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Motivation

• Women face higher risk of long term poverty. (Finnie & Sweetman 2003; Lochhead & Scott 2000; Burstein 2005)
  ○ Women comprise ~61% of the long term poor

• Women were identified by the government of Canada as one of the groups at the highest risk of poverty. Actually, they were identified twice: women and female-lone parents were both identified as high risk groups (Collin and Jenson, 2009).
POVERTY RATES

1997 Net Income

- All
- Male
- Female
- All
- Male
- Female

2009 Net Income

- All Households
- Two Parent HH
- Lone Parent HH
- Single Person HH
- Couples no Kids
- Other HH
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997 Net Income</th>
<th></th>
<th>2009 Net Income</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Households</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.4*</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Parent HH</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.3*</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Parent HH</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>52.0*</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Person HH</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>32.7*</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples no Kids</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other HH</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of individuals in poverty is obtained by multiplying survey weights by size of the household. Poverty line is 0.5*median measure for those < 65 years of age. Net income includes Market income and taxes and transfers divided by (household size)$^{1/2}$ Head of the household is the person most responsible for the economic viability of the household. * Significant at the 5% level.
Motivation

- Women also identified as a high risk group for living in longer-term poverty in Canada (Lohead and Scott 2000; Finnie and Sweetman 2003; Burstein 2005).

- Between 1992 and 1996, over 60 percent of the long-term poor were women. Moreover, 29 percent of all women and 66.7 percent of lone mothers were poor at least once in the period (Finnie and Sweetman, 2003).

- Strong contributor to the feminization and juvenilization of poverty from the 1970s to the 1990s was the increase in the portion of female headed lone-parent families (Dooley, 1994; Crossley and Curtis, 2006).
Motivation

- Previous studies on determinants of poverty duration and exits in Canada (Finnie & Sweetman 2004; Finnie 2000; Antolin, Dang & Oxley 1999; Burstein 2005; Lochead & Scott 2000) find
  - Negative Duration Dependence (\(\downarrow\)prob of exit as time\(\uparrow\))
  - Family Composition
  - Employment Status
  - Age
  - Education (Welfare studies & US poverty studies)
Motivation

- Not all poverty experiences or exits are equal.
- Those most likely to return to poverty are those that exit to just above the poverty line (LICO) (or to near poverty) Finnie and Sweetman (2003).
- Thus, the determinants of poverty duration may be different for those who exit to near poverty and those who exit farther above the poverty line.
Motivation

- Participation in Social Assistance (SA)
  - Substantial decreases in SA benefits post 1996 (cut welfare dependency)

- Introduction of the National Child Benefit
  - Policy instrument designed to decrease child poverty
  - make work pay (working income supplement designed to increase incomes of working poor but not SA participants)

- Update study
  - Current data
  - Determinants of policy interest
  - Examine exit types
Data & Methodology

- Canadian Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID) 1994-2010 (Panels 1-5)
  - Target population was all individuals in Canada excluding persons living on Indian reserves, institutionalized individuals and some northern communities (less than 3% of the population).
  - Interviewed yearly between January and March regarding labour market experiences, income, education, family relationships and other demographics.

- Data were accessed in the Southwestern Regional Data Centre at the University of Waterloo which is part of the Canadian Data Research Data Network. Although the data were accessed through Statistics Canada, the opinions sited within do not reflect Statistics Canada’s policies or opinions.
## Data & Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Panel 1</th>
<th>Panel 2</th>
<th>Panel 3</th>
<th>Panel 4</th>
<th>Panel 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poverty spell: continuous period household income falls below the after-tax Low Income Cut Off (LICO).

Canada does not have an official poverty line but Statistics Canada calculates the LICO included in the SLID.

LICO takes household size, prices and urbanization of the area of residence into consideration when estimating the amount of income necessary to purchase necessities such as food, shelter and clothing needed by the ‘average family’ of a given size.

