

LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF OLDER PEOPLE IN SIX LATIN  
AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Susan De Vos

CDE Working Paper 87-40

LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF OLDER PEOPLE IN SIX LATIN  
AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Susan De Vos  
Center for Demography and Ecology  
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Revision of a paper presented at the Population Association of America meetings, San Francisco, 1986.

The author gratefully acknowledges the permission of the statistical offices of Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Panama and Peru to use World Fertility Survey data to study household structure in Latin America. Mr. Beverly Rowe, former head of the Computer and Archive Division of the World Fertility Survey, graciously facilitated the project's access to the data. The research was supported in part by NICHD grant HD18788 and postdoctoral grants AG00129 and HD07014 to the Institute on Aging and the Center for Demography and Ecology of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Cheryl Knobloch provided assistance in data handling; Kerry Richter provided research assistance; and Janice Deneen and Valerie Bower provided secretarial assistance. Karen Holden and Roger Wojtkiewicz provided helpful comments on an earlier version of the paper. Facilities of the Center for Demography and Ecology of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, funded by NICHD Center Grant HD05876 and the Hewlett Foundation are also gratefully acknowledged.

## ABSTRACT

This paper describes the living arrangements of people 60 and over in six Latin American countries: Mexico, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Panama, Colombia and Peru. It examines how living in a complex family household is associated with marital status, age, sex, urban/rural residence and educational attainment. The study speculates that the factors help indicate a perceived need for residence with kin.

The study finds that a majority of people 60 and over in the six countries lived in complex family households, but that sizable proportions did not. Marital status had the most effect on the likelihood of living in a complex family household, unmarried people being much more likely. The likelihood also increased with age and overall was greater for women than for men. In contrast to these findings that are consistent with speculations, urban/rural residence and education had equivocal effects.

## INTRODUCTION

Although the prevailing wisdom is that the family becomes more conjugally oriented with "modernization" (Cowgill and Holmes, 1972; Goode, 1970), and that the extended family household is a "traditional" living arrangement even among older people, it is also generally acknowledged that culture plays an important role in determining the starting point for change and the speed of change (e.g. Palmore and Maeda, 1985). The problem is that we do not know what the cultural factor in Latin America is although there does appear to be a preference for conjugal couples to maintain their own households (De Vos, 1987).(1) This paper attempts to describe the base from which the family position of older people in Latin America is changing. It examines the living arrangements of individuals 60 and over in six Latin American countries.(2) I argue that Latin Americans are often thought of as family-oriented, but that older people there mainly reside with extended kin when there is a perceived need for family assistance.

One might assume that old people in Latin America live with and rely upon children (International Social Security Association, 1982). The assumption seems reasonable in view of the common expectation that the family cares for its elderly members, and the fact that old-age social security programs tend to cover only government employees and workers in "modern" industrial sectors (U.S. Social Security Administration, 1976; Paillas, 1979). However, figures for household headship suggest by their large sizes that many older people in the six Latin American countries might be fairly independent of an extended family (Table 1). Males were more likely to head their own households than was true in the United States in 1900 or in Spain or Japan in 1970

(e.g. at about 86% among those aged 65-69). They were similarly inclined compared to the U.S. in 1960. The picture for female headship is similar.

On the other hand, we do not know to what extent elderly people live alone or with others as household heads. Also, headship could be merely symbolic; the head could be economically dependent on other household members. Rather, we need to know the actual extent to which older people live in complex family households and how this is related to factors associated with perceived need for coresidence.

#### Commonality and Diversity

I choose to approach a study of the household arrangements of older people in six Latin American countries by making generalizations about the populations at the same time as acknowledging their diversity. There is no question that there is diversity among Latin American countries. For example, the economies of the six Latin American countries studied (as measured by per capita GNP) range from less developed (at a 1981 per capita GNP of US\$1,122 in Peru) to somewhat more developed (at a per capita GNP of US\$2,250 in Mexico). Each country has its own blend of Spanish, Indian, African and "modern" influences that may lead to differences in household organization. At the same time, commonalities such as cultural heritage, economic peripheralization and marital patterns warrant studying the six countries as a group.

The argument advanced here is that there is considerable diversity in Latin America just as there is diversity in Western or Eastern countries. However, there are also commonalities that influence household organization, making it different from that in other regions. If one wants to approach a cultural region with a broad perspective, one searches for commonalities. If, on the other hand, one wants particulars one is sure to find them. I prefer to stress commonalities, although the approach has its limits. In the end, I provide both an average for the countries under study, and results for individual countries so the reader can take either approach.

#### DATA AND METHOD

##### Data

The study uses data from nationally-representative de jure samples of people 60 and more years of age extracted from World Fertility Survey household(3) samples of Mexico, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Panama, Colombia and Peru. Sample sizes range from 1,405 in Costa Rica to 4,030 in Mexico. I omit between 1 and 4 percent of these elderly individuals because they were unrelated to the household head (e.g. servants, boarders or "secondary" individuals) and I am investigating family arrangements. People 60 years and over constituted between 5 and 7 percent of the entire sample populations.(4) More information regarding the data can be found in De Vos, 1985 or in Kabir, 1980.

