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Ángela</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>technical education complete</td>
<td>social plan/pension plan</td>
<td>micro sugarcane prod., part-time administrative job</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>running water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mendoza province</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>primary school complete</td>
<td>pension plan/food package</td>
<td>day laborer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>social plan/pension plan</td>
<td>unemployed, day laborer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>running water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Social Plan</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Access to Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoveva</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>primary school complete</td>
<td>social plan/pension plan</td>
<td>small livestock producer, handicrafts</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>community ownership</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>primary school complete</td>
<td>food package</td>
<td>full-time job, olive &amp; grape plantation</td>
<td>company house</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>running water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raquelina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>primary school incomplete</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>occasional worker (husband)</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>social plan</td>
<td>occasional worker (husband), day laborer, self-consumption</td>
<td>borrowed house</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freire</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>pension plan</td>
<td>self-consumption, occasional worker, handicrafts</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilario</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>pension plan</td>
<td>small livestock producer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>illiterate</td>
<td>pension plan</td>
<td>small livestock producer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>primary school incomplete</td>
<td>pension plan</td>
<td>small livestock producer</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>primary school complete</td>
<td>food package</td>
<td>self-consumption, occasional worker</td>
<td>self-built</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>no access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guía de preguntas

1. Ubicación geográfica:
   ▪ Provincia;
   ▪ Departamento;
   ▪ Municipio;
   ▪ Localidad/Paraje
   ▪ Nombre de la calle y número del domicilio (entre tal y cual calle) o forma de ubicación de la vivienda en el terreno. Por ejemplo, Ruta 9 km 210, a 100 metros de ferrocarril, etc.

   ¿En qué zona está este terreno/lote?
   ¿Qué superficie tiene?
   ¿Es de ustedes? ¿El dueño del terreno/lote es . . . . . . ? Es propiedad comunitaria? Si la respuesta es afirmativa a qué comunidad pertenece y de qué pueblo es?
   ¿Pagan por estar acá? ¿Cuánto pagan?
   ¿Qué arreglo tienen?

2. Datos del respondente:
   ▪ Nombre
   ▪ Sexo
   ▪ Edad

3. Listado de personas que viven habitualmente en esa vivienda
   ¿Cuántos son de familia?/ ¿Quiénes viven aquí habitualmente? /
   Me gustaría que me nombrara a todas las personas que componen este hogar . . .
   1. ¿Cuántas personas viven en la vivienda? ¿Sus nombres?
      a. Para cada componente del hogar:
      2. Relación de parentesco
      3. Sexo
      4. Edad en años cumplidos

4. Características de la vivienda y equipamiento general del hogar
   1. Material predominante de las paredes, techos y pisos (por observación)
   2. ¿Esta vivienda fue construida hace . . .
   3. Cuánto tiempo le llevó construirla?
   4. ¿La construyó usted mismo?
   5. ¿La vivienda es suya? ¿La vivienda es propia? . . . es alquilada? Se la prestan por trabajo? se la presta un amigo? Es característica de su cultura (En el caso de pertenecer a un indígena)
6. ¿Esta vivienda tiene un cuarto para cocinar?
7. ¿En el cuarto donde cocinan también duermen?
8. ¿Cuántos cuartos tiene en total esta vivienda sin contar la cocina?
9. ¿Tienen problemas con el techo de la vivienda? ¿Entra el agua cuando llueve? ¿Se gotea?
11. ¿De dónde traen el agua para beber y cocinar? Según la respuesta: ¿De dónde la traen? ¿Cada cuántos días? ¿La compran? ¿Dónde la compran? ¿Cuánto pagan? ¿Cómo la pagan?
12. La vivienda tiene baño con inodoro o retrete? El inodoro tiene descarga de agua o le tiran agua con un balde?
13. ¿A dónde va el desagüe del inodoro?
17. ¿Qué usa para trasladarse?
   a. En caso de responder transporte público: ¿Cuánto paga? ¿Cómo lo paga?
   Frecuencia de transporte público. Ruta pavimentada o de tierra. En caso de responder de tierra, si llueve quedan aislados?
   b. En caso de responder: automóvil / camioneta / moto preguntar modelo / año:
   ¿Cada cuántos días carga combustible? Cuánto paga? ¿Cómo lo paga?
   c. En caso de responder: bicicleta / carreta u otro vehículo a tracción animal: ¿Lo usa para trasladarse y también para trabajar?

