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Abstract
This study shows how the chronic poor living in the urban context of Rosario overcome their limitations to achieve livelihood goals in their attempt to move above the poverty line. A theoretical perspective, which complements the concept, definitions and analytical viewpoints concerning: livelihoods, resilience and adaptation, chronic poverty, poverty dynamics and poverty line, is outlined to reflect the findings with the existing theories that enable examining the limiting and the supporting factors that really matter for the livelihood of the poor. In total, 27 interviews were conducted, 12 with selected participants who were living in the situation of chronic poverty in the year 2000, and 15 with key informants and other stakeholders in order to explore the life experiences of the poor through: the context vulnerability; access to assets; policy, institutions and processes; livelihood strategies and outcomes. After examining how the chronic poor living in Rosario are able to make their way of living, it has been observed that for them it is not possible to secure strategies which assure enough returns to improve their resilience, capacity of adaptation and reduction of vulnerability if there is no financial and technical support beyond the support given to them in terms of social protection to cover their basic needs. It has also been found that the support and accompaniment given to them during their changing process require a well-coordinated implementation of public policies, programs and projects which need to be improved. Thus, a humanitarian approach focusing on the household livelihood security which links emergency, recovery and development is described to analyze what is being done in Rosario in terms of programing and on the other hand to formulate some recommendations to improve them.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Livelihood of the Poor: Background information and research relevance for the Humanitarian Action

Livelihood, as proposed by Chambers and Conway (1992), is a combination of capabilities, assets and activities required to make a living. Thus, tracking the livelihood of the poor over the time offers a bottom up perspective to analyze what really matters to people regarding vulnerability and opportunities affecting their livelihood strategies in their attempt to make a living. Such an analysis allows a link between the micro (household) and macro (community) levels by which the adversity faced by individuals/households can be externally supported in collaboration with public policy, institutions and community processes to reduce poverty.

Given that this study is carried out in an urban setting, before the introduction of the reasons why it is important to research on livelihoods, it is appropriate to review the existing knowledge on the characteristics of livelihoods of the poor in urban settings.

In urban contexts, people are highly dependent on monetary based economy which is: cash to get access to buy food, cloths, housing, medicine, education, etc. Thus, livelihood strategies to get cash are oriented to the market and wage labor; people in urban settings are reliant mainly on non-agricultural activities such as goods trade, waged employment in industries, services delivering, or within the public sector and self-employment. However, owing to inequalities, it is known that the livelihood strategies adopted by the poor living in urban contexts are very complex and followed by a combination of a wide range of activities, mainly because of job insecurity, unstable sources of income, lack of education, high level of indebtedness, bad living conditions including overcrowding, limited access to basic services such as water and sanitation; and in some cases, poor people facing fears of eviction from irregular settlement where they live. Authors like Farrington, Ramasut, and Walker, (2002) in their work also argue that poor people in urban contexts are highly vulnerable because they lack access to land for housing. Housing is an asset which can be considered as the main capital on which people rely for home base livelihood activities and self-employment, this view is also supported by (Rakodi 2002).
In Argentina, what can be seen is not only an incremented level of inequality but also a chaotically shakeup of people moving in and out of poverty. Thus, what is known about adversity and vulnerability faced by urban poor does not differ that much from what is happening nowadays with the poor living in the cities in Argentina.

Although the re-structuration of Argentina post crisis 1999-2002 was successful, and made it possible to reverse the negative consequences of the crisis by reducing the level of poverty and unemployment rates, little is known about how this process of change has affected the livelihoods of the poor in their context; the outcomes of the livelihood strategies of the poor are considered positive in cases where they: improve incomes, well-being, reduce vulnerability, and express resilience/adaptation (Rakodi 2002:16).

From the Argentina’s GINI index on inequality it can be understood that still there is no equal development possibilities for the whole society. In 2003 the GINI index for Argentina’s main cities was 54.7. While, according to data available from the World Bank, for the year 2010, the figure indicated an index of 44.5\(^1\). To mention inequalities related to livelihoods, specifically in terms of employment, in Argentina many people do not have access to formal employment and those who have access to formal contracts; their jobs are insecure due to national labor reforms that have brought flexibility in labor contracts. According to the government of Santa Fe Province (GSP), the incidence of job insecurity in the Great Rosario, during the third quarter of 2013 reached 34.4 % of salaried employees (GSP, 2014)\(^2\).

Therefore, research on livelihood of the poor within urban contexts is important since, additionally, another major challenge of the world today is the demographic growth combined with the phenomenon of urbanization process that is taking place in many countries all over the world. Consequently there is a need to accommodate an increasingly growing number of job seekers and incremented need of articulating economy development, urban planning and poverty reduction (Rakodi 2002).

In this regard, livelihood approach can be applied as a strategy in developmental practices, by institutions, practitioners and policy makers to reduce poverty and

\(^1\) Available at: [http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.POV.GINI](http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.POV.GINI), accessed 14\(^{th}\) April 2014

\(^2\) Available at: [https://www.santafe.gov.ar/index.php/web/content/download/187709/910900/file/Boletín%20de%20Coyuntura%20enero%202014.pdf](https://www.santafe.gov.ar/index.php/web/content/download/187709/910900/file/Boletín%20de%20Coyuntura%20enero%202014.pdf), accessed 05\(^{th}\) April 2014
inequality. Moreover, it should be noted that this approach, including the methodologies developed here, can also be implemented in contexts of emergencies, after natural disasters or post conflict situations, since it can be used to link relief, rehabilitation and development as a continuum; and even, as a strategy approach for conflict prevention.

With the case study suggested in this thesis, I attempt to put into practice the existing methods and approaches, within a context of developmental practices to examine and understand livelihood of the poor to show how external support can be analyzed. The main objective is to contribute with the strengthening of the projects and programs implemented in Rosario aiming the improvement of livelihood of the poor.

1.2 Objective of the Research

By tracking the livelihood trajectories of a small number of individuals/households, this thesis aims at finding robust evidences to show generalizable common livelihood issues which affect urban poor living in Rosario, with the purpose of contributing with recommendations aiming the improvement of the livelihood of the poor through the reinforcement of: knowledge on methodologies for livelihood analysis, programing and social assistance.

Therefore, the main research question is:

How are the Chronic Poor, living in Rosario, Argentina able to implement livelihood activities that aid them to move above the poverty line? Which are the supporting and the limiting factors that affect them during their changing process?

To answer these questions, interviewees were identified among people living in the situation of chronic poverty in the year 2000, while the challenges and the successes of their livelihood were captured over time through a timeframe that addressed the following sub-questions:

1- What are the reasons that have made them fall below the poverty line?

2- How have they managed to overcome constraints and achieved the livelihoods goals, and what are the results?

3- How have the governmental social assistance and/or humanitarian organizations supported these individuals in their efforts to achieve livelihoods goals? What can be improved? What can be learned?
In this research, the definition of “chronic poverty”, “poverty line” and aspects of “chronic poverty duration” are drawn in order to identify who the poor are, and to be able - after examining their livelihood- to visualize their mobility, whether it is above or below the “poverty line”, using income as an indicator. Thus, with a defined timeframe between the year 2000 and 2013 and guided by the Sustainable Livelihood Framework, the successes and failures of the chronic poor in achieving their livelihood goals will be analyzed by considering their outcomes over time. This theoretical perspective will be described in details in following parts.

1.3. Research Method
This thesis is based on empirical research through the implementation of a qualitative single case study to answer the questions framed in a theoretical perspective and exploratory descriptive approach. The data was collected through semi-structured interviews with purposely selected individuals/households and key informants. In addition, ad hoc spontaneous focus group discussions with women working for community feeding kitchens were conducted to discuss issues related to community networks and interpersonal violence.

The interviews were recorded and stored in digital platforms which in turn were complemented with hand writing notes taken to register visual evidences.

The Sustainable Livelihood Approach was used as a framework for analysis which also guided me during the process of data collection, while the analysis of the data collected relied on “theoretical propositions, reflected in the research questions that narrowed down the case study in terms of data requirement and way of analysis” (Yin, 2013:130). Case description and rival explanation were also used as an analytic strategy in order to contrast different perspectives from interviewees. In terms of analytic techniques, it was used: the “pattern matching; logic model, matching empirical event with theoretical perspective; explanation building in narrative form, explaining a phenomenon with a set of presumed causal links; and time series, compiling and analyzing chronological events” (Yin, 2013:141).

Statistical information and quantitative data, related to the cost of the total basic basket and the consumption according to gender and age, were combined with empirical evidences to calculate the status of individuals/household in relation to the poverty line, using income as an indicator.
**Sampling procedure**

In total, 27 semi-structured interviews were conducted from which 12 were with individuals living in the North district of Rosario selected by purposive and snowball methods, and 15 with personnel representative of different programs from the Municipal government: 4 interviewees are representatives of different structures of the Sub-Secretariat of Solidarity Economy; 2 interviewees are coordinators and extension workers of the Youth Program co-coordinated by the General Directorate of Employment, Secretariat of Production and local Development, Municipality of Rosario (M.R); 1 interviewee is the Sub-Director of the Directorate of Public Policies for Youth; 2 interviewees work at health centers, both Provincial and Municipal; 3 interviewees work with the coordination team of the Family Promotion Program placed within the neighborhood through the CCB Nº16, depending on the Secretariat of Social Promotion of the M.R; 1 interviewee works as a Coordinator for social assistance in charge of the North district depending on the Secretariat of Social Promotion; 1 interviewee works with the directorate of Planning, and finally 1 interviewee is a former coordinator of the CCB Nº16.

In order to select individuals who were considered as chronic poor in the year 2000, I made use of the information from the data base of the CCB Nº16 which in turn was triangulated with the Unique Registration Files (RUB) and short listed interviewees from the reports on livelihood activities, which I implemented in my former job between 2002 and 2003. Besides living in the situation of chronic poverty, the criteria for selecting interviewees also considered: age, selecting people who represent different stages in the life cycle; and gender, considering men and women, heads of household.

**Interview process**

Regarding participants, an open individual questionnaire was administrated in order to discuss their personal livelihoods experiences. At the end of each meeting, a timeline was drawn for each interviewee in order to visualize livelihood trajectories, and review the most important events related to shocks, stressors, resilience and adaptation mechanisms adopted by them. In appendix 1 of this document, the questionnaire guide is included.

It is important to mention that between 2002 and 2003, I was coordinating livelihood activities for a governmental program in Rosario by covering the position of agro-technical extension worker, within the same neighborhoods where this study took place,
in the municipal center Nº16 called “Crecer”, now renamed as Coexistence Neighborhood Center (CCB Nº16). This facilitated me the access to the area under study and conduct interviews with people that I already know or with people recommended by former coworkers who are still working as representatives of the municipality in governmental programs. Therefore, the proximity with participants and key informants was good enough to get reliable information. In appendix 2 of this document, the list of participants and their basic information is attached.

In order to get a deeper insight on peoples’ livelihood experiences, living conditions, access to basic services, assets, equipment, and way of working, I visited people in their houses and workshops, or market places, or conducted interviews with more than one member in their households. In addition, triangulation of data collected was permanently done with the support of the coordination team from the Secretariat of Social Promotion of the M.R. This process facilitated me cross evidences from different sources of data stored in different data bases and from panel data taken in previous surveys. In this way, triangulation of information regarding, origin and timeline of external support provided to interviewees enriched my argument on inter-institutional coordination and accompaniments.

During the interview process, interviewees’ answers were cross checked in multiple ways, especially for these questions considered critical for this study; for example, regarding the question related to the type and origin of the external support received. I asked indirect questions in order to triangulate and get robust evidences, questions as: how were you able to start off with your livelihoods?; or, I asked for a description of their step by step process in the way they managed to restart with a new activity; and how they used their network and connections to face difficult situations, even when they were in need of food. The same multiple crosschecking was done for questions related to the sensitive aspects that caused shocks and stressors, such as: what are, in your opinion, the problems derived from violence, alcoholism, (or drug abuse) and overcrowding conditions?

Before each interview, I introduced myself as an independent person linked to no institution, NGO or governmental organization and explained the nature of this study. Some interviews were conducted at the CCB Nº16. However, it should be noted that the identity of interviewees remains confidential due to research ethic and for security reasons.
Finally, after analyzing the interviewees’ data related to their total earning during the last monthly period, it was possible to calculate their income status in relation to the poverty line, at the moment of the study. See further details in appendix 3. Such a calculation indicates theoretically, whether the individuals/households are located above, shaking up/down or below the poverty line. The calculation was possible by combining the data on income with information related to the value of the Total Basic Basket, and the consumption units by gender and age - available in appendix 4 and 5.

Regarding interviews with key informants, meetings were set by e-mail or phone, following the protocol of sharing the research proposal and commenting on the official permission from the government to carry out this study; while meetings with stakeholders took place in different offices, in different points of Rosario city. It is worth noticing that I have visited training centers and other important facilities such as market places and communal gardens where the Sub-Secretariat of Solidary Economy implements its programs to support the livelihood of the poor.

Finally, I would like to highlight that in order to enrich the quality of the data collected among different stakeholders implementing livelihood programs, I have requested available activity’s progress reports, action plans for 2014, evaluations, and any other relevant documentation available concerning livelihood activities implemented within the area. In appendix 6, the list of key informants is attached.

It is worth mentioning that this research was conducted as it was planned, however, two relevant details should be revealed here, the first is regarding the meeting place; the interviews with (CG, RS, SP, and VM) were conducted at the CCB, Nº16 due to security risk and also to reduce possible violent risk incidents against interviewees, especially women. This means that visual check of the living conditions and assets owned by interviewees was not possible. The second detail is regarding an interview request which was rejected by one of the stakeholders operating with livelihood programs within the area of study. I faced the difficulty to encounter the representative of the Coordination office, Rosario (CDR) depending directly on the National line Ministry of Social Assistance, since the coordinator denied my requests for an interview. The first request was done through the receptionist in his office, and the second request by e-mail, but it was never answered. Thus, I tried to triangulate and get information about their programs with other stakeholders, and key informants.
1.4. Research limitations
This research will neither analyze aspects of the livelihood activities related to the management of natural resources, environmental sustainability, and sustainability of livelihood for the next generation, nor draw recommendation about how to approach or tackle factors which affect livelihoods of the poor. Instead, this thesis, by considering evidences from livelihood trajectories, interviews with key informants, public policies, structures and community processes, will focus on the analysis of the aspects of programs -directed to improve the livelihoods of the poor- which can be reinforced.

1.5. Thesis outline
This thesis consists of eight parts, including appendixes and references.
In part 1, I have introduced the research topic, relevance for the humanitarian field and posed the research questions. Afterwards, I have continued with the description of the research process, methodology and data analysis methods and techniques adopted, ending with reflection on the limitation of the research. In part 2, first of all, I attempt to contextualize and frame the research with background information about the socioeconomic and political context of Argentina after neoliberal reforms introduced in the 1990, and some immediate causes of the last strong recessive period lived in Argentina (1999-2002) which left half of the population below the poverty line. Secondly, I follow with the description of the most important aspects of the context of Rosario city which shapes the livelihood of the poor, as I consider. In part 3, the theoretical perspective is described in two complementing parts. In the first part, I describe the concept of “livelihood” and how it is organized within a wide complex framework for analyzing livelihood activities where the focus is made mainly on five core elements, namely: the context, assets, policies institutions and processes, livelihood strategies and outcomes. In the second part, with an existing working definition of "chronic poor", "poverty dynamic" and "poverty line", I describe a methodology used to identify the target group and analyze the data of livelihood outcomes in relation to the poverty line. In this way, I also attempt to show existing theoretical and methodological tools to operationalize the livelihood approach in humanitarian and social assistance programs. In part 4, which is also divided into two parts, I answer the sub-questions of this thesis. To do this, first I link the theoretical perspective with interviewees’ livelihood trajectories which guides me towards the identification of both, the main stressors that have pushed them in situation of chronic poverty, and the supporting
factors that have helped them to express resilience and adaptation to improve their livelihood outcomes. Afterwards, through the use of graphs, I attempt to show the sequence of events highlighted in the livelihoods trajectories to unravel how the supporting factors operate by: providing, protecting, creating and improving livelihoods while interviewees express resilience. In the second part, I conclude with rival explanations about why some people who were chronic poor managed to move above the poverty line while others did not; additionally I search evidences that later are used as a basis for the analysis of the assistance provided in Rosario in terms of livelihood. **In part 5**, the livelihood approach focused on the household livelihood security is described, which is also used as the basis for examining and describing the humanitarian and social assistance programs implemented in Rosario by the government and other institutions. **In part 6**, I attempt to tie all the parts of this study by answering the main research questions followed by a formulation of recommendations to improve aspects of livelihood programming implemented under the umbrella of the Municipality of Rosario to have an enhanced impact on the livelihood of the poor. Finally, in **part 7 and 8**, appendixes and references are included.
2. Background of the context

2.1 The reforms of the 1990s and the recession period 1999-2002 that lead to the crisis of 2001 in Argentina

According to the Argentinean National Institute of Statistic and Census (INDEC), in 2003 the level of poverty and extreme poverty across Argentina increased to 54 % and 27.7% respectively of the population. The immediate cause of the recession in Argentina within the period (1999-2002) can be attributed to the implementation of structural reforms introduced in the 1990, involving reforms of the financial system through the convertibility plan which has been in force in Argentina since 1991 till 2002. During that period, the exchange rate of the Argentinean currency was tied to the U.S Dollar at one-one parity. Within that frame, Neo-liberal policies were introduced with the purpose of restructuring the economy, the society and the state. Such reforms placed the role of the “market” at the center rather than the role of the “state”, aiming innovation, efficiency of the state and better international integration. The most important reforms were: the liberalization of trade, privatizations of public companies providers of good and basic services, administrative reforms, reforms of labor market legislations and reforms of the social security system.