Motivating The Hypotheses

In my introductory remarks, I speculated that it was reasonable to expect a majority of older people in the six Latin American countries to reside with kin, but that coresidence probably varied according to the perceived need for coresidence, and that one also needed to consider an apparent cultural norm to respect the autonomy of conjugal couples. Further, modernization theories by people such as William Goode (1970) and Donald Cowgill (1974) lead one to expect a negative association between urban residence and education on the one hand, and "traditional" complex family living on the other.

We know that coresidence according to marital status, age and sex varies between cultures: that in some Western countries, unmarried women are much more likely to live with other family members than married women or than men of either marital status (see e.g. Stehouwer, 1968) probably because unmarried women especially need to rely on family members for financial well-being. We also know that age is related to frailty, and that in the West frailty is associated with living with other family members. On the other hand, it appears that most older people lived in extended family arrangements in Japan in 1970 regardless of their sex, marital status or age (Palmore, 1975).

We also know enough about Latin America to be skeptical that household organization follows either a Western or East Asian pattern, but we do not know what that pattern might be. Since I hypothesize that need helps explain older people's variance in living in a complex family household, I speculate that the likelihood of doing so is higher among unmarried people, increases with age, and is greater for women than for

men. I reason that unmarried people are more likely than married people to live in complex family households because married people have the option of living with a related person in the case of an empty nest but unmarried people may only have the option of living in a nonfamily arrangement or a complex family household. Also, the likelihood of still having a never-married child at home declines with age, while physical frailty or the need to live with other family members increases with age. Finally, in Latin culture women are thought to be in need of more assistance from family than are men.

We also have reason to be skeptical about a simplistic application of modernization theories to Latin America. Consider first the effect of urban residence. Reviewers like Butterworth and Chance (1981) cite numerous studies that find extended family living to be both useful and fairly common in urban areas of Latin America, (see also Lopes, 1976) although I am not aware of any study that addresses this issue in terms of older people. So what are we to expect? That urban/rural residence makes little difference.

Less empirical work has been done on the assumed association between education and living arrangement, although the study by van der Tak and Gendell on Guatemala City (1973) leads one to be skeptical of a negative association between education and complex family living as well. Certainly the finding of Lira (1976) for an area in Chile in which the non-manual occupation of the household head was bivariately associated with living in an extended family household is not consistent with "modernization" theories. My reasoning is this: if education were indicative of having more resources with which to live out a preference, and if the preference were for living alone like in the United States



(Soldo, 1981), then we could expect higher education to be negatively associated with complex family living. But we do not know what the preference is, and beside a more traditional perspective might be held by rural residents while the more modern perspective might be held by urban residents. Thus if there is any association between education and the likelihood of living in a complex family household, I expect it to be negative in urban areas, consistent with modernization notions, but nonexistent elsewhere.

### Variables

Distributions of each variable for pooled samples and for each country are shown in Table A-1.

Living Arrangements. Living arrangements of older people are coded differently according to marital status but do not depend on the presence of household members who are unrelated to the head.(5) For unmarried people, an individual is coded as living in a:

- 1) 'nonfamily' household,
- 2) simple family household or
- 3) complex family household.

'Nonfamily' living includes living alone (or in solitary households) or only with nonrelatives ('no family' households). Simple family households are composed of the older person and his/her never married children. Complex family households contain individuals who belong to more than one conjugal unit (e.g. a widowed person and his/her married child).

Married older people can live in:

- 1) an 'empty nest,'
- 2) a simple family household with never married children or,
- 3) a complex family household.

Empty nest households are comprised of a couple only. Simple family households with children are comprised of a couple and their never married children. Complex family households contain members who belong to more than one conjugal unit (e.g. the older couple, a married child and grandchildren).

Marital Status. The marital status of older people is divided simply into married or unmarried. Married individuals are those who currently live with a spouse whether or not they are reported as doing so by the survey.(6) This includes people who are living in a consensual union as well as those who are legally married. The legally married by far constitute the majority of these cases (Table A-1). Unmarried people are those who never married, were divorced, separated, or widowed at the time of the survey. Widowed people constitute the majority of unmarried older people, but separated people constitute a sizable proportion of the unmarried as well, especially in the Dominican Republic and Peru (Table A-1).

Age. Age is divided into three groups, designed to distinguish differences in retirement probabilities and physical limitations. They are ages 60-64, 65-69, and 70 years and more.

Sex. The coding of sex is straightforward.

Urban/rural residence. Except in the Dominican Republic, residence is coded in three categories: capital city or major metropolitan area, other urban areas, and rural areas. In most countries, the capital is qualitatively different from other urban areas and should be separated from them. In the Dominican Republic, it was not possible to make this differentiation.

Education. Education is the best variable available in the survey to indicate possible class or socioeconomic status. It is, however, problematic for two reasons. First, educational attainment varies between countries, being highest in Panama and lowest in the Dominican Republic. Second, the number of years required to graduate from primary school differs, in some cases being five years while in other countries it is six (in the Dominican Republic it is eight, see also De Vos, 1985). Yet I consider finishing a curriculum more important than simple years of education, and code education in terms of not completing, completing, and going to school even after completing primary school. The group of people with no schooling is also considered, making education a variable with four categories.

#### Method

The study always uses multivariate techniques to examine differentials in living arrangement because age, sex and marital status are too intertwined to make their separate association with living arrangements interesting. For instance, the chance of widowhood greatly increases with age, and is also strongly related to sex. Demographic characteristics are also controlled when estimating the effects of urban/rural residence and education.