Respecto de la vivienda que ocupa, cuál de las siguientes respuestas es la correcta:

- Menos que adecuada para las necesidades de la familia
- Adecuada para las necesidades de la familia
- Más que adecuada para las necesidades de la familia

Características migratorias

1. ¿Dónde nació?
2. Para los que respondieron que nacieron en otro lugar: ¿Hace cuánto tiempo que vive aquí?
   Si nació en país extranjero:

Vamos a referirnos a la última época en que vivió en . . . . antes de venir a la Argentina por primera vez . . .
¿Cuál fue el principal motivo por el que se fue de . . . ?
¿En qué año llegó a la Argentina?
¿En qué año llegó a /lugar en el que se está realizando la entrevista/?
¿Cuál fue el principal motivo por el que vino a vivir a este lugar?
   Si nació en otra provincia argentina o en otro lugar de esa misma provincia:

Vamos a referirnos a la última época en que vivió en . . . antes de venir a esta provincia . . .
¿En qué año llegó a /lugar en el que se está realizando la entrevista/?
¿Cuál fue el principal motivo por el que se fue de . . . ?
¿En qué año llegó a...?
¿Cuál fue el principal motivo por el que vino a vivir a este lugar?

**Remesas:**
1. ¿Reciben ayuda (mercaderías, ropa, dinero, etc.) enviada desde/país o provincia de nacimiento? Si responde que sí: ¿Esta ayuda es para/consumo del hogar/actividades productivas?
2. ¿Ustedes mandan/envían mercaderías, ropa, dinero, etc. a su/país o provincia de nacimiento?

**Emigración:**
1. ¿Alguna persona que formaba parte de este hogar y vivía en este lugar, se ha ido a vivir a otro lugar? Sexo; Edad de la persona al momento de irse; Año en que se fue; Lugar donde vive hoy. Motivo de la emigración. Reciben ayuda económica de los mismos?

**Usted desearía vivir en algún otro lugar? Si es así, dónde y en qué momento migraría?**

**Educación:**
1. ¿Sabe leer y escribir?
2. ¿Fue/ asistió a la escuela? ¿Hasta qué nivel y grado completó?
3. ¿Sus hijos van a la escuela? ¿A qué nivel y grado?
4. Reciben educación bilingüe (caso de población indígena), la considera culturalmente adecuada?

**Respecto de la educación suya y de su familia, cuál de las siguientes respuestas es la correcta:**
- Menos que adecuada para las necesidades de la familia
- Adecuada para las necesidades de la familia
- Más que adecuada para las necesidades de la familia