Nevertheless, one of the undesired outcomes of such policies was the speculation and increment of imported goods which undermined the national production, badly affecting the local industry that later made the national economic system collapsing. This was shown through the complete slowdown of national production and trade, by which in 1996 - the first period after the introduction of the reforms - the Argentinean unemployment rate and state deficit soared. Similarly, reforms on labor market regulation were introduced in 1994, 1997 and 2000 with the purpose of reducing unemployment, such reforms were ranked by International Labor Organization (ILO) as favorable for enterprises rather than for the employees. The reforms were focused on the reduction of payroll taxes, the introduction of the modality of fixed term contracts and

3 Available at: http://www.indec.mecon.ar/, accessed 5th February 2014
4 Available at: http://www.unicen.edu.ar/content/las-causas-de-la-crisis-de-2001, accessed 22th February 2014
5 The privatization process was fast and “did not take into consideration the preservation of strategic areas for national development such as the Communications and energetic sector” (García Delgado, 1997: 4)
6 Dissolution and fusion of decentralized administrative bodies (DGI, Aduanas, Ansal) which included removal of 15.000 public employees (García Delgado, 1997:4)
7 Privatization of pension fund and deregulation of social services and risk insurance work (Salvia et al, n.d:137)
wage flexibilities which implied job insecurity with the consequent reduction of the working time, elimination of compensation regime after losing job to mention some of the most criticized changes (Salvia et al, n.d:136).

The situation was even more difficult for Argentina in 1998 as a result of the impact of the international crisis that affected Southeast Asia, Russia and Brazil. The devaluation of the currency of Brazil and other economies coupled with the fall of international prices of commodities and the impossibility for Argentina to manage the exchange rate of its currency due to the convertibility plan made it difficult to place its exports (Salvia et al, n.d:128). Thus, Argentina continued with the process of taking external indebtedness, with reforms on labor market regulations, and with privatization and outsourcing of basic services. This made the Argentinean population look at the loss of its purchase power and unemployment as a central problem creating a growing social disappointment towards the political class and institutions, which reached its highest peak in December 2001 with the outbreak of the crisis when the new government announced “the corralito”, the freezing of the bank deposits in response to a massive withdrawal of money from banks. Thus, the economy stopped dramatically since the availability of cash for business and salaries payment was deficient. In that context, the unemployment and sub-occupation affected 30% of the population; 37% of salaried work force was not registered (“in black”) and had no access to social benefits (Salvia et al, n.d). At the same time, Argentina was recording its highest percentage of population living under the poverty line.

After the stabilization of the political crisis which left a turnover of four presidents between 19th December 2001 and 2nd January 2002, the adopted macroeconomic protectionist measures reversed the situations which helped the economy rebounding again. As a consequence of the recession period, between 1999-2002, the total GDP growth of Argentina fell -3.4% in 1999, -0.8% in 2000, -4.4% in 2001 and -10.9% in 2002 (Weisbrot et al., 2011). It is worth noticing that external financial support was denied to the country at that time due to the fact that Argentina had canceled the payment of its external debt, yet Argentina was able to manage, with its internal tools, to push the economy up (Saxton, 2003:12). By 2005, it bounced back to get a total GDP growth of 8.8% in 2003, 9% in 2004, 9.2% in 2005, 0.9% in 2009 and 9.2% in 2010; and trends are still sustained to these days (Weisbrot et al.,2011). After the crisis,
Argentina’s unemployment rate fell from its peak in 2002 of 21.5% to 7.2% in 2013, and at least up to 2013, poverty decreased throughout Argentina, reaching 4.7%.

Although the restructuring of Argentina post crisis 1999-2002 was successful, and made it possible to reverse the negative consequences of adjustment policies and market flexibility, by reducing level of poverty and unemployment rates, there are still no equal development possibilities for the whole society. According to the GINI index on inequality, in 2003 the index for Argentina’s main cities was 54.7. While in the last data available, it was found that in the year 2010, the figures indicated an index of 44.5. To mention evidences on inequalities, according to the World Bank, 19% of the employment in Argentina was considered insecure (World Bank, 2012).

2.2. Great Rosario and its context

Rosario city is located in the south region of Santa Fe province, 300 km northwest the capital city, Bueno Aires. Positioned in the heart of the industrial area of Argentina with an urban population of 1.3 million if considering its metropolitan area (satellites cities), Rosario is the third largest city in Argentina, and economically the second most important. Although it is highly independent in terms of its autonomy to administrate taxes, services and public assets, the city is one of the 50 municipalities under the umbrella of a federal government of the Santa Fe province.

Rosario and its region have consolidated a leadership in terms of economic development through primary production, industries, commerce and services. The local economy is developed by transnational enterprises, mainly centered in the vegetable oil cluster, petrochemical, and car industry. While the local firms are concentrated on the development of the beef industry, the agroindustry in general, services, agro-machinery, biotechnological and software industry (Castagna and Woelflin, n.d).

---


The connectivity has also prompted Rosario and its region as a drive force of the regional economy. The city has an important port upon the Paraná River bank, the Puerto de Rosario, located near a navigation step which connects internal basin with the basin of the Rio de la Plata, allowing the navigation of large oceanic ships, and giving Rosario city a key location within the waterway course Paraguay-Paraná. The Paraguay-Paraná water system connects Argentina, Paraguay and Brazil in an extension of 3,432 km. This fluvial artery of communication and transport allows important synergies and commercial activities within and across the sub regions of the basin through its different production centers and commercial areas facilitating the physical integration of South America, encouraging the production and the flow of raw materials and industrial goods. Additionally Rosario has an International Airport and is connected to the rest of Argentina through a vast number of routes, highways and railways.

2.2.1 Political organization and Governance

The political history of Rosario after the return of democracy in 1983 can be summarized by a period ruled by the Union Civic Radical Party (1983-1989) which after the National crisis of 1989 led to the resignation of its reelected government. In this way, the Socialist Party got its opportunity and won the elections, initiating an uninterrupted control of the administration of the city since then until these days. Therefore, for more than 24 years, Rosario has been under the rule of the same political project which has allowed a complete transformation of the structure, administration and management of the city.

Decentralization of the Municipal administration

By 1996, the government of Rosario started with a decentralization process of its administration, dividing the city into 6 districts, the Centre District, North District, Northwest District, West District, Southwest District and South District. The process was completed in 2009 with the inauguration of the Southwest District (M.R, n.d:2). According to M.R, the aim of the decentralization of the city administration was focused on 3 main aspects; 1) putting the administration of the city closer to its citizens; 2) creating the conditions for planning and management of policies and activities at

---

district level in order to adapt appropriate strategies for specific realities of each area of the city; 3) coordinating and articulating all the areas within the municipality, in one unique management system at district level including: transit regulation, magistrate curt, public works, district urban planning, public services, heath, housing, etc.\textsuperscript{14}

The figure Nº3 shows the map of Rosario city divided into six districts; the area highlighted in green is where the interviews took place.

![Map of Rosario city with its 6 Districts](image)

In the table Nº 1, the breakdown of demography of Rosario city by district is shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Population (PP)</th>
<th>% of PP by District</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings</th>
<th>Density: Nº people/Km(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center District</td>
<td>243650</td>
<td>25,69</td>
<td>142830</td>
<td>11793,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North District</td>
<td>137883</td>
<td>14,54</td>
<td>46624</td>
<td>3953,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast District</td>
<td>170765</td>
<td>18,01</td>
<td>49950</td>
<td>3896,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West District</td>
<td>135481</td>
<td>14,29</td>
<td>36532</td>
<td>3351,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast District</td>
<td>114276</td>
<td>12,05</td>
<td>32584</td>
<td>5676,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South District</td>
<td>146257</td>
<td>14,42</td>
<td>48606</td>
<td>7787,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Nº1: breakdown demographic figures of Rosario city by district

\textsuperscript{14} Idib.:3
2.2.2 Poverty, unemployment and job insecurity in the Great Rosario

In table Nº2, it is shown the fluctuation of the percentage of individuals and households moving below the poverty line in the Great Rosario from 2001 till 2013\textsuperscript{15}

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Household</td>
<td>31,8</td>
<td>49,4</td>
<td>42,4</td>
<td>27,5</td>
<td>21,4</td>
<td>16,6</td>
<td>9,7</td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below poverty line</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>% of People below</td>
<td>41,2</td>
<td>60,9</td>
<td>54,6</td>
<td>36,5</td>
<td>28,5</td>
<td>22,9</td>
<td>13,6</td>
<td>13,7</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>11,5</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>5,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poverty line</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>

Table Nº2: people below the poverty line in the great Rosario

According to the data available from the Government of the Santa Fe (GSF) province (2014), during the third quarter of 2013, the figures of Rosario indicate that 7,7\% of the population was unemployed. However, beside such a percentage it should be noted that 6,5 \% of the population who is considered “occupied” is in reality sub-employed. This group is constituted of those individuals who work less than 35 hours a week; among whom 4,2 \% is demanding employment, (GSF, 2014)\textsuperscript{16}.

The breakdown of the figures related to the unemployed population shows that 48\% are youth, ranging between 20 and 29 years (Ibid)\textsuperscript{17}. Regarding the incidence of job insecurity, in the third quarter of 2013, the informal employment in the Great Rosario reached 34,4 \%. This means that these employees have no access to retirement and provisional services (GBS, 2013)\textsuperscript{18}.

2.2.3 Urban violence in Rosario

The level of violence in Rosario is worrisome and growing. The evidences can be drawn if we look at the cases of assassinations taking place in the Great Rosario and compare it along the past 10 years; in 2004, 89 homicides were recorded, 108 cases in 2005, 90 cases in 2006, 113 cases in 2007, 121 cases in 2008 and 130 cases in 2009 (Eventon,2013:2). While 119 cases were recorded in 2010, the figures in 2011 reached 170 cases, continuing its growing trend of 188 cases in 2012 and 264 in 2013. Regarding the characteristics of the homicides, the analysis of all the cases registered in

\textsuperscript{15}Available at: [http://www.indec.mecon.ar/](http://www.indec.mecon.ar/), accessed 16\textsuperscript{th} April 2014
\textsuperscript{16}Available at: [http://gobierno.santafe.gov.ar/prensa/noticias_prensa/2014/150114s13_IPEC.pdf](http://gobierno.santafe.gov.ar/prensa/noticias_prensa/2014/150114s13_IPEC.pdf), accessed 5\textsuperscript{th} April 2014
\textsuperscript{17}Ibid:22
\textsuperscript{18}Available at: [https://www.santafe.gov.ar/index.php/web/content/download/187709/910900/file/Boletin%20de%20Coyuntura%20enero%202014.pdf](https://www.santafe.gov.ar/index.php/web/content/download/187709/910900/file/Boletin%20de%20Coyuntura%20enero%202014.pdf), accessed 05\textsuperscript{th} April 2014
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November 2013 showed that, 80% of the cases were committed with guns, also 80% of the cases responded to family and interpersonal related issues, and only 50% of the cases were clarified\textsuperscript{19}.

On the other hand, from 2010 ahead, the number of assassinations recorded was more related to Narco-traffic and the fight among the cartels over the control of the commerce of drugs in Rosario. The 80% of people murdered in 2013 had police records and were assassinated near the “bunkers” or drugs kiosks\textsuperscript{20}.

It is also argued that in Rosario four or five drugs cartels operate and fight over the territory to control the distribution and commerce of illicit drugs such as cocaine, marihuana and pills. The sale of drugs is done through kiosk, named bunkers. It is estimated that the number of bunkers operating in Rosario ranges between 400 and 600, in which youth, younger than 17 years old are recruited as “soldadito”, little soldier functioning as drugs sellers, and soldiers, operating as armed gangs which are deployed outside the bunkers with the function of protecting and controlling the territory against rival gangs; researchers on this topic such as Eventon suggest that the number of young people involved in this illicit livelihood is thousands (Eventon, 2013:2). It should be noted that such activities attract young people, who are stigmatized/ marginalized from the labor market and education system (Ibid).

As mentioned above, Argentina has successfully reduced poverty and unemployment rates; however inequalities remain a challenge, very much expressed in terms of social exclusion, unemployment rates and vulnerabilities among the dwellers living in slums, this fact puts these areas in strategic position for these illicit activities where criminals bands operate and promote drugs consumption and recruit youth to roll down their business; as a result more exclusion and stigmatization arise.

\subsection*{2.2.4 Irregular settlements in Rosario}

Although efforts are being made in Rosario to provide the irregular settlements with full coverage of basic services such as water, sanitation, electricity and garbage recollection; there is still no proper sanitation and access to safe sources of electricity in some of them. According to data available, in Rosario it was counted more than ninety irregular

\textsuperscript{19} Available at: http://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/suplementos/rosario/9-41973-2013-12-22.html, accessed 04\textsuperscript{th} April 2014

\textsuperscript{20} Available at: http://www.lanacion.com.ar/1620250-una-guerra-entre-bandas-siembra-violencia-y-muerte-en-rosario, accessed 04\textsuperscript{th} April 2014
settlements\textsuperscript{21} with round 30,000 dwellings, wherein around 150,000 people live. That sum is almost 10\% of the Rosario’s population (Castagna, Raposo and Woelflin, 2010:2)\textsuperscript{22}. The irregular settlements are areas where illegal occupations and fragmentation of land and informal construction take place. In addition and as mentioned before, these areas have serious deficient or even lack of access to basic services.

Besides being a driver engine of the regional economy, Rosario provides good quality of public health services to its population; this attracts migrants from other provinces of Argentina and even from neighboring countries who move there in search of better life opportunities. Thus, migration creates a huge challenge for Rosario since there are huge numbers of migrants that arrive with the idiosyncrasy of occupying land where they settle down, without having access to the basic services (Castagna, Raposo and Woelflin, 2010)\textsuperscript{23}.

\textbf{2.2.5 North District Neighborhoods and institutions}

According to the Municipality of Rosario (2014), the North District management action plan for the year 2014 indicates that within the North District of Rosario, there are 31 neighborhoods grouped into 6 areas. The area N\textdegree 5 which is the area where this study took place, (zone colored green on the map in Figure N\textdegree 3), includes seven neighborhoods. The neighborhoods “La Esperanza, “Parque Casas”, Union and Parque Casas, and Puente Negro are characterized by a high level of poverty amongst its population. According to a former Coordinator of the CCB N\textdegree 16, at least in the neighborhoods La Esperanza and Parque Casa, in 2003, 86\% of their population lived in informal settlements and 26\% in overcrowding conditions. Most households (41 \%) come from Northern Santa Fe, the north of the country, especially from the provinces of Chaco and Corrientes; and even from Bolivia and Paraguay (Abaroa, 2003:13)\textsuperscript{24}.