The after-tax LICO is used as our poverty line.
Duration of Poverty Spell

- Spell Duration is end date less start date in years
  - Maximum five years

- Left-censored
  - Start dates unknown if spell starts before first year of panel.
  - Omitted as no characteristics of the individual on entering poverty

- Right-censored
  - End dates unknown if spell ends after last year of panel.
  - Retained and corrected
Figure 1: Examples of Possible Spell History in a Single SLID Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Head</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1 0 spell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2 1 spell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3 1 spell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4 0 spell</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 5 0 spell</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 6 1 spell</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 7 1 spell</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 8 0 spell</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 9 2 spells</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 10 0 spell</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exclusions

- Exclude spells where individual <25, >59 or a student
  - <25 or students may be poor given their current income but long-term outlook is may be very different than others living in poverty
  - >59 due to retirement and possible receipt of government support

- Excludes Households labelled as Other
  - Unclear what income sharing relationships are within household

- Those with missing information on determinants also excluded.

- Sample of 3,426 spells; 1,821 by women and 1,605 by men.
Methodology

- Proportional hazard, discrete

\[ h_t(X) = 1 - \exp(-\exp(X'\beta + \lambda(t))) \]

The hazard rate, \( h \), at any year \( t \), depends on individual characteristics, \( X \), and \( \lambda(t) \), the log of the difference between the integrated baseline hazard at the start versus the end of year \( t \).

- Models with and without \( \Gamma \) distrib. Heterogeneity
  - Prentice-Gloeckler 1978; Jenkins 2008
Figure 2: Distribution of the ratio of adjusted after-tax family income to the poverty line, on exiting poverty, by gender of household head.
Methodology

- Competing risks analysis categorical variable
  - 0 if does not exit,
  - 1 if LICO < exit income < 1.1 * LICO,
  - 2 if exit income 1.1 *LICO <= exit income <= 2 *LICO,
  - 3 if exit income is > 2* LICO.

- Report exponentiated coefficients
  - hazard ratios or relative risks
  - if the hazard ratio for a given characteristic is 1.05, there is a 5% increase in the probability of exit, at any time $t$, for each unit increase in the associated characteristic

- All models include province and spell start FE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>41.45</td>
<td>42.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married with children (base)</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattached</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, no children</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of social assistance</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>0.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of preschool child</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full year</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of earners</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>1.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; high school grad (base)</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school grad</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-censored (%)</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spells (no.)</td>
<td>3,426</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>1,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-spell observations (no.)</td>
<td>3,286</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>1,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household heads with a second spell in the sample (no.)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender differences are **significant** for all baseline covariates except married household types, preschool child, less than high school, bachelor’s degree or higher, immigrant, disability.
Significantly different
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Near Poverty ( &gt; 1<em>poverty line &lt; 1.1</em>poverty line)</th>
<th>2 Mid-Range Exits (1.1 *poverty line &lt; 2 *poverty line)</th>
<th>3 Higher Exits (2*poverty line or above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean duration (yrs)</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple spells (%)</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spells exiting by category (no.)</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting to category (%)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Gender differences are statistically insignificant for all groups except the percentage exiting to near poverty.

The gap in average duration between (1) and (3) is statistically significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 of spell</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 of spell</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4+ of spell</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattached</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, no children</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of social assistance</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of preschool child</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full year</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>1.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of earners</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>1.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>1.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>1.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative household-head exit probability (%)</td>
<td>49.78</td>
<td>51.11</td>
<td>49.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spells (no.)</td>
<td>3,426</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>1,605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > 0.01*
Duration analyses ‘determinants’ of exiting poverty.