Since the definition of living arrangement uses marital status as a criterion, I control for marital status by estimating separate regressions for married and unmarried individuals. The samples are sufficiently large to allow for this dichotomization.

I focus on the likelihood that an older person lives in a complex family household, the reasons being that this is the predominant arrangement and the one of theoretical interest here. I first look at the overall likelihood that older people live in a complex family household. Then, for unmarried people, I examine the contrasts between

- a) complex v. nonfamily living, and
- b) complex v. simple family with children living.

For married people, I examine the conditional contrasts of

- a) complex v. empty nest family living, and
- b) complex v. simple family with children living.

The purpose of the more detailed breakdown is to examine the reason why the overall relationship might be so.

I estimate a series of logit and multinomial logit models in each country and for all countries combined. The approach has the advantage over ordinary least squares that it does not assume homoskedasticity in the error term, and the dependent variable cannot leave its range. Estimates are derived from the GLIM (Baker and Nelder, 1978) and MLOGIT (Hall, 1980) software packages.

In accord with my attempt to generalize about all six Latin American countries, I estimate unweighted averages as well as effects for specific countries. In the cases of marital status, age and sex, in which there are data for all six countries, these unweighted averages

are based on weighting each country as one-sixth of the total. In the case of residence in which the coding in the Dominican Republic is different from elsewhere, five countries are used and weighted one-fifth. In the case of education, Mexico is omitted. In the case of testing for an interaction between residence and education, four countries, excluding both the Dominican Republic and Mexico, are used.

Results are reported in terms of relative likelihoods, transformed from their additive log form to their natural multiplicative (antilog) form. For example overall, a married individual 70 or more years old is estimated to be 1.15 times as likely to live in a complex family household as is a married person 60-64 years old, after controlling for sex (Table 3).

## RESULTS

Marital Status

Roughly 20 percent of the married older people lived as solitary couples (in empty nest households) while another 30 percent lived in simple family households with never-married children. See Table 2. A half still lived in complex family households. In contrast, and consistent with speculations, about 70 percent of unmarried older people lived in complex family households, while about 12 percent lived with never-married children, and about 18 percent lived in non-family households, mainly alone.(7) The figures do not, of course, control for age or sex.

When age and sex are controlled, the estimated likelihood that a married older person lives in a complex family household is only half that of an unmarried person (Panel B of Table 2). Marital status then is probably the strongest demographic determinant of whether an older person lives in a complex family household.

Age

The effect of age differs by marital status (when controlling for sex). See Table 3. Among married people for example, on average people 70 years and over are only 1.15 times more likely to live in complex family households than people 60-64 years old (Column 1). The likelihood of living in a complex family household instead of a simple family household with children, 1.93 times, is diminished by the lower likelihood compared to living in an empty nest, 0.55 times (Columns 3 and 2). That is, married older people are LESS likely to live in a

complex family household compared to an empty nest with increasing age, rather than MORE likely. This is true among older married people in all six countries, and is consistent with the notion that the conjugal couple is considered autonomous.

Among unmarried older people, people 70 and older are 1.32 times more likely than people 60-64 to live in complex family households (Table 3 Column 4). This is almost entirely due to their greater likelihood with age of living in a complex family household rather than a simple household with never-married children (Column 6). On average, the contrast between living in a complex family household compared to a nonfamily household does not vary (significantly) with age (Column 5). There appears to be a propensity for MOST unmarried older people to live in complex family households rather than alone, irrespective of age within the 60 years and over group.

#### Sex

Since women tend to marry men who are older than they and to be younger when children leave home, there can be and are significant differences between married women and men of the same age (after controlling for age) in the likelihood of living in a complex family household compared to some other arrangement (Column 1 of Table 4). Married women's greater likelihood of living in a complex family household is due exclusively to their greater likelihood of living in a complex family household rather than a simple family household with never-married children (Column 3). Married women are actually LESS likely than married men of a comparable age to live in a complex family household rather than an empty nest (Column 2). (Put in the other way,

they are more likely to live in an empty nest.)

Unmarried older women are also more likely than unmarried men of a similar age to live in a complex family household, on average 1.90 times so (Column 4 of Table 4). This is largely due to their greater propensity to live with other family members rather than in a non-family arrangement. Indeed, although the effect of sex on the contrast between living in a complex family household compared to in a single parent family household is statistically significant for all six countries combined, it is not significant in four of the six countries when estimated separately (Column 6).

It was possible to use a demographic factor (age at marriage) to explain much of the differences found between married women and married men in their propensity to live in a complex family household, but this is less reasonable in the case of unmarried women and men. Instead, we must speculate that women are either more economically dependent or emotionally closer to extended kin than are men.

#### Urban/Rural Residence

A lower likelihood of extended family living among urbanites compared to their rural counterparts would be consistent with a "modernization" trend toward increased independent living among the elderly as well as more family-centeredness among rural residents. The evidence is only partly consistent with this notion however (Table 5). For instance, among the pooled sample from five countries, residence was significant controlling for age and sex, but in contrasting ways for the two marital statuses. Among married people, rural residents were somewhat more likely to live in complex family households than were



residents of the country's major metropolitan area, but among unmarried people, the opposite was true. Among married people, the difference appears entirely due to a significant difference between living in a complex family household compared to an empty nest. Among unmarried people, the difference appears entirely due to the difference between living in a complex v. non-family household.