Within the Area N\textdegree 5, the government is present, mainly through municipal and provincial health centers, a municipal vocational training center and the CCB N\textdegree 16 which is one of the 33 government offices placed at the heart of the poor areas in Rosario. The CCB N\textdegree 16 was inaugurated in 1998 as “Crecer Program” aiming inclusion, citizen participation and implementation of social policies. In the table N\textdegree 3

\textsuperscript{21} available at: \url{http://www.filoe.uba.ar/contenidos/investigacion/institutos/geo/geocritica2010/212.htm} , accessed 04\textsuperscript{th} April 2014
\textsuperscript{22}Ibid
\textsuperscript{23}Ibid
\textsuperscript{24}newsletter (Vivir el Barrio, n.d)
below, the number of organizations from the civil society and the government working in social issues within the Area Nº 5 and within the North District of Rosario as a whole is described. These organizations were mapped out by, (MR, 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Governmental Institutions and CBOs</th>
<th>* Nº within Area Nº 5</th>
<th>* Nº within the North District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools (secondary, primary, special capabilities, kinder)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal /Provincial health center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coexistence Neighborhood Center (CCB)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Vocational Training Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers/ kitchens and milk cup kitchens</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural centers, Bibliotheca</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood associations/ Cooperatives</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport:clubs, sport complexes/Associations and Foundations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Area number five is highlighted in green within the figure Nº 3

The number of the CBOs registered in Rosario indicates an important network for social organization; as it will be described later, the social network is a very important instrument by which democratic values, participation and inclusion can be strengthened; moreover, it is used by the poor people as an important way to mobilize and access resources (Almasi, 2009:32). For example, during the life span of this project, the North District management action plan 2014 was submitted in a neighborhood assembly conducted at the CMD North. During the assembly, 162 different projects related to urban planning, infrastructure, housing, health, etc. were presented. Some of the projects were identified by the neighbors, through participatory budgeting assemblies.25

After this brief description of the context which shapes the livelihood of the poor living in the urban context of Rosario, I will describe in the next part the theoretical perspective which together with the context background analysis will be used to examine and interpret livelihood activities of the poor and its outcomes,

25 Neighborhood assembly attended at the CMD North, coordinated by the Major of Rosario in collaboration with different line ministries of Santa Fe and neighbors associations, 6 th March 2014.
3. Theoretical framework

In this part, I will elaborate on the theoretical perspective which includes concepts, models, and definitions mutually complemented and used to guide this research. The concept of Livelihood, the description of the Sustainable Livelihood Framework and how its outcomes can be analyzed will be described, particularly stressing on income, resilience and adaptation. In addition, the definitions of Chronic Poor, Poverty Dynamic and Poverty Line, will be used as complementary definitions to the livelihood framework that will help me to identify the poorest and interpret their livelihood outcomes in relation to the Poverty Line according to the Argentinean government.

3.1. The concept of livelihood

The concept of “sustainable livelihood” is the core element for this study. Its origin, as a concept, is from the work of Chambers and Conway who defined “livelihood” in 1992. However, in this research I have considered the definition of “livelihood” adopted by the UK's Department for International Development (DFID) which has taken the original idea but modified it as follow: “a livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both, material and social resources) and activities required for a mean of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, while not undermining the natural resource base “(DFID, 1999:1). The reason why I have chosen this definition is because the focus of the analysis is the “household livelihood security” applied to urban context. Therefore in this research, not only the concept of livelihood implemented by DFID is adopted, but also the Sustainable Livelihood Framework.

3.2. The (DFID) Sustainable Livelihood Framework (SLF)

The SLF is “an analytical structure that provides a holistic perspective for understanding the factors that constrain or enhance livelihood opportunities, and shows how they relate to each other” (Krantz, 2001:3). Moreover, it can be taken as a technical tool to design programs or project aiming poverty reduction. In this part, I will describe the individual component of the SLF which is shown in figure 2.

The DFID SLF\textsuperscript{26} takes people as the center of the analysis, considering the particular vulnerability of the context in which they live, where key “capitals” are deployed (combination of assets and access to services and policy institutions) in order to implement livelihood strategies with measurable outcomes. The outcomes can be

\textsuperscript{26} This framework since 2000 is being widely used by many development agencies. (Solesbury, 2003:5-6).
grouped and measured by using key indicators such as “income, well-being, reduction of vulnerability, livelihood adaptation, resilience and natural resources sustainability” (Scoones, 1998:6). The SLF highlights five key elements: context, resources, institutions, strategies and outcomes (Solesbury, 2003).

The arrows within the framework indicate dynamic relationships among “factors” in terms of influences (DFID, 1999).

As I mentioned before, this framework is used as a lens through which the livelihoods of the poor will be examined. Below, I attempt to provide a comprehensive examination and description of the variables and sub-variables of this framework which will allow me to link the theory with the findings. Some variables like "livelihood Assets" and “livelihood outcomes” are further developed, since they are quite complex, consisting of sub-variables mutually interacting within the process of the livelihood activities.

3.2.1. **Vulnerability context:** it frames the external environment wherein people exist. People’s assets and their availability are affected by critical trends, shocks and seasonality (DFID, 1999). It is well known that shocks can destroy assets directly, as example we can mention an economic shock, a natural shock, a conflict, a human health shock, etc; while trends, although more predictable, they have an influence on the economic returns rates of the livelihood strategies chosen. For instance, National or International economic trends, governance; and Seasonality which affect employment opportunities and food availability, for example food production, seasonal job opportunities, etc. (DFID, 1999:4).
3.2.2. **Livelihood Assets:** as it is shown in the figure Nº2, the SLF recognizes five core categories of assets or types of capitals upon which livelihoods are built. DFID believe that a single category of asset on its own is not sufficient to achieve the varied livelihood outcomes that people seek; additionally they argue that, “this fact is particularly true for poor people whose access to any given category of assets tends to be very limited. Therefore, poor people have to seek ways of increasing/improving and combining what assets they have in innovative ways to ensure survival” (DFID, 1999:5). Within the livelihood assets, the “Asset Pentagon” is placed as a core. It represents a reductionist description of people’s “assets” which in turn are composed of Human Capital, Natural Capital, Financial Capital, Physical Capital, and Social Capital (DFID, 1999). The logic of the pentagon is that its center indicates zero access to assets, thus the shape of the outer perimeter can indicate the variation of people’s access to assets over time, this is particularly useful for livelihood analysis in order to assess what are the key “capitals” for specific activities, context, group of people, culture, etc. upon which well-being underlies (DFID, 1999:5). Therefore, the relationship among the asset pentagon with the other components within the framework constitutes the major “challenge of, and main step in, the process of livelihood analysis leading to action to eliminate poverty” (DFID, 1999:6).

**Relationship of the asset pentagon with other framework components**

The relationship between the “Assets” and the “Vulnerability Context” is mutually related in the way it was mentioned above, assets can be created by investment, innovation, resilience and adaptation; or destroyed as consequences of shocks, trends and seasonality; while the relationship between “Assets” and “Transforming Structures and Process” is mutually related by the fact that institutions and policies have profound influences on people’s access to assets, one example of it could be a governmental agency that facilitates access to credit for the most vulnerable. Another example could be legislations that help people access market places, by reducing taxes or providing access to infrastructure and facilities to implement economic activities (DFID, 1999:6).

It is also important to pay attention to the relationship between “Assets” and “livelihood strategies”, since this relationship determines the livelihood option/s or the combination of options for an individual/household to secure a way of living. For example, a person who has the skill to work with leather, owing a building and equipment could apply a
livelihood strategy oriented to the market by making assorted articles or making and repairing clothes, shoes, etc. Finally, regarding the relationship between “Assets” and “Livelihood Outcomes”, it is pointed out that without asset, by definition, livelihood activities do not exist. Thus, it is proved that people need access to assets to escape from poverty (DFID, 1999:6).

Asset pentagon in details: a brief description is posed in figure Nº4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Nº.4 assets pentagon in details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human capital</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Capital</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural capital</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical capital</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial capital</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship among assets: it is important to note that to achieve desired livelihood outcomes; the combination of the above mentioned “capitals” is inevitable. Thus, the question that could be posed for a specific context and time is; which are the critical asset that can contribute to aid people escaping from poverty?. By understanding this, we can identify paths in poverty reduction (DFID, 1999:6).

3.2.3. Transforming Structures and Processes: this variable is related to the social norms, institutions, organizations, policies and legislation that operate in society working as a normative framework that set the parameters that shape livelihoods strategies of individual/household and communities (Farrington, Ramasut and, Walker, 2002:30).
Policies institutions and processes are present at the private and public spheres; operating in all levels of a social system from micro level (household); meso-level (community), macro level (regional and national level) to international domain (DFID, 1999:17).

The structures, within the SLF, mean “organizations”, both private and public, that set and implement social norms, policies and legislations which influence livelihoods. Structures combined with “processes” determine the way in which structures and individuals operate and interact. Some of the most important transforming processes for livelihoods are: in terms of power relation (gender, age, class); culture (social norms and beliefs); institutions (market, institutions that regulate access to assets); legislation (domestic law, and international agreements); and policies (macro, Sectorial, regulatory, etc. (DFID,1999:19).

In this study, this variable seeks to identify the policies, institutions and processes that help to transform livelihood of the poor and make it more secure (Farrington, Ramasut and, Walker, 2002:30).

3.2.4. **Livelihood Strategies**: are the livelihood option/s or combinations of options that people make/chose to secure their living. In urban contexts, livelihood strategies are mostly oriented to the market throughout trading of goods and service activities, formal or informal wage employment, etc. (DFID,1999:23).

3.2.5. **Livelihood outcomes**: are referred to the “achievements” of the livelihood strategies adopted by people to make their living, as it was mentioned early, they can be assessed through “measurable indicators”. Livelihood outcomes represent a way to understand people’s priorities (DFID, 1999:25). Among the variables that can be used to measure livelihood outcomes, I will focus on Income, Resilience, Adaptation and Vulnerability Reduction.

**Income**
Livelihood incomes could be in kind or based on monetary dimension. However, as mentioned in several opportunities, to visualize how an individual/household is self-sufficient in making its own way of living, data will be desegregated to differentiate income from external support. In this way, how and to what extent a livelihood activity/ies are able to generate self-sufficiency will be shown.
Resilience and adaptation

The concept of “Resilience” is very much contested and used in many disciplines such as: psychology, physiatrists and ecology. From the perspective of disasters; resilience can be seen as the capacity of a community or a system to absorb negative impact and bounce back. (Cardona 2003, cited in Manyena, 2006:437). However, from the livelihood and social system perspective, it is important to consider a definition of resilience that applies to people and structures beyond disasters since communities are a complex combination of sub-systems, functioning simultaneously and mutually dependent. Therefore, in this way resilience to shocks and adversity within livelihood activities could be seen in two dimensions; on one hand, the personal social-psychological resilience, which is the personal mechanisms that any human being puts in place, consciously or unconsciously to overcome shock and adversity; and on the other hand “livelihood resilience” which is the ability of livelihood systems to resist a shock without sustained livelihood damage (Shepherd, 2007:19).

Therefore, the definition of resilience that could best match with the purpose of this study perceives “Resilience” as the capacity of a community or society exposed to hazards to adapt, by resisting or changing in order to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning and structure. This is determined by the degree by which a social system has the capacity of understanding its context; identifying hazards and organizing by itself to be protected or adapted for the future (UNISDR, 2005, cited in Manyena B., 2006:437). This description is particularly useful since it does not only encompass “capabilities” to bounce back (reactive), but also it involves aspects of preparedness and adaptation.

The analysis of the vulnerability context, shocks and trends affecting a given community, family or individual system, can be treated as resilience applied on people and structures, allowing it to examine multidimensional aspects of vulnerability given by: physics vulnerability, when a community is exposed to natural threats or reduced access to livelihood inputs; state fragility that may affect its communities creating high incidence of poverty, problems in access to basic services, health and housing, etc.; and social vulnerability such as high level of violence, gender based violence (GBV), criminality, alcoholism, etc. with this view, it could be seen that the vulnerabilities could exist within any community’s components systems (Maguire and Cartwright, 2008:2).
This thoughtful analysis facilitates to see the changes needed, to make plans for anticipating such changes in order to increase community resilience or adaptation (Maguire and Cartwright, n.d, cited in Heinberg and Lerch, 2010:5).

Therefore, the concept of resilience can be used to confront vulnerability focusing on “disruptive challenges”, whether on people or structures within the domain of natural disasters, and reinforce resilience capacities towards potential events such as, market disturbance, financial crisis, criminality, disruption of basic supply chain; it is very important to expand this vision to people’s vulnerability to any kind of life events that can bring the likelihood of experiencing poverty such as age, ill-health, getting old without social prevision, etc.; Concerning the last two points, some researchers suggest that poverty in developing countries is more likely to happen at the beginning or at the end of the life course (Shepherd, 2007:7).

Through the analysis of livelihood, I will focus on showing key factors that indicate initiation of upward mobility and how people are able to move forward with or without external support.

So far, I have elaborated on: the basic concepts, definitions and a framework that enable examine the livelihood trajectories, to analyze the supporting and limiting factors affecting livelihood activities of “people”. However, in order to identify who the poor are, and how to interpret their poverty status and mobility, I will link these concepts and model described above with the definition of “chronic poverty”, “poverty dynamic” and “poverty line”.

3.3. Linking chronic poverty with livelihood approach

One of the major challenges to make humanitarian assistance and poverty reduction more effective is to identify the poorest. According to the Chronic Poverty Research Center (CPRC), “Chronic poverty is absolute poverty that is experienced for an extended period of time –many years, or even over the life course. A person living in absolute poverty is not able to satisfy his or her minimum requirements for food, clothing or shelter” (CPRC, 2004:131).

Although the concept of poverty is contested, authors like Hulme and Shepherd suggest that “all the debates that surround it apply to chronic poverty” (Hulme and Shepherd, 2003:406). Broadly, they argue that, it is widely accepted that poverty is deprivation of a range of capabilities related to income, education, health and civil rights. Capability
“represents the various combination of functioning (being and doing) that a person can achieve” (Sen, 1995:41).

In terms of duration, it is possible to identify three interrelated forms of chronic poverty namely: long term poverty, life-course poverty and intergenerational poverty. In terms of long term poverty, it is difficult to establish a minimum number of years where poverty is considered chronic (Shepherd, 2007:4). This fact is particularly important for this study for identifying the target group. Therefore, I would like to mention a “working definition” elaborated by Hulme and Shepherd for those living in chronic poverty, which is “viewed as occurring when an individual experiences significant capability deprivations for a period of five years or more” (D. Hulme and Shepherd 2003:404-405). In their definition, these authors emphasize some core aspects and argumentations, specifically: “length of time”, “capability deprivation” and “focus of analysis” which are important to be noted and described in details since they, are used as variables in this research.

Length of Time: according to Hulme and Sheph, the reasoning for supporting this arbitrary decision of five years in their definition is based on three points. Yet, two of these points, I consider important to be mentioned; the first, a period of five years is a significant period of time for a person’s life, for any culture; and the second, empirical materials indicate that people staying poor during five years or more have high probability of remaining poor for the rest of their life (Corcoran 1995 and Yaqub 2000 cited in Hulme and Shepherd, 2003:405).

In terms of capability deprivations, Hulme and Shepherd have mentioned that it is possible to identify many variables for poverty assessment when looking at chronic poverty, where the measuring of income and consumption is included, but these are not enough indicators that represent the total spectrum of capability deprivations that may involve chronic poverty and its persistence over time; as cited in their article, poverty covers multidimensional aspects, and “understanding the nature and degree [of this domain is] an important task” (Hulme and Shepherd, 2003:405). They have suggested examples of indicators that are worth to be mentioned: tangible assets variation, nutritional status, education, etc. Although this study will strongly make reference on the income as an indicator of poverty line, it will also inform about specific sets of capability deprivations linked to livelihood activities.

Finally, the focus of analysis on “individuals” or “households” is an important aspect to be defined when livelihoods of the poor are studied. Although the intra household
dynamics have an influence on livelihoods of individuals, which are somehow considered, the focus of this study is on livelihood experiences of individuals located in a specific area of the community of Rosario, where the poorest settle down.

The points portrayed within the working definition of chronic poverty are especially linked to the theoretical perspective of the livelihood approach developed above, thus very much applicable within the humanitarian assistance implementation since one of the weak points of the Sustainable Livelihood Framework is its inability to deal with the identification of the poor (Krantz, 2001:3).

3.4. Change of poverty status over time: Visualizing poverty dynamics

Analysis of trajectories related to mobility “in” and “out” of poverty of the chronic poor is important to be noted, they can experience downward and upward mobility, yet not enough to sustainably escape from poverty (Shepherd, 2007:5). From the perspective of the individuals, making this type of analysis provides evidences that could be considered for better understanding of the reasons behind such dynamics, whether they are caused by exogenous or endogenous variables (Osmani, 2006, cited in Shepherd, 2007:6).

Before focusing on poverty dynamic of the poorest, it is important to know that there are different types of “poverty dynamics,” each related to different categories aggregated into three groups: the first group, the chronic poor which in turn are subdivided into two sub-categories, the always poor and the usually poor; the second group, transient poor which in turn are subdivided into two sub-categories, the “churning” poor and the occasionally poor; and finally, the third group, the non-poor, constituted by those never poor (Hulme and Shepherd, 2003:405).