**Trabajo**
1. ¿Durante el mes pasado trabajó?
2. ¿Trabajó de manera continua, esporádica o eventual?
3. El mes pasado vendió/hizo algún producto para su venta? Prestó algún servicio a cambio de un pago (cortar el cabello, dar clases, lavar ropa ajena). Ayudó en las tierras o en el negocio de un familiar/otra persona?
5. ¿Por ese trabajo recibe un sueldo? ¿Cómo le pagan? ¿Cuánto tiempo le pagan? ¿Recibe además como pago comida, vivienda, etc. por ese trabajo?
6. ¿Cuáles son las tareas que desempeñó en ese trabajo?
7. ¿Estuvo buscando trabajo el mes pasado?
8. Además del trabajo del que ya hablamos, vendió...y sigue la misma pregunta número 2. Si tiene un segundo trabajo: pregunta número 5.
9. En total ¿cuántas horas a la semana trabajó?
10. Durante los 6 meses anteriores al mes pasado: ¿trabajó en algo completamente diferente a lo que trabajó el mes pasado?
11. ¿Recibió ingresos en dinero o en especie por esos trabajos?
12. ¿Es pensionado o jubilado?
13. ¿Recibe algún plan jefas y jefes?
14. ¿Hace regularmente alguna de las siguientes actividades? La realiza en forma comunitaria (para población indígena)?
- Agricultura, siembra, cosecha, huerta
- Pesca (no deportiva)
- Ganadería/Cría de animales
- Caza (no deportiva)
- Artesanía
- Recolección de frutos
- Recolección de miel
- Extracción de madera
- Minería
- Turismo
- Otra actividad
- ¿Con qué fin la realiza?
- Consumo familiar, Venta; intercambio. Si responde venta: ¿A cuánto lo vende? ¿Cómo se lo pagan? Si responde intercambio: ¿Qué le dan a cambio?
- Participa de alguna cooperativa?

Salud
1. Diga a qué distancia está el centro de salud más cercano.
2. Concurre al centro de salud?
3. Con qué finalidad?
4. Qué miembro del hogar estuvo enfermo recientemente? Qué tuvo?

Respecto de la atención de salud, cuál de las siguientes respuestas es la correcta:
- Menos que adecuada para las necesidades de la familia
- Adecuada para las necesidades de la familia
- Más que adecuada para las necesidades de la familia

Agricultura
1. ¿Sembró o cosechó entre octubre 2006 y febrero 2007 o tuvo huertos, invernaderos, viveros u hortalizas propiedad del hogar?
2. ¿Recoleció frutas?
3. ¿Las actividades las realizó dentro del predio de la vivienda?
4. ¿El cultivo lo hizo a medias o aparcerías? ¿Cuánto cosechó? ¿Vendió su cosecha? ¿De lo que vendió, cómo se lo pagaron? ¿Con cuánto se quedó?
5. ¿Guardó o tomó de su cosecha para sembrar y/o alimentar a los animales utilizados en la producción?
6. De su cultivo, ¿Destinó alguna cantidad para consumo del hogar? ¿Cuánto?
7. De su cultivo, ¿destinó alguna cantidad para regalar o pagar alguna deuda o servicio?
8. ¿Cuándo dinero recibió como apoyo para su cultivo? ¿del gobierno? ¿de instituciones no gubernamentales? ¿de familiares o amigos? ¿otros?
10. ¿Las herramientas que utiliza son propias? ¿son suyas? ¿Cuánto gastó en: alquiler de maquinaria, equipo y animales? (si no son propios)
11. Hubo factores climáticos o de otro tipo que impidieran sembrar/cosechas y en esos casos qué tipo de asistencia recibió?
12. Utiliza alguna técnica de cultivo ancestral o cultiva algún tipo de semillas “domesticadas” ancestralmente. En caso afirmativo, lo han patentado o sabe de alguna empresa que sí lo ha hecho?

Ganadería
1. Crió, explotó u obtuvo algún producto de sus animales entre octubre 2006 y febrero 2007?
2. De los animales que crió, ¿vendió alguno de ellos? ¿Cuáles? ¿Cuánto vendió? ¿Cuánto destinó para el consumo del hogar? ¿Utilizó alguno para su negocio? ¿Regaló alguno o pagó una deuda?

3. ¿Cuándo dinero recibió como apoyo para criar sus animales? ¿del gobierno? ¿de instituciones no gubernamentales? ¿de familiares o amigos? ¿otros?

4. ¿Las herramientas que utiliza son propias? ¿son suyas? ¿Cuánto gastó en el alquiler de maquinaria, equipo y animales? (si no son propios)

5. Realiza invernadas/veranadas. Si la respuesta es afirmativa los lugares de traslado son de su propiedad, o deben gestionar permisos y/o pagar por las mismas?