I am uneasy about these overall results. Among married people, results are not only statistically insignificant in some of the countries, but they are actually opposite the overall results--in Peru for instance. This was found even after residence was transformed into a trichotmous variable from a simple "urban/rural" split (see also p. ). We might be skepticle along with Lira (1976) about the definitions of 'urban' and 'rural.'

#### Education

The findings for education were equivocal, also suggesting the necessity for additional research. First, overall there was a relationship between people with higher education having a lower propensity to live in a complex household (in five countries not including Mexico), but there was no significant relationship among married individuals in two of the five countries or among unmarried individuals in four of the five countries (Table 6).

Second, there was a significant relationship in the expected direction among married individuals among a four country average (not including Mexico or the Dominican Republic for data reasons) for metropolitan areas but not for rural areas (Table 7). This would certainly accord with a modernization perspective. But individual

country findings were more equivocal, especially in Peru. Indeed, it appears that the findings for Costa Rica and Panama (although the Panamanian results are insignificant and the sample sizes particularly small) determined the overall finding. It might be important that educational attainment was higher in these two countries than in the others, and that education might have more of a stratification effect there. My tentative conclusion, based on these data, is that the theory might hold in Costa Rica but not in Colombia or Peru. I am even less sure about the other countries.

It is noteworthy, furthermore, that education had no effect on the complex family living of unmarried older people overall or in any of the individual countries. Perhaps people considered to be in most need of something, whether financial resources or just companionship, are usually incorporated into a complex family household. Married people, on the other hand, may be considered to be in less need and may prefer to live separately.

#### SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this paper has been to describe and examine some of the factors behind the living arrangements of people 60 years and older in six Latin America countries: Mexico, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Panama, Colombia and Peru. The study used data from nationally-representative household files of the World Fertility Survey gathered in the middle 1970's. Living arrangements were coded using a modification of Eugene Hammel and Peter Laslett's household typology.

Although two dimensions of household organization in Latin America are the relative independence of the conjugal unit and the importance of an extended family, it was unclear at the outset how this might be expressed in terms of older peoples' living arrangements. The study found that a majority of older people lived in complex family households, but that this was considerably more so for unmarried people than for married people. In addition, a significant number of both married and unmarried older people still lived in simple family households with one or more never-married children. This latter situation was common because many people did not have their last child until their 40's or 50's.

I speculated that factors potentially indicating perceived need for coresidence could help explain variation in living arrangements among older people. To test this, I examined the effects of marital status, age and sex on the likelihood of living in a complex family household controlling for the other variables. Consistent with speculations, unmarried older people were much more likely than currently-married people to live in complex family households. Age was not as important on average, and among the married, people 70 years and above were generally less likely than people 60-69 to live in a complex family household rather than an 'empty nest' household (with a spouse only). Finally, women were more likely to live in complex family households than were men, but this depended both on marital status and on the alternative to complex family living. Although unmarried women were much more likely than unmarried men to live in a complex family household instead of a non-family household, married women were less likely than married men to live in a complex family household rather

than an empty nest.

I wondered whether socioeconomic differentials in living arrangement might be consistent with a "modernization" hypothesis: whether individuals in urban areas, or with greater educational attainment in urban areas were less likely to live in a complex household and more likely to live in a non-family or "empty nest" household than were their counterparts. In general, the data did not support such suppositions. Overall, complex family living was greater in rural areas among the married but less among the unmarried; and among the married, some countries had a tendency opposite the average. For education, there was an overall negative relationship among married people in the major urban area, but not among unmarried older people. The relationship appeared clearest in Costa Rica, in contrast to Peru.

I emphasize that the results from all six countries tended to be similar, especially with regard to demographic characteristics. At the same time, it is useful to note differences. It appears that Colombia and Peru follow an extended family system most closely whereas the Dominican Republic and Panama tend to have the least "nuclear" family system, with the lowest incidence of husband-wife-children or single-parent households. It appears that Costa Rica and Mexico follow the most "conjugal" of the extended family systems. This implies that among the six countries, change in Mexico and Costa Rica might be most similar to that which occurred in the United States, change toward more separate living among older people.

Since the data for this study were cross-sectional although we tried to address some ideas stemming from "modernization" theories, it is possible that more couples will choose to live in "empty nest" households rather than complex family households in the future if they have the means, such as through adequate pensions, to do so. Certainly the proportion of unmarried individuals who live in non-family households, roughly 18 percent, is no cause for complacency concerning the willingness or ability on the part of older people or extended family members to share living arrangements.

Another point is that all of the countries are experiencing radical demographic and socioeconomic changes likely to affect household arrangements. Cohorts entering their old age in the future will have faced a different set of pressures than is true among older people today. Still, household forms appear to reflect cultural resiliency in spite of large-scale changes such that the living arrangements of older people today should provide some predictive power for the situation of older people in the coming years.

## FOOTNOTES

(1) Little research on family or household structures has been performed in Latin America. Aside from occasional small-scale studies that focus on only one village or area (e.g. Deere, 1978; Kendall, 1978; see Carlos and Sellers) one must rely on the rather limited compilation of essays in such edited volumes as those by Das and Jessor (1980) or Marks and Romer (1975). In Spanish, the classic study of the Colombian family by Gutierrez de Pineda (1968; see also Ordonez, 1986) and the compilation of studies edited by Burch et al. (1976) provide some insight but make us all the more acutely aware of how little we know.