The above categories of “poverty dynamics” will be used in this study as a continuum, to describe “poverty transition” of the interviewees’ livelihood’s trajectories. Thus, considering the fig. 3 below, an individual can be seen as moving above the poverty line, if s/he moves from being usually poor upward to become occasionally poor. Inversely, an individual can be seen as descending below the poverty line if s/he moves from being never poor to become always poor, or occasionally poor depending on individual’s internal/external circumstances.
As it has been mentioned “[d]epending on data availability, poverty could be assessed in terms of household’s expenditure, income, consumption, a nutritional measure, a poverty index, a poverty scale or an assessment of assets capital” (Hulme and Shepherd, 2003:406). Income as an indicator is widely used to determine the poverty line, thus, as follow, a brief description is presented since this study relays on the Argentinean poverty line as one of the referential axis to track outcome of livelihood strategies over time applied by the poor, by considering their “total income.”

It is worth noticing that income in livelihood trajectory will be desegregated into two different “lines”, income from external support and income from own livelihoods activities; the last will show strictly the ability of a person/household to live above poverty line on its own, without external support. By doing this differentiation, the support mechanism to improve self-sufficiency can be better understood.

### 3.5. Poverty line

In Argentina, the calculation of households and people living under the “Poverty Line” (PL) is based on data from the Permanent Household Survey (EPH). This survey investigates households’ income and their ability to have, through purchase of goods and services, access to a set of food and non-food items including services which are considered essential\(^{28}\). To make the calculation of the “Poverty Line” as an indicator, the procedure starts with the calculation of a Basic Food Basket (BFB) which, in turn, is enlarged to include Non-Food Items and services such as: clothing, health and transportation, etc.. In this way, the cost of the Total Basic Basket (TBB)\(^{29}\) is obtained.

---

\(^{28}\) Available at: [http://www.indec.mecon.ar/](http://www.indec.mecon.ar/), accessed 15\(^{th}\) February 2014

\(^{29}\) Ibid
Thus, poverty incidence ponders the number of households whose monthly income is not enough for covering the cost of the Total Basic Basket. It should be noted that in Argentina, households or individuals whose minimum monthly income is below the cost of the BFB are considered to be living under the “Indigence line” while those whose monthly income is below the cost of the TBB are considered to be living under the “Poverty line”.

The INDEC in Argentina calculates the cost of the BFB and the TBB on the basis of the monthly consumption unit which is calculated using an adult man as a reference. Thus, with this value the “Adult’s Equivalence Table” is defined by calculating the consumption units according to the age and gender which are weighed in relation to the already defined adult consumption unit. Once the table is defined, the calculation of the “indigent line” and “Poverty Line” for a household can be estimated according to the household’s size, which is the number of people eating from the same pot (INDEC, 2014)\(^{30}\). It is worth noticing that this table and the official figures related to the cost of the BFB and TBB values are posed in the appendixes 4 and 5 attached to this document\(^{31}\). These tables are used with the purpose of calculating the current situation of each visited individual in relation to the poverty line, while the retrospective data facilitated by them, is qualitative data used with the purpose of visualizing poverty dynamics. It is worth noticing that the TBB is based in relation to data availability.

At the moment of this study, estimations are made with data collected in the Great Buenos Aires (Great Buenos Aires considers the capital city and its satellite cities around).

Now considering the background information of the context described in part two with these concepts, tools and methodologies described in this part, I will proceed now with the analysis of the livelihood experiences of the chronic poor living in Rosario city in order to start to answer the research questions.

\(^{30}\) Ibid

\(^{31}\) According to the INDEC this definition uses theoretical values as a reference, for statistical ends, they are not normative, thus the definition of BFB should not be misunderstood with Living cost, Available at: http://www.indec.mecon.ar/, accessed 15th February 2014
4 Research finding: examining the livelihood of the poor

In this part, the research finding will be presented. First of all, I will describe the reasons why the interviewed individuals/households have fallen into poverty. Afterwards, I will describe the supporting factors that affect their livelihoods with the purpose of elaborating how they have expressed resilience and adaptation while trying to overcome their constraints and achieve livelihoods goals; and what the results are. Finally, I will focus 1) on analyzing the circumstances in which resilience and adaptation go beyond interviewees’ capacity, and 2) on the gaps or deficiencies of the livelihood programs which later are used as the basis to examine what can be improved.

4.1. Reasons why people have fallen into poverty

The table Nº 5 shows the reasons pointed out by people as the causes of falling into poverty which in turn are sorted out according to its level of occurrence; the commonalities among interviewees can be visualized with the acronyms cited in the columns. In order to make the analysis easier, I have divided them into four groups as follow: reasons related to access to assets; social problems; health problems; and policies and process that affect people in their context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limiting factors, Shocks/stressors</th>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Interviewees affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of assets</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>VA RS Mm VM CG CB SP MM MR RG JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV/ Domestic violence</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>RS VM CG SP MM MR RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food prices combined with low incomes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>VM CG CB SP MM MR RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans generational poverty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RS VM CG SP MM MR RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Drugs usage/consumption</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>VM CG CB SP MM MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence and *Narco-criminality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>VM CG CB SP MM MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High dependence rate/family planning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RS VM CB SP MM MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Problems/ high level of expenses on health issues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mm CB MM MR JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>RS VM CB SP MM RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable income / Job Insecurity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mm CB MR RG JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recession of activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mm CB MR RG RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of social prevision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>VA Mm RG JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of regular job</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VA Mm RG JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal displacement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VM CG MM MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VM CG SP MM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Nº5: Reasons why people have fallen in poverty situation

* Criminality linked to distribution and commercialization of illegal drugs
Lack of assets: this is one of the major reasons why people have fallen into the situation of chronic poverty or even inherited poverty from previous generation. Lack of assets limits individuals/households capabilities to define or access job opportunities, pushing them to insecure and unstable sources of income. It has been found that the main assets whose limitation has affected the livelihood strategies of interviewees are physical, human and financial; defined mainly as housing, education level and skills, followed by lack of financial support.

In term of housing, it has been observed that 5 out of 12 interviewees (41%) are living in occupied land and do not have decent houses. It is worth noticing that 9 out of 12 of interviewed individuals/households (75%) pay neither housing taxes, nor services of electricity and water. In terms of skills and education, it has been found that 9 out of 12 interviewees (75%) have no higher education than the primary one; three of them haven’t even finished their primary school and one is illiterate. Interviewees have argued that, because of the lack of education and skills, they just have the chance to work temporarily, as hawkers, occasional workers or as house cleaners. Just 3 out of 12 interviewees (25%) have had the experience of being employed within the formal market as unskilled workers. The major reason for lacking financial capacity is mostly assumed to high dependency ratio, alcoholism, and unstable source of income and lack of credit.

Social problems: within this group of reasons, it has been found that 7 out of 12 cases (58%) of individuals/households have been pushed to the situation of chronic poverty because of social problems related to, interpersonal violence, “Narco criminality”, drug addictions, alcoholism and gender based violence (GBV) which have affected them in their capabilities to access assets or possibilities to implement activities that can aid them to make a living on their own.

Regarding “Narco criminality”, it can be said that this is a growing social problem in the contemporary Rosario, it has been explained to me that the term ‘‘Narco-criminality’’ is used to describe criminality, mainly as a consequence of the rivalry amongst gangs groups or other groups linked to illicit activities related to drugs distribution and commercialization32. Thus, Narco-criminality causes interpersonal violence with diverse negative consequences on the livelihood of the poor, pushing

---

32 Interview with Guillermo Lasala, from the Directorate of Public Policy and Youth on 7 April 2014 and Interview with Josefina Bienachi, Coordinator of planning of social assistance for the, Secretariat of Social Promotion, Municipality of Rosario on 15th April 2014
them deeply into poverty. Moreover, It has been found that 6 out of 12 (50 %) of interviewed individuals/households have been facing the negative consequences of this problem such as displacement, loss of assets, violence and homicides.

One woman shared how she had to flee violence leaving all her assets behind. Her house was burnt by someone, due to the fact that her 14 years old son, who consumed drugs, had been involved in some problems with a person linked to drugs and criminality. This is what she shared “At the end of 2013, one night two masked men broke in my house; they put me inside the closet and locked it while they were looking for something. I couldn’t understand anything, and after their departure, I managed to get out of the closet and flee with my children; my oldest son refused to come with me. The next day I was told that my house was completely burnt out. The police came and asked me to follow them to the police station; where I was told that someone was murdered in my house, a corpse was found with signals of torture. When I heard that, I was about to fall down, I thought it was my boy, I thought they were about to give me my son in a black plastic bag, instead it was a little boy, who was living alone behind my house; he was also in drug problems. I couldn’t believe how much difficult it became to live in my neighborhood, I got depressed. After that episode, I couldn’t find a place to live. At the beginning, during the first few weeks, I was living with my two little children in a public square. I didn’t want to go to my father’s house, because he is alcoholic and used to beat me and my siblings while we were living with him, and couldn’t go to my sister´s house, because her husband whom I denounced once for beating my sister so badly was against my stay. Finally, someone helped me and found me a place to live with my children, but I had to pay a lot for the rent and housing taxes. Although I had lost all the equipment that I used to make bakery at home, I managed to keep the other regular job that I have, yet the money I earn is not enough. You know, my house was built in an occupied land, but at the end the house was mine, I was about to sell it out, and move away from that neighborhood before all this happened. I was very poor when I was young, but when I grew up I did too much efforts to get my self-sufficiency and support my children. Today after losing everything with this painful experience that I had to go through; I need desperately help to overcome and try to assist my son.”

33 CG Interviewed on 13th march 2014
Regarding GBV, it has been found that this problem disturbs the capabilities of affected individuals to conduct livelihood activities on their own. One woman shared that she suffered from violence since her childhood; her father was alcoholic, violent, and cockfighting gambler. She had fled from her father’s house because her stepmother had mistreated her. Later, when she got married, she was permanently mistreated by her husband. He used to beat and mistreat her to the level that she suffered many psychological problems and difficulties such as depression and low self-esteem. In 1998, things became even worse after her husband’s abandonment; he left her alone with her 6 children. At the same period, her nine years old daughter was raped. Then, she added that she was overwhelmed and totally collapsed. After more than 4 years, thanks to the psychological support and empowerment received in the CCB Nº16 (Institution of the municipal state anchored in the slums designed to provide social assistance), she was able to recover.  

Another case related to social problems could be the one of drug addictions; I have found that this stressor affects the capabilities of people to make a living. It is a recurrent stressor that drives people into poverty. One woman, a mother of 4 children shared that she was addicted to drugs for more than 10 years; this problem dragged her deeper into poverty owing to its negative consequences, such as family dissolution, selling of assets and incapability to look after her children. This is what she shared “I had been addicted to drugs since 2000 until few months ago; I was encouraged by my ex-husband to take this way. At the beginning of 2014, I had to move away from the neighborhood because I couldn’t stand the situation any more, I was still living at the backyard of my ex-husband’s mother’s house after my divorce in 2010; When finally I could find another place to live, I moved out, now I just think about my children, they give me the strength to move forward, it is very hard to live in this way. My oldest boy is living with my friend’s family who is looking after him. The other 3 children are with me, and I have to admit that it is very difficult to do everything on my own. My ex-husband does not help me in anything; on the contrary he treats our children violently. I don’t have a stable job; I work from time to time, to get some money.”  

Health problems: 6 out of 12 (50%) individuals/households mentioned have Health problems as a direct cause of falling into poverty, mainly, because the problem has

34 MM Interviewed on 26th February 2014
35 SP Interviewed on 20th March 2014
affected the main income earner of the household. Thus, livelihood activities have been interrupted or even lost. In addition to the problem of losing the source of income, people have faced overwhelming recovery costs; moreover, in 3 cases the outcome of an accident has generated work disability.36 One of interviewees shared that she and her family fell into poverty because of an accident that her husband had at home, “we were already in a very bad situation because of the 2001 crisis, but things became even worse for us, it was near 9/11 when my husband was working as a taxi driver. One day he was at home and fell down inside a pit, the result was catastrophic for me and my family, he lost his job. After the accident, it took him 11 months to be totally recovered. Since he neither had a formal contract nor a medical insurance, we had to pay all his recovery costs. We had to sell out our little plot of land in order to pay for surgeries, treatments and recovery. We fell into a very bad situation, for more than 2 years; we ate food from the garbage and we were asking for the leftover from restaurants. I had to start picking up recyclable material from the streets to get income to survive”.37 Another woman shared, that she and her husband works, on their own, baking bread and selling it in the highway, then her husband had an accident. This is what she shared, “Nine months ago, my husband had an accident, a car crashed him when he was biking back home, breaking his hip bone. Since that time, we have been facing so many difficulties to make our living. The situation is even worse because we are old and I can’t be standing for long, since I have some problems with my legs. I don’t know what is going to happen with us”38

Policies and processes that affect people negatively in their context: 4 out of 12 cases (33%) of individuals/households interviewed were pushed into the situation of chronic poverty as a consequence of the structural reforms introduced in Argentina during the 1990s and as a result of the impact of the recession period between 1999 and 2002. Within this group, I have found cases related to: loss of regular job in private/public sector, job insecurity, and recession of activities. In terms of losing regular job in the public sector, it can be cited the experience of (VA), an individual, working as an employee for a governmental service company from which he was fired after its privatization, and overnight he and his family with 4 children became poor. Here is what (VA) shared during our interview, “when I was 40 years old, I was a train driver’s

36 JA interviewed on 7th march 2014; RC Interview on 27th February 2014, CB interviewed on 12th March 2014
37 RC Interviewed on 27th February 2014
38 JA Interviewed on 7th march 2014
assistant, it was the only source of income for my family, after being fired in 1998, I was never again able to find a formal job, since I was considered, according to the new standards, as an unskilled old man. I had to change everything in my life and also the lives of my family members in order to survive. During more than four years, I and my kids were eating from a community feeding kitchen financed by the government; where my wife found a position as a collaborator, working just for our daily food. For her, it was very difficult time; she used to tell us how people were literally fighting for the food. It took us too much time to move forward”³⁹.

In terms of losing of regular job in the private sector, a similar problem was faced by (Mm), a woman who lost her job in 1991. She was working as a cleaner for a private company. After getting pregnant, she was fired and was never again able to find a formal job for being old and unskilled⁴⁰.

In addition to this, it should be noted that since 2008 the rising of food price and the inflation have been factors that tend to push individuals/households into the situation of poverty; this has been at least mentioned by 7 out of 12 interviewees.

To conclude, regarding the reasons why individuals/households fall down into the situation of poverty, it can be seen from table Nº5 and the cited experiences that these problems are not static, but they affect capabilities, access to assets and activities of people in their attempt to make a living in a multidimensional and extremely dynamic way. In most of the cases, more than one of these stressors are acting at the same time, or affecting people’s livelihoods uninterruptedly, producing a complex phenomenon.

4.2. How people respond to adversity in order to achieve livelihoods goals

The table Nº 6 shows the supporting factors that help interviewees overcome constraints and adversity in their attempt to achieve livelihood goals on their own. The factors are sorted out according to their level of incidence. On the right side of the table, it can be visualized the existing commonalities among interviewees (pointed out with acronyms inside the columns).

In order to make the analysis easier, I have grouped them into five overlapped groups namely: social support; human support; financial support; policies institutions and processes that affect the livelihoods of people in their context; and factors related to intra household, such as reorganization and multiple livelihood strategies. These groups

³⁹ VA Interviewed on 12th March 2014
⁴⁰ Mm interviewed on 5th March 2014
of categories are related to the SLF described in the theoretical perspective in part 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting factors</th>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Interviewees affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community feeding kitchens at school &amp; neighbors associations.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>VA RS Mm VM CG CB SP MM MR RG JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/provincial and municipal funded safety-net programs (Child allowance/food tickets through the Citizen Unique Card)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>VA RS Mm VM CG CB SP MM MR RG JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic services for free (health, water, sanitation, and electricity)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>VA RS VM CB SP MM MR RG JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal employment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mm CG CB MM MR RG JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>VA RS VM CG SP MM MR RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra HH Reorganization/multiple livelihood activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>VA Mm CG CB MR JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans/favors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>RS CG CB SP MM MR JA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and child care</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>RS CG CB SP MM MR RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succeeding in Home based activity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>VA Mm CG JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>VA Mm CG JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to market</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>VA Mm CG MM JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes free/taxes reduction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>VA RS Mm JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce dependence rate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>VA Mm CG JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support for IGAs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mm VM JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal strength</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VA Mm JA RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversification of activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VA Mm RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinvestment in assets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VA Mm RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picking/selling recyclables material</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VM SP RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VM SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment in the formal sector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Nº6: Supporting factors by which people improve their livelihoods

According to the interviewees, these are the supporting factors that help people to recover, create, achieve and improve their livelihood opportunities and activities. It is quite complex to identify, even on the case by case basis, which support factor is the main contributor in the process of change. Thus, one way to disentangle the changing process is by following the sequence in which these supporting factors have been operating during the change process which has helped individuals/households to express resilience and adaptation in their livelihood strategies in order to move above the poverty line. These sequences will be displayed in charts later when the livelihood outcomes are described, but before I would like to describe briefly how the supporting
factors operate during adverse moments and how individuals/households combine them to express resilience and adaptation through their livelihood activities.