- Factors (year prior to poverty spell) that increase likelihood of exit
  - Labour attachment for females
  - Having higher education for females
  - Number of earners for males

- Decrease likelihood of exit for males and females
  - Years in poverty increase (negative duration dependence)
  - Participating in social assistance
  - Being an immigrant

- Decrease likelihood of exit for females
  - Having younger children for females
  - Being unattached (compared to couples with no children)

- Decrease likelihood of exit for males
  - Disability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Near Poverty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mid-Range Exits</th>
<th></th>
<th>Higher-Income Exits</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 of spell</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 of spell</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4+ of spell</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>0.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattached</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>1.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, no children</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of social assistance</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of preschool child</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full year</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>1.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of earners in family</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>1.396</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>1.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.616</td>
<td>1.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>1.401</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>3.049</td>
<td>1.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative HH-head exit prob (%)</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p > 0.01 \)
### TABLE 5

**Competing-Risks Framework: Specification 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Near Poverty Female</th>
<th>Near Poverty Male</th>
<th>Mid-Range Exits Female</th>
<th>Mid-Range Exits Male</th>
<th>Higher-Income Exits Female</th>
<th>Higher-Income Exits Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 of spell</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 of spell</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4+ of spell</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>0.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattached</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>1.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, no children</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of social assistance</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of preschool child</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full year</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>1.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of earners in family</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>1.396</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>1.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.616</td>
<td>1.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>1.401</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>3.049</td>
<td>1.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative HH-head exit prob (%)</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > 0.01*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Near Poverty Female</th>
<th>Near Poverty Male</th>
<th>Mid-Range Exits Female</th>
<th>Mid-Range Exits Male</th>
<th>Higher-Income Exits Female</th>
<th>Higher-Income Exits Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 of spell</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 of spell</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4+ of spell</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>0.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattached</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>1.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, no children</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of social assistance</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of preschool child</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full year</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>1.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of earners in family</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>1.396</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>1.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.616</td>
<td>1.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>1.401</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>3.049</td>
<td>1.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative HH-head exit prob (%)</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > 0.01*
Change Characteristics

- Gain or loss of income earners in the family
- Increases or decreases in the number of children in the family
- Employed full year to not employed full year, not employed full year to employed full year
- Disabled to not disabled, not disabled to disabled
- Unmarried to married, and married to previously married (divorced, widowed, or separated).

If household head at the start of a poverty spell was not the household head the year before the start of the spell, we consider this a change in household head at the start of the spell.

If the household head at the start of the spell is no longer the household head at the end of the poverty spell, we consider this a change in household head mid-spell.
Specification II:
Adding Characteristics that change within a spell

- **occur at the start of the spell may be reasons that the poverty spell occurred**
  - e.g., marital dissolution or job loss.

- **occur mid-spell may result in shorter or longer spells depending on the characteristic**
  - e.g., adding an income earner is likely to increase income, but marriage may or may not increase equivalent household income depending on whether additional family members are income earners).
Specification II: Adding Characteristics that change within a spell

- Adding them do not change estimates substantively

- Changes in First year of spell

- Marital dissolution and loss of earners reduce the likelihood of exit by almost 17 percent and 29 percent, respectively, consistent with short-term shocks to income.

- Gaining earners or changing disability status increases the probability of ending a spell.
  - An increased probability of exit for those who become disabled upon entering a poverty spell may seem odd, but a household head may have a temporary shock to income and then qualify for disability benefits, and this may raise the family income enough to exit poverty.
Specification II: Adding Characteristics that change within a spell

- Mid-Spell Changes
- With the exception of marital status, which is insignificant, changes in characteristics decreases the probability of exiting poverty.
  - The decrease in probability associated with gaining full-year employment and gaining earners may seem counterintuitive; becoming employed full year or gaining earners *within a poverty spell* means that the increased income is not sufficient to raise the household out of poverty, and these types of low-wage jobs tend to have lower earnings trajectories, resulting in a lower probability of transitioning to higher income (Dunifon, Kalil, and Danziger 2002; Green and Ferber 2005; Johnson and Corcoran 2002).

- Multiple spells increase likelihood of exit (have to get out to get back in)
Descriptive statistics indicate that nearly one-third of poverty spells do not end in the panel windows.

The average duration of poverty spells is almost two years,

over one-third of poverty spells are experienced by household heads who have multiple spells.