(2) Mexico, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Panama, Colombia and Peru. Although the Dominican Republic can be considered part of the Caribbean, and separate from countries of Central and South America, I consider it part of Latin America because Dominicans have an Hispanic cultural heritage.

(3) "Members of a household live together and eat together. Hence a household is not NECESSARILY a dwelling or a family (though in many cases it is). For example, servants or friends living with the family are members of the household but may not be family members. Also, especially in urban areas, there may often be more than one household in a single dwelling." (Page 11 in "Interviewers' Instructions," Basic Documentation no 6 of the World Fertility Survey 1975).

(4) A slightly greater proportion of the survey populations tended to be reported as 60 years and over compared to in national censuses, as reported in the U.N. Demographic Yearbook, but the differences were in a

reasonable range (generally less than half a percent per five-year age group).

(5) A modification of the Hammel/Laslett household typology (1974), the typology shares many characteristics of the Shanas et al. gerontological typology (Shanas et al., 1968; Shanas, 1973) as in its different categorization depending on marital status. Yet it is better because the hierarchical nature of the Shanas et al. scheme causes unnecessary difficulties in interpretation. Also, the definition of a child as "unmarried" is not specific enough. In Latin America, many "unmarried" children are "formerly married" (separated, divorced, widowed, an unwed mother, or married but not living with a spouse) as well as "never married." By combining all of them merely as "unmarried," one loses the distinction between living in an extended family household or simply in a nuclear family household. Although it would be possible to ignore the marital status of children altogether (Palmore, 1975), this would be unsatisfactory because it would confuse the two very different arrangements. Instead, I prefer to measure directly whether the household is extended or not.

Also, whereas the Shanas et al. scheme has five alternative household types per person, this scheme has only three. This makes it easier to perform multivariate analyses that analyze choices between living in one or another living arrangement.

Finally, some individuals do not have children and instead depend on other relatives in their old age. Yet it is not clear from a simple distribution whether people live with other relatives only because they have no children or because they or their children do not choose to live

together. In my scheme, I combine into one category people who live in complex family households, whether those households include married children or not. Since almost everyone has kin (whether real or fictitious), everyone has the possibility of living in a complex family household.

(6) Between 0.7 and 4.9 percent of the samples were reported as married but did not reside with a spouse. These individuals are considered unmarried in this study.

(7) There were a couple of households in which the older person lived as a never-married child in a household with yet an older parent, but in most cases, the person 60 years or older was the parent.



## REFERENCES

- Baker, R.J. and J.A. Nelder. 1978. The GLIM System Release 3 Generalised Linear Interactive Modeling Manual (The Statistical Society and Numerical Algorithms Group: Oxford).
- Burch, Thomas K., Luis Felipe Lira and Valdecir F. Lopes (eds.). 1976. La Familia Como Unidad de Estudio Demografico (Centro Latinoamericano de Demografia: San Jose, Costa Rica).
- Butterworth, Douglas and John K. Chance. 1981. Latin American Urbanization (Cambridge University Press: New York).
- Carlos, Manuel L. and Lois Sellers. 1972. "Family, Kinship Structure and Modernization in Latin America," Latin American Research Review 7(2):95-124.
- Cowgill, Donald O. 1974. "The Aging of Populations and Societies," The Annals of the American Academy Vol. 415 (Sept.)
- Cowgill, Donald O. and Lowell D. Holmes (eds.). 1972. Aging and Modernization (Meredith Corp.: New York).
- Dahlin, Michel. 1980. "Perspectives on the Family Life of the Elderly in 1900," The Gerontologist 20(1):99-107.
- Das, Man Singh and Clinton J. Jesser (eds.). 1980. The Family in Latin America (Vikas Pub. House Pvt. Ltd.: New Delhi).
- De Vos, Susan. 1987. "Latin American Households in Comparative Perspective," Population Studies 41:501-517.
- De Vos, Susan. 1985. "Using World Fertility Survey Data to Study

Household Composition: Latin America," CDE Working Paper 85-22  
(University of Wisconsin Center for Demography and Ecology:  
Madison, WI).

Deere, Carmen Diana. 1978. "The Differentiation of the Peasantry and  
Family Structure: A Peruvian Case Study," Journal of Family  
History 3(4):422-438.

Goode, William J. 1970 (2nd edition). "World Changes in Family Patterns,"  
Chapter 1 in World Revolution and Family Patterns (The Free  
Press: New York).

Gutierrez de Pineda, Virginia. 1968. Familia y Cultura en Colombia  
(Tercer Mundo: Bogota).

Hammel, Eugene A. and Peter Laslett. 1974. "Comparing Household  
Structure Over Time and Between Cultures," Comparative  
Studies in Society and History 16(1):73-109.

Hall, Bronwyn H. 1980. MLOGIT: A Program for Conditional Logit  
Estimation by the Method of Maximum Likelihood (Stanford, CA).

International Social Security Association. 1982 "Social Security  
and the Elderly: Background Document Prepared for the World  
Assembly on Aging by the International Society Security  
Association International Social Security Review  
35(4):489-527.

Kabir, Mohammad. 1980. "The Demographic Characteristics of Household  
Populations," WFS Comparative Studies no.6 (International  
Union for the Scientific Study of Population: The Hague, the

Netherlands).