**Social Capital:** within this set of factors, community based institutions and organization networks are the most important. Through them, people manage to mobilize and access resources in order to cope with adversity and build resilience and adaptation. As it can be observed in table Nº6, this research has found that all interviewees have pointed out that they cope or manage to overcome their stressors and unmet needs by using community feeding kitchens and other CBOs facilities, to access food and others supporting mechanisms. One woman said, “we have economic problems so often, when there is no food at home, I scatter my family around the community kitchens and church within the neighborhood to feed them.”

Another woman shared how community based institutions had helped her to cope with her difficulties. She said: “the Crecer Program”, now CCB Nº16 and other milk cup centers from the neighborhood have helped me to feed my children. You know all my children were malnourished because I didn’t have money to buy food and feed them.”

Social network and community based organizations constitute a social capital which supports people beyond money and food, they are also used to cope with crisis and desperation; this fact is shown with the following testimony shared by another woman: “during the period after the crisis of 2001, there was no money available in the market, I engaged the club of barter to exchange stuff with people, I also engaged other organizations in the neighborhood. Being with people, sharing the same experience helped me a lot, I learned also how to do something for myself, on my own, and this encouraged me a lot to move forward.”

Another case of a supporting factor related to Social Capital which in turn improves “human capital” of individuals can be illustrated with the institutions of the neighborhood which aim empowering people against GBV and domestic violence as well as inter-institutional collaboration. One woman shared how, thanks to the support given to her by a worker from the “Crecer program,” her case was referred to another institution qualified to address issues related to GBV. She was able to start attending meetings to be recovered from the psychological problems she had after many years of mistreatment. This is what she said:” I started to be part of the activities and workshops

---

41 MR Interviewed on 26th February 2014
42 CB interviewed on 12th March 2014
43 Mm Interviewed on 5th March 2014
conducted within the Crecer program, I felt released there, later Dolores encouraged me to go to the “CEDEIFAN”, which is another institution based in this neighborhood that organizes meetings with women who face the problem of GBV or domestic violence like me. Right there, after 2 years of continuous support, I was able to recover, to understand that I am valuable and my family needs me. It is worth noticing that these institutions have been mentioned by, 7 out of 12 interviewed individuals/household.

Through social network, people are able to find jobs or ways out of their crisis. This has been pointed out by all interviewees. I want to share in this part the experience of a woman who has inherited poverty, and also suffered GBV and domestic violence since her childhood. This woman after more than 6 years succeeded in improving her self-esteem, finding a profession, and later a job. This is what she said “My family comes from Chaco province, we were always poor, my father was alcoholic, and he treated us badly, I left his house because of that. Then I started participating in different activities and workshops conducted at the Crecer Nº16 in 1999; by that time my ex-husband was unemployed. There, Dolores, the head of the kitchen helped me to believe in myself, to deal with the violence that my ex-husband also exerted against me. Moreover, I learned how to cook and prepare food. One day in 2004, I was at Crecer taking lunch with my children; when something flashed in my head, something as a click, giving me the feeling that it was not possible to continue living in this way, I needed to do something. I didn’t know how, but very soon with the support of people who I met while attending workshops at Crecer, I could find myself a job (preparing food in an elderly care home); I started in 2005 and am still working until these days.”

Policies, institutions and processes: within this group of supporting factors, it has been found factors related to the public institutions, policies, legislations and programs articulating processes among the different levels (micro, meso and macro level) which influence livelihoods positively. These policies, institutions and processes provide livelihood, foster access to livelihood opportunities, improve and create livelihood activities and not less important reduce livelihood vulnerability of people in situation of longstanding marginalization. These relations and processes are described below.

---

44 MM interviewed on 28th February 2014
45 Interviews with individuals participant: MM, RC, MR, RS, CG, SP, VM further details see appendix 2
46 CG Interviewed on 13th March 2014
In terms of livelihood provision, the second most important supporting factor which provides and protects livelihoods has its origin in the national policies (macro-level) with the social protection decree Nº 1602/09, called “Universal child allowance” which benefits children under 18 years of unemployed parents or those parents receiving less than the minimum salary. The universal child allowance was created in 2009. This study has found that this allowance benefits 6 out of the 8 individuals/households (75%) interviewees who have children younger than 18 years. It is worth noticing, that before 2009 there was a cash transfer based safety net program, named Program for Unemployed Head of Household (Programas Jefes y Jefas de Hogar Desempleados, (PJyJH)) which benefited 11 out of 12 interviewees, (91%), at some periods in time, between 1998 and 2009.

Another supporting factor linked to policies at macro level which in turn is complementary to the universal child allowance is the “Unique Citizen Card”. Holders of this card can buy food items framed in a specific budget funded by the provincial line ministry of Social Development of the Santa Fe province which is distributed and administrated by the M.R through the Secretariat of Social Promotion. It has been found that 6 out of 12 interviewees (75%) benefit from this supporting factor.

In terms of supporting factors linked to policies institutions and processes that protect and promote livelihoods at meso-level (municipality) are the programs implemented under the umbrella of the Secretariat of Social Promotion and the Sub-Secretariat of Solidary Economy of the M.R. These programs somehow articulate with the macro-level pro-poor policies allowing the poor households to phase out from livelihood provisions through access to market and productive assets. According to the interviews and after crossing information with the data base of the M.R, at least the interviewees: (Mm), (RC), (MM), (VA) and (JA), who benefited from safety net program accessed financial and supporting factors aiming creation and diversification of livelihood activities.

Finally, another example of a support factor related to policies institutions and process which link the macro and meso levels aiming to reduce vulnerability is the inclusion into the national government optative taxation regime under the law Nº 25865 called “Monotributo social”. This law facilitates the incorporation of individuals with
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47 Interviews with individuals participant: MR, MM, SP, VM, RS, CB, further details see appendix 2
48 Ibid
49 Interviews with individuals participant: Mm, RC, MM, VA, JA further details see appendix 2
longstanding marginalization to the formal economy. This pro-poor policy benefits 3 out of 12 interviewees, (24%)\textsuperscript{50}. With this low taxation regime, people have access to provisional services for health and retirement and the possibility to bill services and products to the state. Thus, in relation to these successful cases that link the support given by policies, institutions and processes interconnecting meso and macro level, one woman said “you know, I had to reconверt myself. I just have the primary school. During almost nine years I was a beneficiary of the program (PJyJH). After some trainings and different attempts to make my own livelihood with the support of the \textit{“Crecer”} Program with courses about entrepreneurship, bakery, and many other topics, I could finally, in 2005, find something good for me. I started my shop at home, taking the advantage of living in a very crowded street. I received 5000 pesos subsidy which helped me to open my own shop. I started selling few things, and little by little I was adding stationary, shoes and toys. Now I have become self-sufficient. However, although this neighborhood is very crowded, it is full of shops, and most consumers are middle or low purchaser. Thus, I decided diversifying this activity with another temporary job, as a cleaner. Another important thing I did, since I am getting old, was the inscription of my shop under the low taxation regime. Now I am paying for my retirement and health services.”\textsuperscript{51}

A similar experience has been shared by an interviewee who belongs to a minority indigenous group “Coya”. (VA) has harmonized his livelihood strategies with pro-poor policies, public/private institutions, legislations and culture as a driver of the transforming process in his way to achieve self-sufficiency. This is what he said, “After I became unemployed in 1998, I was included in the program (PJyJH) for few years. I couldn’t find a formal job again. My family had to be reorganized, my wife, after few years, found a stable job that helped us a lot. At that time, I approached the \textit{“Crecer Nº 16} where, in 2001 I got the idea of making bread and starting to work on my own. Thus, after some training courses in bakery and food processing following the traditional methods of “Coya” people, little by little, with the support of the municipality programs and regulations, I got the permission to produce and sell my products free from taxes. This process helped me to get a position in one of the most important events that take place in Rosario annually: the collectivity fest. Every year I sell out, with my family, more than 21 regional products from the Coya cuisine. In addition to that, I did a

\textsuperscript{50} Extracted from interviews with individuals participant: VA, RS, Mm, JA, further details see appendix 2
\textsuperscript{51} Mm interviewed on 5\textsuperscript{th} March 2014
calendar with the events taking place in Rosario annually, and I started to go right there to sell out my bakeries. I am doing it for more than 10 years now. I have done very well with the support of the municipality of Rosario. My wife has regular job therefore access to credit. In 2010, she got loans from a bank. With that money, we rented a local near the bus station and opened a regional fast food shop. Few months ago, I started to do my papers to get the “Monotributo”.52

Regarding provision of service to the municipality, one woman shared how she became integrated into the formal economy: “in early 2013, I became a member of a cooperative of workers which had been providing cleaning services to the Municipality for several years in many places in Rosario. The cooperative was and is still paid by the Municipality of Rosario and I was appointed here at the CCB Nº16, as a permanent cleaner. With this job, I pay now for social services of health coverage and retirement, I am very happy because I am working here, in a place where I feel comfortable; I can also take lunch after work. However, as the income I receive from this job is very small, I have kept the universal child allowance that I am also receive”53

So far, it has been shown how pro-poor polices designed at meso level applied under the umbrella of the M.R contribute to improve access, creation and improvement of livelihood activities. Under these provisions, the interviewees like (MM), (RC), (VA), (JA), and (MM) have accessed not only legislation and policies, but they are also selling their products within the different market places and events organized by the M.R.54

Factors related to human support, among these supporting factors, it has been found that technical assistance and trainings, with health related support, for example against GBV and domestic violence contribute to improve individuals/households in their livelihood activities. Trainings and skills transfer were pointed out by 11 out of 12 interviewees (90%) as one of the major supporting factors in their way to improve, create or access livelihood opportunities.

In terms of good health it has been found that 7 out of the 12 interviewees55 due to GBV or domestic violence suffer self-esteem. It is worth noticing that 3 out of the 7 interviewees shared that before making it possible to move forward, they had to improve somehow their self-esteem and psychological problems. Among interviewees

52 VA interviewed on 12th March 2014
53 RS Interviewed on 6th March 2014
54 Interviews with participants: RC, VA, JA, MM, Mm further details see appendix 2
55 Interviews with participants: MM,RC,RS,CG,MR,VM,SP further details see appendix 2
there were two cases that illustrated these mentioned factors. The first is the testimony of (RC). She said “my husband was so aggressive, he prohibited me from doing anything, and he still sometime mistreats me. One day I denounced him, and after that, he started to change his attitude towards me. I was too much down and depressed. However, things started to change after he had an accident. He saw that suddenly I became in charge of our family. I started to participate in workshops to learn skills in order to do something; moreover, sharing my problems with others helped me a lot to get motivation. I did courses in urban agriculture and carpentry. I have been working in gardening since 2002 until now, you know, “plants saved my life,” I am doing well with this activity.”

The second case is a woman who faced similar problems and after receiving support to overcome the consequences of GBV, domestic violence and vocational training, she was able to reframe her life and find a job.

Factors related to financial capital: it has been found that if there is no financial support or improving access to productive assets; it is not possible for individuals/households to secure livelihood strategies which could assure enough returns which in turn could improve their resilience, adaptation and reduction of vulnerability. Beyond the support given to them with the universal child allowance or free food, it has been found that financial assistance and support to access productive assets are required to help them to phase out from dependency.

In this research, it was found that at least 5 out of 12 interviewed individuals/households received financial support for IGAs and support to access market which contributed as a critical factor in improving their resilience and adaptation that later helped them in their attempt to move above the poverty line. One woman shared that in 2005, she and her husband presented a project and received a microcredit from the municipality under the program, “labor integration and self-employment” from the Secretariat of Social Promotion of the Municipality of Rosario, they bought equipment to make bakery such as oven for cooking pizza, blender, and mixer. In addition to this, the municipality helped them by buying from them some bakery to be supplied to the municipality during specific events. Another woman shared that, thanks to the Sub- Secretariat of Solidary Economy of the M.R, she joined a producers

56 RC interviewed on 27th February 2014
57 MM interviewed on 26th February 2014
58 Extracted from interviews with participants: JA, Mm, VA, RC, MM, further details see appendix 2
59 JA interviewed on 7th March 2014
program which provided her with stalls in 2 market fairs where she was able to sell out her plants. After few years, she decided to diversify her activities in order to increase her income, she received another subsidy and attended a course in carpentry in one of the vocational training schools coordinated by the municipality and now she has started to make and sell plant pots carrier and wooden toys.60

**Livelihood strategies:** the intra-household reorganization, which in some cases leads to good coping strategies that help individuals/households expressing resilience, is another supporting factor mentioned by interviewees. One man shared how he had reorganized his family in order to be able to face their critical times. His wife started to work as a school keeper, and her four children combined their free time to help him with bakeries.61 There are two other successful cases of women who have set their own income generation activities (IGA) and complemented their husbands’ jobs.62 However, there are cases of individuals who have applied detrimental coping mechanisms. One divorced woman shared that she asked her children to drop out from the school in order to work, because she faced health problems for more than 6 months, now she is too weak and she is unable to work as she used to do in the past.63

After examining how the supporting factors are used by interviewees during their adverse moments to express resilience and adaptation through their livelihood activities, I will, in the figures below, show the livelihood results of interviewees and the trends of their outcomes. For better appreciation, the interviewees’ livelihood experiences are divided into three different groups disaggregated in categories according to their status in relation to the poverty line. The groups are: livelihood trajectories of those individuals/households that have managed to move above the poverty line; those who are moving up/down the poverty line; and finally those who are trapped below the poverty line.

4.2.1 **Livelihood outcomes of the poor that have managed to move above the poverty line**

The figure Nº3 shows a process and livelihood results of individuals/households moving above the poverty line. The process includes the outcomes of coping mechanisms applied (livelihood provisions from CBOs, safety net programs and food from feeding

---

60 RC interviewed on 27th February 2014
61 VA interviewed on 12th March 2014
62 RC and Mm interviewed on 27th February and 5th March 2014
63 VM interviewed on 25th February 2014
kitchens) followed by a phase out towards livelihood recovery. It can be seen how little by little these cases have been able to express resilience and adaptation through improvement or creation of their own livelihood activities facilitated by external support. Also within this group it can be observed a good enough vulnerability reduction, in at least two cases that have successfully got inserted in the formal economy, indicating the accomplishment of entire cycle.

Looking at individual cases, the dotted line represents the incomes from external assistance and support from free food used by interviewees to cope with adversity while the solid line represents incomes from own livelihood initiatives. It can be observed that at some points in time, the income lines merge, meaning that, from that point on forward the interviewee has started to rely on his/her own livelihood outcomes. However, reaching this point does not mean that s/he has also reduced vulnerability enough. If we look at the black spots which represent the shocks faced by interviewees after getting self-sufficiency, the case of (JA) shows that although this individual/household could overcome stressors on his/her own and stay above the poverty line, the shock (health problems and a car accident) has pushed him/her again into the situation of poverty, before expressing resilience. In my opinion, this evidences the need to do more in order to reinforce further resilience, adaptation and vulnerability reduction. Finally, the yellow spots represent the full integration of individuals/households to the formal economy; it can be seen with 2 interviewees where the process has taken them more than 10 years.

The figure Nº4 shows a sequence about how coping mechanisms and supporting factors are used by individuals/households to overcome adversity and express resilience and adaptation. In this figure, the positive trend process can be seen in details by examining
the “patterns and style of the dynamic process of livelihood trajectories” (Davis, 2006, cited in Shepherd 2007:5). The figure shows how individuals/households in this group managed to follow a sequence of events using supporting factors to overcome stressors and shocks. It is worth noticing that the level and intensity of the stressors have been reduced, not eliminated. In the figure, the stressors and shocks are referred to with the red arrows while the supporting factors with the green ones.