6. Hubo factores climáticos o de otro tipo que le han impedido hacer invernadas/veranadas y en ese caso qué perjuicio le ocasionó?

Recolección de productos forestales y tala de árboles

1. ¿Recolectó algún producto forestal entre octubre 2006 y febrero 2007?


3. ¿Cuándo dinero recibió como apoyo para recolectar? ¿del gobierno? ¿de instituciones no gubernamentales? ¿de familiares o amigos? ¿otros?

4. ¿Las herramientas que utiliza son propias? ¿son suyas? ¿Cuánto gastó en el alquiler de maquinaria, equipo y animales? (si no son propios)

5. Ha realizado alguna actividad relacionada a la prevención de incendios forestales y de recolección de leña muerta?

6. Participó de algún plan de manejo forestal?

7. Han talado productos forestales de gran arraigo cultural?

8. Ha cultivado productos forestales exóticos? En caso afirmativo cuáles fueron y cuál fue la incidencia cultural que ocasionó?

Pesca, caza y captura de animales

1. ¿Cazó o capturó algún animal entre octubre 2006 y febrero 2007?


3. ¿Cuándo dinero recibió como apoyo para pescar, cazar o capturar animales? ¿del gobierno? ¿de instituciones no gubernamentales? ¿de familiares o amigos? ¿otros?

4. ¿Las herramientas que utiliza son propias? ¿son suyas? ¿Cuánto gastó en el alquiler de maquinaria, equipo y animales? (si no son propios)

5. Pertenece a una cultura cazadora/recolectora? Modificó algunos de estos hábitos, por ejemplo en lugar de recolectar miel mediante el corte de árboles introdujo alguna técnica para la realización de la misma?

Para detectar otros ingresos (en especie):

- Recibió artículos o servicios ¿tomó o utilizó durante el mes pasado alguno de su negocio o trabajo? ¿Qué artículo tomó o utilizó? ¿Qué cantidad? ¿Cuánto habría pagado si lo hubiera comprado?

- Recibió artículos o servicios de otro hogar? ¿Recibió durante el mes pasado alguno como pago por su trabajo? ¿Lo recibió como parte del sueldo? ¿Cómo complemento del sueldo? ¿Qué artículo o servicio recibió? ¿Qué cantidad recibió? ¿Cuánto habría pagado si lo hubiera comprado? Algún tipo de fondo rotatorio?

Movilidad territorial por trabajo:

- ¿Durante este año, viajó para trabajar en otro lugar?

- ¿Lo hizo para trabajar en siembra, cosecha o zafra; esquila; pesca; veranada, invernada o arreo; turismo; otra actividad.
¿Durante cuánto tiempo?

Por cuestiones culturales?

Ingresos individuales de los integrantes del hogar

- ¿Trabaja solo o lo ayuda su señora, sus hijos, etc.? ¿Con quiénes hace esas tareas? pertenece a alguna cooperativa? ¿Por esas tareas reciben . . . :
  - Sueldo, salario o jornal
  - Destajo
  - Comisiones y propinas
  - Horas extras
  - Aguinaldo
  - Premios
  - Ganancias de la cooperativa
  - Otro

GASTOS

Para detectar gastos mensuales:

1. Durante el mes pasado ¿Qué artículos de limpieza compró? ¿Cuántos y cuál fue su precio unitario? ¿Dónde los compró? Forma de pago: de contado; de fiado.
2. Durante el mes pasado ¿Qué artículos para el cuidado personal compró? ¿Cuántos y cuál fue su precio unitario? ¿Dónde los compró? Forma de pago: de contado; de fiado.
4. Durante el mes pasado, realizó algún gasto en la escuela.? ¿Cuánto pagó? ¿Forma de pago?
5. Durante el mes pasado, ¿cuánto gastó en comunicaciones telefónicas? Incluya fijo, celular, teléfono público, etc. ¿Forma de pago?
6. Durante el mes pasado, ¿cuánto gastó en combustible, mantenimiento del vehículo que tiene? ¿Forma de pago?
7. Durante el mes pasado, ¿Cuánto pagó de alquiler? ¿de la casa? ¿del terreno?
8. ¿Cuánto pagó de impuesto?
9. ¿Cuánto pagó de servicios: luz, gas, agua?
10. ¿Cuánto pagó el carbón, la leña, velas y veladores, otros combustible? (si los usa para calentar o cocinar)
11. Por pertenecer a alguna asociación/ comunidad, tuvo algún gasto?