- Kendall, Carl. 1978. "Female-Headed Households and Domestic Organization in San Isidro, Guatemala: A Test of Hammel and Laslett's Comparative Typology," Journal of Comparative Family Studies 9(1):129-141.
- Lira, Luis F. 1976. "Aspectos Demograficos de la Familia en una Provincia de Chile Segun el Censo de 1970," pp.261-304 in Burch et al. (eds.) La Familia Como Unidad de Estudio Demografico (CELADE: San Jose, Costa Rica).
- Lopes, Valdecir F. 1976. "La Familia en el Brasil, Segun el Censo de Poblacion de 1960," pp.141-168 in La Familia Como Unidad de Estudio Demografico (CELADE: San Jose, Costa Rica).
- Marks, Arnaud F. and Rene A. Romer (eds.). 1975. Family and Kinship in Middle America and the Caribbean (International Sociological Association).
- Ordonez G., Miriam. 1986. Poblacion y Familia Rural en Colombia (Pontificia Universidad Javeriana: Bogota, Colombia).
- Paillas, Carlos A. 1979. "Pensions in Latin America: The Present Situation," International Social Security Review 32(3): 299-303.
- Palmore, Erdman. 1975. The Honorable Elders: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Aging in Japan (Duke University Press: Durham, N.C.).
- Palmore, Erdman and Daisaku Maeda. 1985. The Honorable Elders

Revisited (Duke University Press: Durham, N.C.).

Shanas, Ethel. 1973. "Family-Kin Networks and Aging in Cross-Cultural Perspective," Journal of Marriage and the Family August pp. 505-511.

Shanas, Ethel; Peter Townsend, Dorothy Wedderburn, Henning Friis, Poul Milhoj, and Jan Stehouwer. 1968. Old People in Three Industrial Societies (Atherton Press: New York).

Soldo, Beth. 1981. "The Living Arrangements of the Elderly in the Near Future," pp.491-512 in Sara B. Kiesler, James N. Morgan and Valerie Kincade Oppenheimer (eds.) Aging: Social Change

Stehouwer, Jan. 1968. "The Household and Family Relations of Old People," Chapter 7 in Ethel Shanas et al. Old People in Three Industrial Societies

United Nations. 1981. "Estimates and Projections of the Number of Households by Country, 1975-2000," (ESA/P/WF., U.N.:N.Y.).

U.S. Social Security Administration. 1976. Social Security Programs Throughout the World, 1975 (Government Printing Office: Washington, D.C.)

van der Tak, Jean and Murray Gendell. 1973. "The Size and Structure of Residential Families, Guatemala City, 1964," Population Studies 27:305-322.

\$

Table 1. Age-Sex Specific Household Headship Rates for Older People 55 and Above in the United States (1900, 1960, 1970), Japan (1960, 1970) and Six Latin American countries (middle 1970s)\*

Country	Male			Female		
	55-64	65-74	75+	55-64	65-74	75+
	Total					
United States						
1900	88	79	64	22	28	25
1960	90	---83---		24	---36---	
1970	95	93	86	27	42	51
Japan						
1960	91	---63---		14	---10---	
1970	92	---68---		19	---13---	
Six Country Average	91	86	78	30	36	36
Colombia (1976)	89	83	74	29	32	30
Costa Rica (1976)	88	84	72	27	33	38
Dominican Republic (1975)	91	85	82	37	48	46
Mexico (1976/77)	93	89	82	26	33	34
Panama (1976)	90	87	80	34	41	44
Peru (1977)	92	88	76	26	31	26

The six country average is an unweighted average. Figures for Colombia and Peru are based on weighted counts.

Sources: Figures for the United States in 1900 and 1970 come from Dahlin (1980) Table #2. "1970 figures came from Neugarten (1974). These figures include the less than 3% of the population who are institutionalized; the 1900 figures, however are for the non-institutionalized old population only." 1960 figures come from United Nations (1981) p.35 Table #9.

Figures for Japan come from United Nations (1981) p.35 Table #9.

Figures for the six Latin American and Caribbean countries come from the household samples of the World Fertility Survey.

Table 2. The Relative Odds of Living In One or Another Living Arrangement By Age Among Individuals 60 Years and Over in Six Latin American Countries in the Middle 1970's--in Multiplicative Form (controlling for sex)

	Married Individuals						
	Complex v. Other	Complex v. Empty Nest	Complex v. Simple with Children	Complex v. Other	Complex v. Non-family	Complex v. Single Parent	
Unweighted 6							
Country Average	*	*	*	*	ns	*	
65-69	1.04	0.76	1.21	1.10	0.97	1.30	
70-	1.15	0.55	1.93	1.32	1.10	1.75	
Colombia	*	*	*	*	*	*	
65-69	1.44	0.94	1.72	1.65	1.69	1.62	
70-	1.41	0.62	2.17	1.63	1.50	1.77	
Costa Rica	*	*	*	*	*	*	
65-69	0.77	0.63	0.82	1.15	1.04	1.23	
70-	0.72	0.34	1.07	1.61	1.25	2.01	
Dom. Rep.	*	*	*	*	*	ns	
65-69	1.13	0.70	1.41	0.74	0.67	0.93	
70-	1.57	0.65	2.64	0.93	0.74	1.60	
Mexico	ns	*	*	*	ns	*	
65-69	1.16	0.74	1.52	1.28	1.25	1.34	
70-	0.98	0.43	1.95	1.27	1.04	1.74	
Panama	ns	*	*	ns	*	ns	
65-69	0.84	0.68	1.00	0.77	0.61	1.39	
70-	1.09	0.65	1.97	0.97	0.83	1.35	
Peru	*	ns	*	*	*	*	
65-69	1.15	0.99	1.25	1.36	1.19	1.77	
70-	1.51	0.70	2.64	1.86	1.65	2.26	

Omitted category is of individuals 60-64 years of age.