4.2.2 Livelihood outcomes of the poor that have been moving up/down the poverty line

The figure №5 shows the process and the livelihood results of interviewees moving up and down the poverty line. It is worth noticing that those cases are on their way to become self-sufficient. They implement livelihood activities on their own and have the potentiality of generating income and express resilience and adaptation. However, their vulnerability is very high and they are unable to sustain their livelihood outcome above the poverty line; it seems that: the number, combination and severity of stressors which affect them are stronger than the supporting factors available to them. It should be noted that the black spots in this figure represent shocks mostly related to Narco-criminality and interpersonal violence. Resilience in this case should be improved at community or system level with multidimensional approach since these factors overwhelms the capabilities of people. This fact is evidenced with internal displacements. In terms of income, it can be seen that livelihood trajectories within this group are represented by two lines (traced and continuous) which are moving together over the evaluated period, this indicates that, with the exception of (CG)’s case, these individuals/households have been unable to get self-sufficiency, thus they are permanently dependent on external support.
Figure Nº6 shows in detail the results of livelihood activities when the sequence of events affecting interviewees indicates a tendency of difficulty to express resilience and adaptation to overcome stressors.

4.2.3 Livelihood outcomes of chronic poor trapped in poverty

In figure Nº 7, it is shown that interviewees’ livelihood outcomes within this group are permanently below the poverty line. They are overwhelmed by: the number, combination and level of intensity of stressors; even deprived from supporting factors which constrain their capabilities to secure livelihood strategies. Therefore, they are always applying coping mechanisms, including detrimental; such as the case of (VM) a head of household who has fallen sick for more than 6 months due to intoxication by eating spoiled uncooked chicken from the garbage, her careless children have had to drop out from school to get income and food somewhere. Within this group, the black spots represent shocks related to Narco-criminality, health problems, interpersonal violence, and displacements. Resilience and adaptation also have to be improved at individuals/households level and at community level. The livelihood results shown here
and in the previous group emphasize that the support to the poorest has to be systemic and provided in a multidimensional approach to sustainably reduce vulnerability. Similarly, as shown in the figure 5 and 6, the dotted line represents income from safety-net programs or contributions from external assistance while the solid line represents income from individuals/households’ own livelihood initiatives. It can be seen that the two lines never meet each other.

The figure N° 8 shows the livelihood results of individuals/households trapped in poverty. The dynamic indicates a descending trend, at least during the signaled period. With red arrows, the shocks and stressors that have made them descending deeper below poverty line are described. Conversely, the green arrows indicate the supporting factors that help them to cope with their situation. It can be seen that there are several turning points that illustrate resilience and adaptation, but the outcomes are not strong enough to change their trendy process of descending deeper in poverty.
So far, I have shown an insight on the results of the livelihood activities implemented by interviewees; below I will attempt to conclude with an overall analysis carried out in this part.

4.3. Remarks

Overall, it has been analyzed how individuals/households are able to express resilience and adaptation through their livelihood outcomes using supporting factors. Thus, beyond the fact that the finding shows that 4 out of 12 interviewees managed to succeed in their livelihoods and kept their incomes above the poverty line; it is arguable why some interviewees, living into the situation of chronic poverty, confronting the stressors using the same safety networks and social assistance programs equally available for all the interviewees, have been able to succeed in their livelihoods while others have not.

When looking in details at the livelihood trajectories of those cases whose incomes are moving up/down the poverty line, and those whose incomes are below the poverty line, it is found that they have limited capabilities to express resilience, achieve adaptation and vulnerability reduction; and even the same limitations are seen from some of the cases who, although, are receiving good enough income, they still have not reduced enough their vulnerability. Therefore, regarding why it was, and is still difficult for them to overcome constraints to achieve livelihood goals and reduce vulnerability, it could be explained with a general interpretation which suggests that it depends upon: the number, combination and severity of stressors affecting individuals/households coupled with deprivation of supporting factors. Additionally, since the focus of my analysis tries also to contribute to the strengthening of how external support can be improved; some explanations can be related to the management and performance of ongoing livelihood programs and projects.

Regarding the general interpretation, the findings suggest that either the number, combination and severity of the stressors affecting individuals/households in the situation of poverty overwhelm the capability of the current supporting factors available for them or the supporting factors themselves do not reduce vulnerability enough. This is further illustrated with testimonies of four interviewees. The first is represented by (MM), who after more than 9 years of receiving external support and being recovered from GBV and also supported with trainings to improve her skills under M.R programs, could improve her access to market to sell her own products facilitated by the financial support which she used for buying equipment. However since 2009, she started to face
very difficult problems with her children, two of them had links with Narco related
criminality, because of that she had to flee from Rosario for more than one year; she lost
her house and now she is in charge of her children and grandchildren, such level and
severity of stressors have affected her livelihood activities. Today, she as a head of
household is not able to overcome constrains with available supporting factors. (For
more details of this testimony see foot note Nº57, p.48). 64
Before describing the other three cases, it is worth noticing once again that external
support has to be oriented also to improve resilience and adaptation at community
structures or sub-systems level to reduce vulnerability, at least to facilitate resilience to
stressors such as Narco related criminality and interpersonal violence. The coordination
of different directorates from the government are required to address not only
livelihood, health, basic services or infrastructure issues, but also security, and the
improvement of the judicial system as well as the reduction of corruption; since these
individuals/households are exposed to stressors that go beyond their resilience and
adaptation capability. The argument for this claim is supported by the fact that 6 out of
12 interviewees were affected by these social problems where 4 of them were/are in a
situation of internal displacement within Rosario and outside Rosario city. 65 Such
stressors have collapsed their livelihood activities. One case is mentioned in page 38
(foot note Nº33), where a woman- head of household- that had to move away from her
neighborhood because of the high level of insecurity and criminality 66.
Another case that shows evidences of the need of improving resilience capacity at
community level is of a woman, mother of a boy, 17 years old who is addicted to drugs
and was working in kiosks called “bunkers” as a drug seller. She asked for the support
of the police to protect her son and prevent him from being part of criminal networks;
she also asked support in others institutions within the neighborhood to recover him
from drugs addiction, but it looked like everything was out of her control or capacity. In
our interview she said, “You know, I have recognized and said to everybody that my
son is very addicted to drugs since he was nine years old. He was a “soldadito”. I want
to help him, but I can’t, I am so tired... Police do not care about my son, but about
protecting drugs businesses, they are supporting all the dealers whom I have seen giving
money to them. You know, I can’t tell you everything because I have no trust in

64 MM interviewed on 26th February 2014
65 Extracted from interviews with participants: MM, CB, CG, VM, MR, SP further details see appendix 2
66 CG Interviewed on 13th March 2014
anybody. Have you seen? You were there looking for me after someone was burning out my house.”

Another woman shared that two of her sons, older than 17 years, who have primary education were attending courses in carpentry and electricity for the purpose of gaining some skills to do something later, however, they dropped out, the woman said, because it was not possible either to find a job, or to do anything profitable with that. At the end, she said, they had continued making troubles within the neighborhood, and finally one of them was shot by someone, he received 6 bullets, I don’t understand how he is still alive; my son is in jail now and there is still one bullet inside him. The woman has literally said, “You know we don’t know what to do; my husband, my children and I cannot find job, we are 10 people at home, and we can neither cover our daily food, nor our clothing. I have also too much debt to pay, this is too much.”

The mentioned cases above may suggest a well-managed multidimensional approach with the interaction of different institutions coordinated properly for the purpose of addressing the wide range of stressors and problems that affect their livelihoods.

Regarding the external support, the livelihood programs and projects implemented in Rosario under the umbrella of the National, Provincial and the Municipal governments are quite impressive. There are many longstanding ongoing programs, well designed and targeting wide range of people in need. Thus, it is difficult to argue to which extent “factors related to poor management of livelihood programs” are among the reasons why people are not moving above the poverty line, instead I would like to stress on some identified aspects (gaps) in livelihood programs which could have had a positive effect on resilience and adaptation of the interviewed individuals/households if they are attended properly. Therefore, by considering comments and evidences gathered from interviewees and key informants about what is being done and what can be improved, it is arguable the existence of gaps in terms of geographical coverage; shortfall in terms of budget and also human resources allocated to programs and projects. In addition, it has been found poor planning and management, important lack of coordination at inter-institutional level within the neighborhoods and between governmental offices; lack of accompaniment, poor technical support directed to individuals/households alongside their processes of change; and poor monitoring and evaluation of the projects and programs. Below, I will attempt to show these aspects through the evidences from
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67 VM interviewed on 25th February 2014
68 CB interviewed on 15th March 2014
livelihood experiences, it is also worth noticing that in some cases these aspects are overlapping and interacting with each other at the same time.

In terms of accompaniment and technical support, it can be mentioned the case of (JA), registered as a beneficiary of the livelihood programs of the Secretariat of Social Promotion in 1998. (JA) joined the livelihood activities and workshops, and after attempting with a wide range of activities, in 2006 (JA) managed to get livelihood self-sufficiency in terms of income working on bakery. Alongside the process (JA) received also financial support for buying equipment. According to (JA) testimony, the accompaniment and technical assistance were cut, since the support was considered accomplished by the workers of the secretariat of social promotion. Nevertheless, little attention was paid to the fact that (JA) is becoming elder, entering a stage in the life cycle where the social prevision is very important to avoid poverty; however, this part was neglected by the interviewee and by the social assistance. Now after continuous health problems, (JA) and her partner are facing a situation which could push them towards poverty again. They have not paid attention to the fact that, with their livelihood activity, they have the option to be included under the National government optative taxation regime, last modified in 2009\textsuperscript{69}, “Monotributo social”. This regime provides assurance for health care and retirement; in my opinion, these aspects should be included in external support through accompaniment/follow up. Considering this case, it could be arguable when external support could be considered finished\textsuperscript{70}.

Another worth noticing case, which shows with evidences the lack of accompaniment, lack of inter-institutional coordination and lack of monitoring and evaluation process, can be illustrated with the case of (RC), who has been registered as a beneficiary of the livelihood programs coordinated by the Sub-Secretariat of Solidary Economy since 2001. She has attended several livelihood workshops at the CCB Nº16 oriented to self-food production and micro entrepreneurship. Along a process of 13 years, she was asking and receiving ad hoc technical and financial support, and even an opportunity to improve access to market through stall positions, tax free, in two market fairs coordinated by the M.R. Such a process allowed her to consolidate and achieve self-reliance with her livelihood activity focused on producing plants which in 2011 was

\textsuperscript{69} Available at: http://www.sgp.gov.ar/contenidos/ag/paginas/opp/docs/2010/08_OPP_2010_MONOTRIBUTO_Y_SALUD.pdf, accessed 5\textsuperscript{th} May 2014

\textsuperscript{70} JA interviewed on 7\textsuperscript{th} March 2014
diversified with making wooden toys. In our interview she mentioned that she was so happy for the support given to her and stressed the fact that the programs and projects implemented by the municipality had saved her life. However, although she has achieved and consolidated a sustainable livelihood strategy assuring income and increasing her capability to absorb and express resilience, adaptation and reduce vulnerability on her own, according to her testimony, she argued that nobody visited her, at her house, to see, to monitor or accompany what she was doing with all the funds and equipment she had received. In fact; after crossing data from her testimony and information from the data base from the municipality, it has been observed that (RC) in 2011, received an important subsidy from the National line Ministry of the Social Development through the coordination office of Rosario, which the Municipality of Rosario was not informed about. In addition, what I have observed, beyond the motivation and the very interesting work that she has been doing, is the sub-exploitation of the productive capacities and the need to further explore market access, in order to strengthen the capabilities to reduce vulnerability, and even to support the possibility that (RC) has to integrate her unemployed daughter with her. This case illustrates an example of multiplier effect that the external support could have. Finally, as already described with the previous case, (RC) is also in a situation of lack of assistance to be integrated in the formal system through the low taxation regime called “Monotributo Social”.

In two other cases, it has been found poor planning and management, in the short, medium and long term period of the programs and projects which could help beneficiaries a smooth phasing out from livelihood provisions and protection, towards improvement and creation of their own livelihood activities in order to promote self-sufficiency. Self-sufficiency can be shown through individuals/households capability to express resilience and adaptation to absorb stressors on their own. The case of (MR) illustrates this claim. In 1998 she was registered and started to receive support for her, her 5 children and her concubine. Although till 2004 she and her children attended different workshops related to a wide range of topics at the “Crecer”, according to (MR) she faced so many technical and financial limitations which pushed her to abandon everything. After 16 years, not only she and her family are still under the same livelihood provision program, but also her daughters’ children. They are perpetually

71 RC interviewed on 27th February 2014
receiving tickets for free food, attending community feeding kitchens and receiving financial support from the universal child allowance. She said, “I am in need of further support, beyond what I am receiving now, for me and my daughters, in order to do something on our own. You know my partner is a stonemason but he is getting old and he has health problems. Today in this house we are more than 9 people and he is the only source of income. Counting his income with the support we receive from the child allowance and tickets for free food, the total sum is still not enough for all of us. She added the “Crecer” program is not working as it was 10 years ago; there are not workshops and technical support as there were before.\textsuperscript{72}

The case of (VM), who also shows evidences about another individual/household that has developed high dependency on external support as a way of living, she has always been integrated in projects under “livelihood provisions” since the year 2000. She is provided with tickets for free food and food from community feeding kitchens, and the universal child allowances; she has also received subsidy in the years 2004, 2006, 2007, 2010 and 2014 for her house reparation; mattresses, etc. (VM) is a head of household, a mother of 5 children, unfortunately one is dead. After crossing information coming from her interview and those from the data base of the CCB Nº 16, and from the data panel belonging to the central administration of the Secretariat of Social Promotion of the M.R; except for some activities of self-food production carried out between 2000 and 2002, and in 2004 within the “Crecer Nº16”, it can be seen that (VM), during the last 14 years, has not been included in any project aiming creation of own livelihoods which may lead to self-sufficiency.\textsuperscript{73}

Gaps related to human resources allocation and geographical coverage can be illustrated with the experience of (CG), described in page 22. Her livelihood trajectory is shown in the blue colored line, drawn in the figure N°5. (CG) was struggling for more than seven years to get self-sufficiency in terms of livelihoods; since 2005 until the end of 2013 she was showing success. Unfortunately, her son´s drugs addiction problem put her and her family in insecurity risk and poverty situation again, to the extent that she lost her house, they were displaced within the city, and as a result, one of her livelihood activity was destroyed. At the time of my interview with her, which was just few months after her displacement, she was still unable to find any support to help her son or protect her family against other similar disruptive events. Through the CCB Nº 16, she asked for

\textsuperscript{72} MR Interviewed on 26\textsuperscript{th} February 2014 \\
\textsuperscript{73} VM interviewed on 25\textsuperscript{th} February 2014
the possibility of getting support from the youth program, since they target youth people from 14 years forward with a wide range of activities. Yet, this youth program was cut off two years ago due to the fact that human and economic resources were relocated and concentrated in the so called priority areas.74 On the other hand at North district level, at the CDM, a co-coordinated program between the national, provincial, and municipal government directed to youth between 18-24 years aiming labor inclusion, named “more and better jobs”, did not include him, firstly because he was out of the threshold age, and secondly because the program was facing some difficulties in term of planning, funding and implementation.75

Additionally, it has been found that at the CCB Nº16 there are lacks of knowledge on standard procedures which enable its workers to refer such cases to qualified institutions. Finally, in order to further support the evidences regarding gaps in livelihood programs, I would like to indicate what has been mentioned in the interviews with key informants and personnel involved in livelihood programs that represent the government.

When looking at the information available in the general action plans of the Secretariat of Social Promotion for 2014; the action plan of the CCB Nº16 for 2014; the policies directions for the youth 2014 of the Youth Directorate; and after examining interviews with representatives of governmental offices from the Secretariat of Social Promotion, it is evidenced poor program planning and management, poor program coverage in terms of geographic areas, lack of human resources, and even frustrations from workers about the low speed performance of the M.R in relation to coordination, implementation and articulation with the rest of the network organizations.