Para detectar gastos trimestrales

1. Durante los meses de enero, febrero y marzo, compró alguna prenda de vestir, calzado o accesorios? ¿Cuánto compró y cuánto fue su precio unitario? ¿Dónde lo compró? ¿Cómo lo pagó?
2. Durante los meses de enero, febrero y marzo, compró alguna vajilla o utensilio doméstico? Mantelería o artículos de mercería? ¿Cuánto compró y cuánto fue su precio unitario? ¿Dónde lo compró? ¿Cómo lo pagó?
3. Durante los meses de enero, febrero y marzo, gastó en algún servicio de salud? ¿Qué servicio? ¿Cuánto gastó? ¿Dónde? ¿Cómo lo pagó?
4. Durante los meses de enero, febrero y marzo, compró medicamentos? ¿Cuánto compró y cuánto fue su precio unitario? ¿Dónde lo compró? ¿Cómo lo pagó?

Para detectar gastos semestrales

1. Durante los 6 meses anteriores, ¿compró algún artículo para el hogar? ¿Cuánto compró y cuánto fue su precio unitario? ¿Dónde lo compró? ¿Cómo lo pagó?
2. Durante los 6 meses anteriores, ¿tuvo gastos para mantener la vivienda? ¿Cuánto gastó? ¿Cómo lo pagó?
3. Durante los 6 meses anteriores, ¿Compró por ejemplo algún vehículo, de transporte, de carga?
4. Durante los 6 meses anteriores, ¿cuánto gastó en transporte por mes?

**Gastos diarios en alimentos, bebidas, tabaco y transporte público**

1. ¿Cada cuándo realizan las compras en alimentos y bebidas para sus alimentos?
2. Gastos diarios para consumir dentro de casa: Durante el día de ayer (o la semana pasada) usted o algunas de las personas que conforman el hogar realizaron gastos en alimentos, para preparar el desayuno, la comida, la cena o gastaron en alimentos para animales domésticos?
4. ¿Cuántos desayunos, comidas, cenas o entrecomidas consumieron?
5. Durante el día de ayer, usted o algunas de las personas del hogar gastaron en servicios de transporte público?
6. Durante el día de ayer, usted o algunas de las personas del hogar recibieron alimentos, tabaco o alimentos para animales domésticos, o les pagaron el pasaje? ¿Qué recibieron? ¿Qué cantidad? ¿Quién se los dio? ¿Cuánto pagarían por ese artículo si lo hubieran pagado?
7. Durante el día de ayer, usted o algunas de las personas del hogar recibieron alimentos o bebidas a un precio menor como ayuda por parte del gobierno o de alguna institución?
8. Durante el día de ayer, usted o algunas de las personas del hogar, recibieron alimentos, bebidas o servicios de transporte por parte de su trabajo?

**Respecto del consumo de alimentos en el último mes, cuál de las siguientes respuestas es la correcta:**
- Menos que adecuado para las necesidades de la familia
- Adecuado para las necesidades de la familia
- Más que adecuado para las necesidades de la familia

**Respecto de su nivel de vida en general, cuál de las siguientes respuestas es la correcta:**
- Menos que adecuado para las necesidades de la familia
- Adecuado para las necesidades de la familia
- Más que adecuado para las necesidades de la familia
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