\* The whole variable was found to be Chi-squared significant at  $p < .05$ .

ns The whole variable was not Chi-square significant at  $p < .05$ .

Estimates for Colombia and Peru are based on weighted samples.

Source: World Fertility Household subsamples of individuals 60 years or above.

Table 3. The Multiplicative Logit (Antilog) Effect of Being Female on the Likelihood of Being in One or Another Living Arrangement (controlling for age)--Six Latin American Countries in the Middle 1970s

Country	Married				Unmarried		
	Complex v. Other	Complex v. Empty Nest	Complex v. Simple with Children	Complex v. Other	Complex v. non-family	Complex v. Single Parent	
Unweighted 6 Country Average	* 1.22	* 0.68	* 1.91	* 1.90	* 2.47	* 1.24	
Colombia	* 1.38	ns 0.75	* 1.96	* 1.70	* 1.97	* 1.48	
Costa Rica	ns 1.27	ns 0.74	* 1.68	ns 1.25	* 2.00	ns 0.71	
Dom. Rep.	* 1.42	* 0.64	* 2.51	* 2.72	* 3.14	* 1.84	
Mexico	ns 1.16	* 0.68	* 1.89	* 1.43	* 1.66	ns 1.15	
Panama	ns 0.95	* 0.57	* 2.15	ns 2.57	* 3.10	ns 1.58	
Peru	* 1.38	ns 0.75	* 2.15	* 2.05	* 2.59	ns 1.29	

\* Variable (sex) is Chi-square significant at  $p < .05$ .

ns Variable is not significant at Chi-square  $p < .05$ .

Estimates for Colombia and Peru are based on use of weights.

Source: World Fertility Survey subsamples of individuals 60 years and older.

Table 4. Living Arrangements of Individuals 60 Years and Older in Six Latin American Countries in the Mid-1970's by Marital Status

	Percentage Distribution							
	Married				Unmarried			
	Empty Nest	Hus/Wife with Child	Complex	Sample Size	Non-Family	Single Parent	Complex	Sample Size
Unweighted Average	20	30	50		18	12	70	
Colombia	16	35	49	(1443)	13	15	72	(1327)
Costa Rica	17	35	48	( 756)	16	15	69	( 608)
Dominican Republic	14	25	61	(1564)	21	8	70	(1364)
Mexico	27	33	40	(2320)	19	12	69	(1663)
Panama	29	25	46	( 753)	23	9	68	( 800)
Peru	17	30	53	(1448)	19	11	70	(1072)

B. The Multiplicative (antilog) Logit Effect of Being Married (vs. unmarried) on the Likelihood of Living in a Complex Family Household--controlling for age and sex

6 Country Average	0.50*
Colombia	0.46*
Costa Rica	0.46*
Dominican Republic	0.92ns
Mexico	0.34*
Panama	0.46*
Peru	0.60*

\* Significant at Chi-square < .05

ns Not significant at Chi-square < .05

Estimates for Colombia and Peru are based on weights.

Source: World Fertility Survey household subsamples.



Table 5. The Effect of Urban/Rural Residence on the Living Arrangements of Individuals 60 Years of Age and Over in Six Latin American Countries in the mid 1970s (controlling for age and sex)

Country	Married			Unmarried		
	Complex v. Other	Complex v. Empty Nest	Complex v. Simple Family with Children	Complex v. Other	Complex v. Non-family	Complex v. Simple Family With Children
Unweighted 5 Country Average (less Dominican Republic)	*	*	ns	*	*	ns
Other Urban	1.25	1.66	1.06	0.92	1.03	0.78
Rural	1.15	1.20	1.13	0.79	0.80	0.78
Colombia	*	ns	*	ns	ns	ns
Other Urban	1.12	0.86	1.22	1.11	1.02	1.18
Rural	1.47	0.90	1.85	1.10	0.85	1.43
Costa Rica	ns	*	ns	ns	ns	ns
Other Urban	1.49	2.17	1.23	0.79	1.23	0.52
Rural	1.19	1.78	0.97	0.78	0.90	0.66
Dom. Rep.	ns	ns	ns	*	*	ns
Rural	0.83	0.89	0.82	0.71	0.67	0.82
Mexico	*	ns	*	*	*	*
Other urban	1.10	1.15	1.03	0.69	0.63	0.81
Rural	1.31	1.16	1.40	0.60	0.66	0.66
Panama	ns	*	ns	*	*	*
Other urban	1.72	2.38	1.30	1.75	2.09	1.30
Rural	1.11	1.40	0.87	0.68	0.75	0.87
Peru	ns	*	ns	ns	*	ns
Other urban	1.02	0.76	1.14	0.75	0.41	1.48
Rural	0.82	0.44	1.17	0.83	0.45	1.72

The omitted category in the five cases is the capital city or the major metropolitan area. In the Dominican Republic, the omitted category is "urban."