At neighborhood level, at least where this study took place, in the CCB Nº16 action plan for 2014, specifically in relation to the component program of livelihood projects implemented under the umbrella of the sub-secretariat of Economy Solidary, there was neither description of activities, nor objectives, nor quantifiable indicators to be measured, nor monitoring plan, nor budget to address livelihood activities or projects at household level. After examining interviews with the CCB Coordinator, Extension Workers, Program coordinators and the Director of the sub-secretariat of Solidary Economy: it was found a lack of annual budget allocation, a lack of coordination meetings, a deficiency of reporting activities, poor monitoring and evaluation of the

74 Interviews with Guillermo Lassala, Anonymous Ext. Worker and Carla Teppa, further details see appendix 6
75 Interview with Julia De Marco and Carolina Simiani from the youth program on 12th March 2014
programs and a lack of human resources.\textsuperscript{76} The coordinator of the CCB N°16 explained to me that since 2005 till now, the way of implementing livelihood activities have been under a restructuring process; the entire portfolio of livelihood programs is now under the control of the Sub-Secretary of Solidary Economy. Unfortunately for this CCB, as this geographical area has not been defined as a priority area, the program by now works on request; the extension worker who was full time allocated for these neighborhoods to articulate: activities, programs and institutional process was removed. It means that if someone comes to this CCB asking for livelihood projects/micro entrepreneurship, the issue is remitted to “Solidary Economy” which, after a process of project definition and evaluation in collaboration with the applicant, submits the project requesting financial support until it gets started. In her opinion, in that way everything goes so slowly, with just one Extension Worker attending the area once a week.\textsuperscript{77}

Similar comment I received from an extension worker in charge of livelihood programs under the Sub-Secretariat of Solidary Economy who asked to remain anonymous. This key informant said, “We are just 13 extension workers to cover the six districts of Rosario. In this way, it is difficult to be organized, for example, I can just come once a week here, to this CCB, and work in livelihood projects for a very large population. Unfortunately in one day, it is not possible either to visit people in need, or to do monitoring of the ongoing projects. In terms of coordination, since 2013 we have been working without a technical coordinator, because the last one has left; and till today the position is still not covered\textsuperscript{78}.

After describing the factors that make people fall down into the situation of poverty, I have shown livelihood results considering how the supporting and limiting factors create a complex phenomenon that lead individual/households to succeed or not in their livelihoods activities. In the next chapter, I will elaborate on a perspective where livelihood programs can be examined and operationalized. At the end, a review of the humanitarian programs implemented in Rosario will be outlined,

\textsuperscript{76} Extracted from Interviews with Carla Teppa, anonymous Extension worker, Alfredo Oldani and Maria Eugenia Hulten, Claudia Manacero and Susana Bartolome, further details see appendix 6

\textsuperscript{77} Interview with Carla Teppa, coordinator of the CCB N°16 on 21\textsuperscript{st} February 2014

\textsuperscript{78} Interview with anonymous Extension Worker of Solidary Economy, Sub-Secretariat of Economy Solidary, Secretariat of social Promotion, Municipality of Rosario 18\textsuperscript{th} March 2014
5. Research finding: Public institutions, policies and processes influencing livelihood

The theoretical perspective described in part 3 has supported the analysis of the livelihood experiences examined in the previous part. Such analysis has allowed me to track the supporting and limiting factors affecting the livelihood activities of poor people living in Rosario, and to understand how these factors influence their changing process of moving above the poverty line. Thus, in this part, the focus is put on the household livelihood security approach. With this, I will attempt to describe an existing perspective on how the livelihoods of the poor can be improved through programs and projects, followed by a description of the livelihood programs implemented in Rosario.

5.1 How can the livelihood of the poor be improved?

The literature review about operationalization of perspectives and strategies regarding how to improve livelihood of the poor in practice suggests a methodology which is best captured by: the household livelihood security approach of CARE International (Rakodi, 2002:247). This approach suggests external support, using three different strategies defined as follow: a) Livelihood provision, b) Livelihood Protection; and c) Livelihood Promotion (CARE International, cited in Hussein, 2002:56). It is important to mention that these three strategies can be applied separately, or in combination. In this way, as posed by the authors Frankenberger and McCaston, the combination of these strategies represents a wide range of possibilities oriented to reduce vulnerability originated by many circumstances and stressors, and on the other hand, to increase access to assets or livelihood opportunities which in turn promote individual/household livelihood security, resilience and adaptation (Frankenberger and McCaston:1998:32).

In the table N°7 below, the three strategies are described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table N°7: strategies aiming the improvement of livelihood, focusing on HH livelihood security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Livelihood Promotion, Directed to those individuals/households that are able to experience upward mobility, but not enough to sustainably escape from poverty (Frankenberger and McCaston, 1998:32). Example of this type could be the creation of alternative IGAS and diversification of market to increase sales and activities; improving production. This does not exclude investment in infrastructure and market organization to create/improve local and regional synergies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Livelihood Protection, Directed to those individuals/households that are potentially able to experience upward mobility, but they are unable to meet their basic needs, thus, this strategy is oriented to avoid detrimental coping mechanisms, such as erosion of productive assets, children dropping out of school, etc. (Frankenberger and McCaston, 1998:32). Example support of this type could include cash transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
program and safety network such as community kitchens and food cards.

c) Livelihood Provision,

Directed to those individual/households that are trapped in poverty or are in an emergency situation. This short term strategy aims to cover survival needs. In a middle term period, these strategies should be designed to phase out in order to integrate this group to a range of livelihood self-managed oriented activities (Frankenberger and McCaston, 1998:32). Additionally to the examples mentioned in livelihood protection posed above, infrastructure support, psychological support and empowerment could also be added.

In developmental practices, these strategies should not be implemented statically and separately of each other. For example; such an isolated set of initiatives could create dependency if there is not phase out of livelihood provisions. Thus, the implementation of these strategies should be mutually interrelated in the sense of forming a continuum set of options designed to address vulnerability of individuals / households as a whole, over time, framed within provision, protection and livelihood promotion well coordinated in combination and not in linear perspective (Lindenberg 2002:305).

Therefore, this perspective encompasses actions within the short, medium and long term period as a continuum of relief, rehabilitation and development (Frankenberger, 1996, cited in Lindenberg 2002:305). In this way, resources allocation could be more efficient, when including the most vulnerable in livelihood programs, but phasing them out from strategy to strategy in the sense to promote resilience and adaptation, which in turn minimizes the risks of creating dependence. That’s it, putting a range of initiatives available for poor people, tailored to the context to address the stressors that affect them, bearing in mind that in some cases, stressors operate at the same moment (Frankenberger and McCaston: 1998:32).

So far, I have described the perspective that can be used to improve the livelihood of the poor, in the next section; I will describe the livelihood programs implemented in Rosario.

5.2. Livelihood programs implemented in the urban context of Rosario.

In terms of livelihood support given to the poor, it was found that in Rosario the emergency and developmental programs are open to the society in general, and carried out at least on three different levels of implementation and collaboration namely: Municipal level; coordination, (Nation, Province and Municipality); and National level.

At the level of the Municipality of Rosario, it was found that all the programs and projects focused on livelihoods in Rosario city are almost fully implemented by the Secretariat of Social Promotion, except for the West District where an International
NGO, named “Aldeas Infantiles” and the National organization, “ARCOR” collaborate with some projects. While at the level of the coordination, (Nation, Province and Municipality), some programs are implemented by the Municipality of Rosario through the Secretariat of Production and Employment, for example the Program, “Youth for more and better job”. At this level, it can be also mentioned the support given by the Secretariat of Social Promotion to people facing food insecurity, with the distribution of food vouchers, funding of community kitchens and also with food distribution.

At national level, the most important programs is the universal child allowance for each child younger than 18 years, which benefits the children of unemployed parents or those parents receiving less than the minimum salary, implemented by the ANSES; and livelihood projects implemented by the CDR, described in details below.

With resources coming from the National, Provincial and Municipal budget, the Secretariat of Social Promotion of the M.R and the Sub-Secretariat of Solidary Economy which also is part of the Secretariat of Social Promotion of the M.R coordinate the highest volume of programs implemented in Rosario which is a portfolio of projects and programs oriented to support, directly or indirectly, the livelihoods of the poor. These programs include an important number of permanent and ad-hoc human resources distributed among the different districts to articulate activities with neighbors, CBOs and the complex network of institutions mentioned in part two.

Broadly, the portfolio of programs can be described as follow: programs aiming the production support; programs and projects aiming provision of infrastructure such as workshops and access to marketplace in order to create and improve livelihood opportunities and activities; projects aiming the provision of training and technical assistance; and support in terms of employment and cooperatives formation.

Within the “Production Support”, several programs are implemented, such as: the promotion of animal production, fishery, food processing, clothing and footwear, recycling materials and constructing services. It is worth noticing that some of the programs implemented by this secretariat also have international recognition, as an
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79 Interview with Josefina Bianchi, Coordinator of social assistance planning for the Municipality of Rosario, depending on the Secretariat of Social Promotion, 15th April 2014
80 Interview Maria Flor Abella, Julia De Marco and Carolina Simiani, Coordination team, Program youth for more and better job, 12th March 2014
81 Interview with Carla Teppa, Coordinator CCB Nº16, 21th February 2014
83 Interview with Susana Bartolome, Secretary of Solidary Economy, Secretariat of Social Promotion of the Municipality of Rosario City, 10th March 2014
example of good social policies and programing\textsuperscript{84}. The urban agriculture program, which supports a gardener network of 300 members,\textsuperscript{85} which currently produces in 40 hectares scattered within the city, is one of them. In terms of “workshop and marketplace” support, what can be mentioned is 3 permanent commercialization centers where the municipality provides stalls for free to the producers of solidarity economy\textsuperscript{86}. In terms of “cooperatives conformation”, several cooperatives, pointed in the table Nº3 in chapter two, were organized by the municipality in order to improve employment by outsourcing public services such as cleaning, painting and maintenance\textsuperscript{87}.

It is worth noticing that the Youth Center coordinated by the Directorate of Public Policy and Youth of the M.R also implements livelihood programs directed to youth exposed to high vulnerability\textsuperscript{88}. In the same way, livelihood provision, and training program targeting youth ranging between 18 to 24 years are implemented by the Secretariat of Production of the M.R, as mentioned here above.

On the other hand, the National Ministry of the Social Development coordinates and implements livelihood programs through the Center of Reference Rosario (CDR). This coordination office offers financial support for IGAs. In addition, this office is in coordination with 5 microcredit institutions offices located in Rosario, three ongoing programs called entrepreneurship collective brand, the Pro-Huerta Program and 1 permanent market fair.\textsuperscript{89}

**Comments**

Overall, what I have found is that it is quite impressive the diversity and complexities of the programs directed to provide, protect and promote livelihoods, in the short, medium and long term period; focused on a wide range of target groups such as youth, chronic poor, elders, people with special needs, and minority groups. However, drawing on the comments from participants and key interviewees, and evidences found after the analysis of the livelihood experiences of interviewees, some policy recommendations aiming improvement of livelihood programing will be formulated in the next part.

\textsuperscript{84}Available at: http://www.rosario.gov.ar/sitio/desarrollo_social/empleo/programa_au.jsp#practicas accessed 20\textsuperscript{th} April 2014

\textsuperscript{85}Ibid

\textsuperscript{86}Interview with Alfredo Oldany, Psychologist, Coordinator of the commercialization center “La toma”, Sub-Secretariat of Solidary Economy, Depending of the secretariat of social Promotion of the Municipality of Rosario City, 12\textsuperscript{th} March 2014

\textsuperscript{87}Interview with Carla Teppa, Coordinator CCB Nº16, 21\textsuperscript{st} February 2014

\textsuperscript{88}Interview with Guillermo Lasala, General Coordinator of the youth center depending of the Directorate of Public Policy and Youth, 8\textsuperscript{th} April

\textsuperscript{89}Available at: http://www.desarrollossalud.gob.ar/mapa.aspx?tipo=cdr accessed 20\textsuperscript{th} April 2014
6 Conclusions and recommendations

Finally, I will link the contents of the different parts of this thesis to answer the main research questions followed by a formulation of recommendations to improve social assistance which in turn will have an impact on the livelihood of the urban poor, living in Rosario.

6.1. Conclusions

Answering the research questions: How are the Chronic Poor, living in Rosario, Argentina able to implement livelihoods activities that aid them to move above the poverty line? Which are the supporting and the limiting factors that affect them during their changing process?

I would like to start answering these questions by mentioning first the key factors related to the context which shape, according to my analysis, the capability of the poor to secure livelihood activities and reduce vulnerability. At national level, the uninterrupted pro-poor policies implemented at least since the year 2000, with the cash transfer program (PJyJH) followed by the “universal child allowance” provide the ground which protected and helped the interviewees to cope with uncovered needs. Additionally, these public policies allow a smooth articulation with other livelihood programs and meso-level policies and projects aiming the improvement and the creation of livelihood opportunities. Thus, such policies are favored for the positive outcomes and trends of the macroeconomic indicators of the country which provide stability at the economic, political and social level. However, it is worth noticing that the economic stability of Argentina is being eroded by a growing level of inflation which has started to be noticed since 2008. In relation to the context of Rosario, it has been found that most interviewees have been shocked by urban violence and narco-criminality; which go beyond their capability to express resilience and adaptation. These factors do not only erode the efficiency and articulation of policies, institutions and processes at meso level but they also push people into the situation of poverty, as it was shown.

Then, after examining the livelihood trajectories of interviewees, it can be recognized a road map which shows how they have managed to overcome stressors and constraints by using supporting factors to succeed in their livelihoods. This can be described as a continuum process which includes 3 differentiated stages.

In the first stage, it can be recognized that individuals/households are under high pressure caused by the combination and the severity of several stressors and limitations.
In this stage, they have difficulties to rely on their own livelihoods activities, thus, they survive by applying coping strategies. The CBOs and institutions operating within the neighborhood are key social capitals used to access livelihood provisions such as food for free, and also used for mobilizing resources to improve access to assets or opportunities with the purpose of securing future livelihood. It is worth noticing that those individuals/households badly affected by stressors and deprived from supporting factors are pushed to apply detrimental coping strategies, evidences have shown cases of individuals/households eating food from garbage and cases of children dropping out from school to get income. This situation threatens their present and future access to livelihood opportunities, even for next generations.

In the second stage, it can be recognized that food for free is not enough to help people in the situation of chronic poverty. In order to succeed and be able to rely on their own livelihoods, what is required is reducing stressors or their severity while, at the same time, improving their assets and access to livelihood opportunities. During this process, human, financial and institutional support through pro-poor public policies and projects is critical to reinforce “assets” and “access” in order to improve, create and secure better livelihood opportunities. During this stage, it is important to provide technical support and accompaniment to promote self-sufficiency. The case of (RC) illustrates this process. (RC) was very vulnerable, and applied detrimental coping mechanisms. However, in 2000 she entered in a process of external support where during 14 years (RC) was showing resilience and adaptation, to the extent that she became able to multiply the effects of external support by generating employment; similar experience is proved with (VA).

In the third stage, it can be recognized that the interviewees figured out ways to overcome their stressors, using all the resources available to improve their livelihoods. It has also been found that accompaniment and monitoring are important not only to support them refining their livelihoods activities, but also to aid them keep working on reducing: the number, combination and severity of their stressors. Those individuals/households who succeeded in controlling stressors and reframing their livelihood strategies with outcomes that enabled them to absorb shocks, express resilience and self-sufficiency, followed a process of reduction stressors and improvement of “assets” and “access” before being able to secure livelihood uninterruptedly. This study also shows cases of individuals/households who were able to accomplish the whole cycle by joining the formal economy. It took them more than
10 years of a continuum process where the three stages described were experienced. The engagement in the formal economy is one indicator of the main objective which humanitarian organizations, practitioners or policy makers pursue with programs oriented to support the livelihood of the poor.

On the other hand, what can be also seen are cases of individuals/households stagnated in dependency and overwhelmed by the number, combination and severity of the stressors that constrain their livelihood activities and, even pull them deeper in poverty.

In terms of supporting and limiting factors, it has been observed that interviewees are highly susceptible to multidimensional and extremely dynamic issues related to family planning, health problems, lack of skills and education, and social problems such as urban violence, GBV and alcoholism; while in terms of livelihood programs, it can be said that the poor accompaniment and the low level of performance or management of the pro-poor policies can undermine individuals/households’ processes to achieve self-sufficiency. This has been observed with the cases of (RC), (JA), (MR), (VM), (CG) where external support is abandoned; moreover, it is seen that it is difficult to determine when the process of external support is totally accomplished. So far, external support is neglected, some cases, considered as successful, are falling while some others who could multiply the effects of the external support are neither accompanied nor followed.

Therefore, in terms of supporting factors, it has been observed that community based organizations and pro-poor policies have been the basis of the improvement and the creation of livelihood for those interviewees in the situation of poverty. It has also been observed that it is not possible for them to secure livelihood strategies which assure enough returns to improve their resilience, capacity of adaptation and reduction of vulnerability if there is no financial and technical support beyond the support given to them in terms of livelihood provisions and social protection to cover the basic needs.

6.2 Policy recommendation

Based on evidences from key informants and livelihood trajectories, it is possible to gain an insight about how individuals/households are able to implement livelihood activities that aid them to move above the poverty line. Moreover, we have explored what has constrained the livelihood activities of those who are still struggling to express resilience, adaptation and reduce vulnerability in order to escape poverty. Thus, after considering what they have recommended in terms of how to improve the support given
to them; and the perspective developed in part 5 about the strategies focused on improving household livelihood security, it was possible to draw some lessons that could contribute to reinforce ongoing practices and future programs and projects aiming the improvement the livelihood of the poor.