Of the spells that do end, over 23 percent exit to near poverty, 61 percent exit to within 1.1 to 2 times the poverty line, and only 16 percent exit to over twice the poverty line.
Conclusion/Discussion

- duration analyses indicate that several factors may improve the probability of exiting poverty for Canadian men and women.

- higher education, especially for women, is a significant determinant of exit.

- participating in social assistance, being an immigrant, and having younger children are characteristics associated with a lower probability of exiting poverty.

- consistent with previous studies, we find a negative duration dependence; the probability of exit falls as the years in poverty increase.
**Conclusion/Discussion**

- Competing-risks framework indicates that, compared to not exiting, few characteristics are associated with exiting to near poverty;
  - Social assistance recipients, immigrants and those with disabilities are less likely to exit to near poverty. Being an immigrant, receiving social assistance, having any preschool children, and having more children are negatively associated with leaving poverty to further above the poverty line.

- In contrast, full-year employment before spell start and a high school diploma or some college (compared to less than a high school education) are associated with moving to between 1.1 and 2 times the poverty line.

- Those with a bachelor’s degree or above are more than twice as likely to exit to 2*poverty line (relative to non-exit);
  - More substantial for females.
  - Result is consistent with the decline in poverty rates among unattached women over the same period in which educational attainment for prime-aged women is rising (Turcotte 2011).
  - Masked when we consider exits in a single category only.
Conclusion/Discussion

• The largest and most robust gender differences are seen in education.
  ○ For spells experienced by women, a bachelor’s degree is associated with higher rates of exit to the categories beyond near poverty, whereas for men a bachelor’s degree reduces the probability of exiting to between 1.1 and 2 times the poverty line but increases the probability of exiting beyond that. A bachelor’s degree seems to be more beneficial for a female than a male when exiting to the highest income levels.

• Employment
  ○ Being employed full year before the start of the spell is significant for female spells exiting to the mid-range category, whereas no longer being employed full year is associated with a higher probability of exits to twice the poverty line for male spells. These results suggest that differences in the labour market conditions, attachment, and/or preferences among men and women may differentially influence poverty exit rates across the sexes.

• Marital Status
  ○ some differences but mainly insignificant which is surprising particularly lone-parent status

• With the exception of education, employment, and changes in marital status, we find very few other characteristics with robust gender differences.
However, while there are relatively few robust gender differences in the main sample, the sensitivity analyses highlight that left-censored spells exhibit far greater male–female disparities in characteristics.

The relatively short panel windows of the SLID do not allow us to fully investigate the determinants of these longer-term spells.

Yet annual exit models suggest that these determinants do not differ substantially from those reported in the hazards analysis. Similarly robust findings across duration and annual exit models are reported in Finnie and Sweetman 2003.
Possible Policy Conclusions

- Our data seem to indicate that a not so small portion (about 1/3) of men and women who enter poverty are ‘trapped’ there (min 5 years - the length of the SLID Panel).

- The results suggest that policies directed at increasing education and improving employment opportunities for the poor may not only increase the probability of transitioning out of poverty but also allow individuals to exit further above the poverty line.

- Social assistance participation is a strong barrier to exiting poverty, indicating that social assistance benefits are low relative to median incomes.

- Policies which raised social assistance benefits would assist families in exiting poverty; however, such policies have negative labour market consequences. A combination of policies that provided more generous incomes for individuals who are not able to work while assisting those who are able to work to re-enter the labour force by allowing more non-taxed work hours might address this concern.

- Changes in marital status (particularly marital dissolution for women) hinder poverty exits. Fairer redistribution of family resources and stronger penalties for non-payment of child support payments may be remedies for these issues.
Possible Policy Conclusions

- the competing risks framework demonstrates that exiting poverty is not the same experience for all.

- Studies examining poverty and poverty duration should differentiate between those who exit to near the poverty line or to far above the poverty line – clearly, these are very different experiences for women and their families and are strong indicators as to whether or not a woman (and her family) will return to poverty.