Under the umbrella of the Secretariat of Social Promotion of the M.R, a recognizable number of programs and project are implemented; my recommendation is that these programs and projects should be better articulated in the short, medium and the long term period with national, provincial and municipal pro-poor public policies.

In order to address this recommendation properly, the following identified problems should be tackled: lack of human resources, poor planning, lack of coordination among the different stakeholders and within the different offices of the governmental programs, lack of monitoring and evaluation, poor accompaniment to the beneficiaries of the programs, lack of promotion of self-reliance among beneficiaries and lack of training for the extension workers.

**Recommendations**

**Improving coordination to promote self-sufficiency and cut dependency**: it is well known that “the poor are always stigmatized for being lazy”. However, it is found that due to the lack of human resources, the lack of articulation among the different institutions, the slow performance of the system and the lack of promotion of self-reliance, many individuals/households are stagnated within the livelihood provision programs; perpetually receiving ticket for free food, child allowance and gifts. During the interviews process, it has been observed that the livelihood protection and creation programs, in spite of being opened for the whole population, are functioning by request. It means that individuals who are interested in improving their livelihood have to go and knock the door of the right governmental offices, with a good and polished livelihood idea to be able to receive support and help after a long evaluation period. This way of working does not only hinder the support that people need, but also it erodes workers´ motivation and energy, since lack of human resources and lack of information and plans create frustration and inefficiency.

**Improving planning and management**: I have identified four aspects of planning and management that should be considered: 1) Filling the empty positions and gaps of human resources; 2) improving beneficiaries targeting; 3) defining indicators for measuring programs and projects achievement and impact; and 4) improving the
Monitoring and evaluation, accountability and “learning” of activities. This aspect will be developed separately, after this action point since it requires special attention.

These recommendations are based on evidences shown in part four and on the basis of the analysis of the action plans shared by the Secretariat of Social Promotion of the M.R concerning the general objectives for 2014 and the action plan of the CCB Nº16. It is worth noticing that at least till the end of April 2014, no action plan for livelihood programs for 2014 was defined from the Sub-Secretariat of Solidary Economy.\(^{90}\)

Therefore, the evidences show the absence of a general strategy, poor planning and management. In addition to this, it has been found no definition of target beneficiaries; poor coordination and lack of information sharing about budgets. These problems increase the sense of frustration and powerlessness amongst the staff from different programs offices, especially amongst those who daily work in contact with individuals/households in need. Due to this poor planning, the staff do not know either the action lines, or the allocation of resources or even how much budget they have, and consequently they either know how to manage the everyday demands within the neighborhoods nor how to elaborate their action plans.

According to the action plan 2014 shared by the Secretariat of Social Promotion to the CCB Nº16, what can be observed is a general plan aiming the achievement of 8 general objectives for Rosario city, including the six districts. This plan includes one objective fully devoted to livelihood programing under the coordination of the sub-secretariat of Solidary Economy. However, the document does not define how the objective will be addressed in terms of methodology, activities and allocation of resources, or which indictors will be used to measure the achievements in terms of impact and success. Additionally, despite the fact that there is no action plan from the Sub-Secretariat of Solidary Economy, crossing information with the action plan defined by the CCB Nº16 has shown that there is no planning for livelihood activities, at least, within the neighborhoods where this study has taken place.

**Monitoring and evaluation, accountability and learning (MEAL):** In terms of monitoring and evaluation, I have identified two aspects that should be reinforced. The first is related to the MEAL of the ongoing projects and programs. The Secretariat of Social Promotion should reinforce its information management, monitoring and evaluation system, including the development of standard tools and systemic unified

\(^{90}\) Interview with Solidary economy extension worker who asked to remain anonymous, 18\(^{th}\) March 2014
data collection for: baseline assessments, post distribution monitoring assessments, activity progress reports, learning from experiences and projects impact assessments. Moreover, it has been found that there are no computers at the CCBNº16, neither for extension workers.

The second is related to researches and studies to improve pro-poor public policies and their impact on the poor. In terms of programs and projects, what has been found is the lack of market assessments which could contribute to improve access to market and self-employment; moreover, studies on labor market requirements should also be included to focus the external support beyond self-employment.

**Training of human resources:** Although technical qualifications are defined and required in job descriptions, a staff such as extension workers (officers directly involved in programs implementation) should have basic knowledge about public policies, institutions and processes in order to be able to provide critical information that really matters to the poor and their livelihood; or refer cases and situations beyond their scope. Therefore, I have identified three key important aspects which need to be permanently updated and reinforced with training amongst the staff.

The first is related to the training of the extension workers and practitioners on pro-poor public policies implemented at municipal, provincial and national levels with the purpose of improving synergies between community process and existing laws, decrees, taxation regimes, projects and programs implemented to maximize efficiency and uses of resources. It has been found that due to the lack of access to information, poor people are deprived from the already available resources that could improve their situation. In part 4, poor knowledge about pro-poor policies among the staff has been evidently found.

The second is related to training on inter-institutional coordination to refer cases of multiple and complex situations, using the available network of institutions. It has been found poor inter-institutional coordination, exacerbated by the lack of human resources.

The third is related to training on monitoring and evaluation, methodologies and approaches to improve livelihood of the poor. Regarding methodologies and tools, this thesis has attempted to show an example of methodology for livelihood approach focused on the improvement of household livelihood security, with short, medium and long term period perspective of programs and projects implemented in synergies aiming provision, protection and creation of livelihood.
7. Appendix
Argentina’s Map\textsuperscript{91}

\begin{itemize}
\item Available at: \url{https://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/argentina.html} accessed 11\textsuperscript{th} on May 2014
\end{itemize}
7.1. Appendix 1: Questionnaires

**Semi-structure interviews with Individuals**

1- According to the information recorded in the “RUB” at the “Programa Crecer” your living and economic situation in 2000 was very difficult, may you please explain the reasons that made you fall in such situation?
2- Which period of time do you consider as the most difficult since 2000 until these days? Why? Can you describe personal and external factors such as risk, shocks, and trends affecting you?
3- How did you respond to the shocks and trends that you faced? What were your coping and adapting mechanisms?
4- Which circumstances /persons/institutions/organizations helped you during difficult times in your attempt to move forward?
5- What are the main individual’s/household’s assets possessed (owned, held in common, available through varied means)? How has it been acquired over the time? (this was checked out according to the asset`s pentagon described in the theoretical framework)
6- How is the Intra-household allocation of activities and responsibilities? Have you taken loans and beds?
7- May you please describe, as much as you can, the details of the livelihood activities implemented by yourself since 2000 until these days? Which are the supporting and the limiting factors that have been affecting you and your livelihoods activities? Is any of these activities disapproved/discouraged/illegal according to the social norms?
8- May you please explain, what, in your viewpoint, is considered as a key constrain for each of the mentioned livelihood activity, (including barriers to entry such as: capital, cash, skill, knowledge, social influence, political influence, etc.)?
9- May you please explain the key problems and risks for each mentioned livelihood activity?
10- What are your livelihoods goals? How have you managed to overcome constraints and achieved livelihoods goals, and what are the results?
11- What are the livelihood activities of the poorest within this neighborhood? Why do they follow these activities?
12- What are the livelihood activities of the rich? Have these activities made them rich. If not, how have they accumulated wealth?

---


93 This question considers the differentiation of livelihood activities by: gender (relation to the head of the household and age); by its continuity over the time (occasional, regular, and constant); by the level of return, (which activity/ies is/are the main income earner/s?); And finally by identifying which of the mentioned activity/ies can be considered as “coping strategy activities”, and which could be considered “capital accumulative”?
13-How have the governmental social assistance and/or humanitarian organizations supported you in your efforts to achieve livelihoods goals? What can be improved?
14- Is there any recommendation from you to any organization or governmental institution working to improve livelihoods activities?

Personal information
15- How old are you? What is your level of education? Whom do you live with at the moment?
16- How many people are living with you in the same household? How many of them are children?
17. How much income did you get during the last month? And, how much income did the rest of the people in this household get during the last month?

Interview guide with Key informants
1. Could you please describe, according to your knowledge, what are the major challenge that the poorest face in their livelihood activities in Rosario?
2. Have you witnessed some successful experiences of chronic poor escaping poverty? How have they managed to do that? Which kind of livelihood strategy have they implemented?
3. Do you find key essential factors that contribute positively on people’s livelihoods?
4. According to your knowledge, may you explain to me when you consider a livelihood strategy successful?

Added questions to key informant from CBO, NGO, Government
5. Which program/s does your organization implement in this neighborhood to improve the livelihoods of the poor? And, how it is coordinated among the different stakeholders?
6. What kind of activities does your organization implement? And, which kind of support does your organization provide to the poorest?
7. Are the activities implemented, monitored and evaluated by your organization?
8. In your opinion, what are the weaknesses that you can identify in your program, activities?
9. In your opinion, what can be improved, what is your recommendation?
### 7.2. Appendix 2: Interviewees

**Individual/households participants Interviewees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Civil status</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>HH size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VM0225</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Primary Uncompleted</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MR0226</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Concubine</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RC0227</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Concubine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MM0228</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Primary Uncompleted</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RS0306</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Primary Uncompleted</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MM0306</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JA0307</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RG0307</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BC0312</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Secondary uncompleted</td>
<td>Concubine</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AV0312</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Secondary uncompleted</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CG0313</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Secondary uncompleted</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SP0320</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Illiteracy</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.3. Appendix 3, table of interviewees’ income status at the moment of the study

**Interviewees income status at the moment of the study, according to the Total Basic Basket which indicate theoretically whether the individuals/households are located above, between or below the poverty line.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee income current status in relation to the P.L</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>HH size</th>
<th>HH minimum Income needed according to PL Dec. 2013 (Arg. pesos)</th>
<th>Total Income in $ (Arg. pesos)</th>
<th>HH livelihoods Income in $ (Arg. pesos)</th>
<th>Differential income between needed vs achieved (Arg. pesos)</th>
<th>Relation between income achieved and P.L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below PL VM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1951,04</td>
<td>1680,00</td>
<td>300,00</td>
<td>-271,04</td>
<td>0,86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between PL MR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3515,33</td>
<td>4440,00</td>
<td>2300,00</td>
<td>924,67</td>
<td>1,26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above PL RC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1460,39</td>
<td>4400,00</td>
<td>4400,00</td>
<td>2939,61</td>
<td>3,01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between PL MM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3827,03</td>
<td>5200,00</td>
<td>1600,00</td>
<td>1372,97</td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below PL RS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2678,35</td>
<td>2570,00</td>
<td>1650,00</td>
<td>-108,35</td>
<td>0,96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above PL MM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1108,28</td>
<td>7140,00</td>
<td>7140,00</td>
<td>6031,72</td>
<td>6,44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above PL JA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1454,62</td>
<td>2460,00</td>
<td>2000,00</td>
<td>1005,38</td>
<td>1,69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above PL RG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>473,33</td>
<td>1200,00</td>
<td>1200,00</td>
<td>726,67</td>
<td>2,54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below PL BC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4513,94</td>
<td>3580,00</td>
<td>2200,00</td>
<td>-933,94</td>
<td>0,79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above PL AV</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3128,59</td>
<td>6000,00</td>
<td>6000,00</td>
<td>2871,41</td>
<td>1,92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above PL CG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4951,04</td>
<td>7500,00</td>
<td>7500,00</td>
<td>2548,96</td>
<td>1,51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below PL SP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1674,40</td>
<td>1960,00</td>
<td>120,00</td>
<td>285,60</td>
<td>1,17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Energy needs and consumer units by sex and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Energetic Needs (kcal)</th>
<th>Equivalent consumer units according to adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger than one year</td>
<td>Male and female</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>0,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>0,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>0,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>0,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>0,63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>0,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 12 years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.230</td>
<td>0,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 15 years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.580</td>
<td>0,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 17 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.840</td>
<td>1,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 12 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>0,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 15 years</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.140</td>
<td>0,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 17 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.140</td>
<td>0,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.860</td>
<td>1,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30 to 59 years</strong></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td><strong>2.700</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years and more</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.210</td>
<td>0,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 59 years</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years and more</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.730</td>
<td>0,64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: table exerted from MORALES Elena’s table (1988), Basic Food Basket - Buenos Aires, Working paper Nº 3, INDEC/IPA

The methodology can be found in the press release "Monthly Valuation of the Basic Food Basket and Total Basic Basket"

Source: INDEC, Permanent Household Survey (EPH)

---

7.5. **Appendix 5**: Value of the monthly Basic Food Basket and the Total Basic Basket for adult equivalent in the Greater Buenos Aires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Basic Food Basket Extreme poverty line</th>
<th>Inverse Engel Coefficient</th>
<th>Total Basic Basket Poverty Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>209,98</td>
<td>2,22</td>
<td>465,34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>213,42</td>
<td>2,21</td>
<td>472,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>216,26</td>
<td>2,21</td>
<td>477,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>218,26</td>
<td>2,21</td>
<td>482,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>220,60</td>
<td>2,21</td>
<td>487,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>222,77</td>
<td>2,22</td>
<td>494,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>226,22</td>
<td>2,23</td>
<td>503,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>229,01</td>
<td>2,23</td>
<td>509,97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>230,75</td>
<td>2,23</td>
<td>513,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>231,86</td>
<td>2,23</td>
<td>517,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>232,71</td>
<td>2,24</td>
<td>522,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>233,13</td>
<td>2,27</td>
<td>529,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>233,47</td>
<td>2,27</td>
<td>530,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>234,63</td>
<td>2,28</td>
<td>533,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>234,94</td>
<td>2,28</td>
<td>535,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>234,54</td>
<td>2,28</td>
<td>534,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>236,58</td>
<td>2,30</td>
<td>543,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>239,80</td>
<td>2,29</td>
<td>550,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>242,49</td>
<td>2,28</td>
<td>552,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>242,90</td>
<td>2,29</td>
<td>555,94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>245,75</td>
<td>2,28</td>
<td>561,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>249,06</td>
<td>2,27</td>
<td>566,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>254,78</td>
<td>2,27</td>
<td>577,23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the methodology can be found in the press release. "Exploitation of monthly Basic Food Basket and Total Basic Basket".

---

## 7.6. Appendix 6: Key informant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20140212</td>
<td>Silvina Abaroa</td>
<td>Psychologist, Former Coordinator “Crecer” Nº16, now CCB Nº16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20140221</td>
<td>Carla Teppa</td>
<td>Psychologist, Coordinator CCB 16, Secretariat of Social Promotion of the (M.R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20140306</td>
<td>Claudia Manacero</td>
<td>Social Promotion Coordinator for CDM North District, Secretariat of Social Promotion of the (M.R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20140310</td>
<td>Maria Eugenia Reano</td>
<td>Gynecologist, Provincial Health Center Casiano Casas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20140310</td>
<td>Susana Gonzalez</td>
<td>Social Worker, Municipal Health center Nº 20 and Provincial Health Center Casiano Casas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20140310</td>
<td>Susana Bartolome</td>
<td>Secretary of the Sub-secretariat of Solidary Economy, Secretariat of Social Promotion, (M.R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>From 2014021 to 20140414</td>
<td>Dolores Cisterna Gonzalez, Romano Cecilia Ferrari Marcela Camaño,</td>
<td>Technical team CRB Nº 16, (M.R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20140312</td>
<td>Alfredo Oldani</td>
<td>Psychologist, Coordinator of commercialization center “La toma”, Sub-Secretariat of Solidary Economy, Secretariat of Social Promotion, (M.R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20140312</td>
<td>Julia De Marco, Carolina Simiani</td>
<td>Extension Worker of the “program for youth with more and better job” Information Management. Inter-institutional coordination of Municipality, Province and National Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20140318</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Promoter of Solidary Economy, Sub-Secretariat of Economy Solidary, Secretariat of Social Promotion – (M.R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20140318</td>
<td>Angeles Celaya</td>
<td>Director of Family Promotion, Secretariat of Social Promotion of the (M.R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20140408</td>
<td>Guillermo Lasala</td>
<td>General Coordinator of the youth center depending of the Directorate of Public Policy and Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20140411</td>
<td>Maria Eugenia Hulten</td>
<td>Coordinator Especial project at Sub-Secretariat of Economy Solidary, Secretariat of social Promotion of the (M.R).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20140411</td>
<td>Maria Flor Abella</td>
<td>Coordinator of the program: Youth with more and better job, depending on the General Directorate of employment, Secretariat of Production and local Development, Municipality of Rosario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20140415</td>
<td>Josefina Bianchi</td>
<td>Coordinator of social assistance planning for the (M.R), depending on the Secretariat of Social Promotion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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