\* Variable Chi-square significant at  $p < .05$ .

ns Variable not significant for Chi-square at  $p < .05$ .

Table 6. The Multiplicative Logit (antilog) Effect of Education on the Living Arrangements of People 60 or More Years of Age in Six Latin American Countries in the Middle 1970's (controlling for age and sex)

Country	Married			Unmarried		
	Complex family v. Other	Complex v. Empty Nest	Complex v. Simple with children	Complex v. Other	Complex v. Non-family	Complex v. Simple family with children
Unweighted 5 Country Average (ommitting Mexico)	*	*	*	ns	ns	*
Some primary	0.93	1.21	0.80	0.97	1.12	0.76
Primary grad.	0.91	1.00	0.84	0.93	1.12	0.71
Some secondary +	0.54	0.43	0.61	0.83	0.87	0.79
Colombia	*	ns	*	ns	ns	ns
Some primary	0.78	1.10	0.64	0.98	1.10	0.86
Primary grad.	0.66	0.95	0.54	0.81	1.04	0.66
Some secondary +	0.56	0.63	0.47	0.91	0.95	0.85
Costa Rica	*	*	*	ns	ns	ns
Some primary	0.96	1.19	0.89	0.81	0.84	0.75
Primary grad.	0.91	0.71	1.00	1.31	1.35	0.94
Some secondary	0.25	0.11	0.41	0.64	0.56	0.75
Dom. Rep.	ns	ns	*	*	*	ns
Some primary	0.98	1.22	0.86	1.33	1.38	1.23
Primary grad.	0.58	0.64	0.53	0.37	0.33	0.51
Some secondary	0.63	0.94	0.52	0.91	0.90	1.04
Panama	*	*	ns	ns	ns	ns
Some primary	1.34	1.37	1.43	0.75	0.71	0.81
Primary grad.	1.66	1.47	1.99	0.76	0.67	1.06
Some secondary	0.93	0.66	1.51	0.68	0.65	0.78
Peru	ns	*	ns	ns	*	*
Some primary	1.00	2.04	0.94	1.11	1.61	0.62
Primary grad.	1.28	3.05	0.97	1.18	2.77	0.45
Some secondary	1.49	1.58	0.79	1.13	1.51	0.72

The omitted category in each case is having no schooling.

\* Variable is significant (Chi-square) at  $p < .05$

ns Variable is not significant (Chi-square) at  $p < .05$

Estimates for Colombia and Peru use sample weights

Table 7. The Effect of Education Within Residence Areas

	Complex v. Other					
	Married			Unmarried		
	Metro.	Other Urban	Rural	Metro.	Other Urban	Rural
4 Country Average	*	*	*	ns	*	ns
< Primary	.89	.77	1.05	.91	.88	.77
Primary grad	.59	.88	1.84	.89	.74	.90
Some secondary +	.42	.50	.81	.74	.56	1.51
Colombia	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
< Primary	1.17	1.30	1.15	1.73	2.60	1.08
Primary grad	.38	.45	.35	1.33	1.56	.98
Some secondary +	.70	.75	.61	2.05	1.82	2.61
Costa Rica	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
< Primary	.85	.69	.97	.82	.83	.79
Primary grad	.35	.95	2.28	1.28	.94	.99
Some secondary +	.15	.23	.31	.71	.17	.58
Panama	ns	*	*	ns	*	ns
< Primary	.76	.37	1.75	.71	.10	.63
Primary grad	.69	.76	3.24	.52	.06	.81
Some secondary +	.56	.13	2.47	.40	.03	1.45
Peru	ns	ns	*	ns	ns	*
< Primary	1.08	1.24	1.25	.82	1.40	1.04
Primary grad	1.26	1.40	1.38	.87	1.04	9.6 E2
Some secondary +	.86	1.10	2.0 E-4	.67	1.43	2.69
	Married--Complex v. Empty Nest			Unmarried--Complex v. Nonfamily		
	Metro	Other Urban	Rural	Metro	Other Urban	Rural
4 Country Average	*	*	*	ns	*	ns
< Primary	.88	1.05	1.35	.99	1.51	.75
Primary grad	.49	1.19	1.62	.98	1.03	1.03
Some secondary +	.25	.50	.60	.67	.75	1.63
Colombia	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
< Primary	1.15	.82	1.32	1.08	1.34	.72
Primary grad	.35	.92	1.09	.98	1.26	1.82
Some secondary +	.61	.48	1.46	2.61	.77	1.92
Costa Rica	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
< Primary	.50	.84	1.21	1.20	1.16	.65
Primary grad	.17	.45	7.3 E2	1.78	1.31	1.98
Some secondary +	.04	.07	.13	.62	.92	.24
Panama	ns	*	ns	ns	*	ns
< Primary	.84	.15	1.86	.80	5.2 E-4	.54
Primary grad	.75	.42	3.00	.56	5.0 E-5	.79
Some secondary +	.49	.04	1.35	.46	6.8 E-5	2.54
Peru	ns	*	ns	*	*	ns
< Primary	3.00	2.42	1.50	1.29	3.20	.88
Primary grad	2.65	3.22	1.30	8.01	2.10	630.81
Some secondary +	.91	1.66	--	1.64	1.96	1.95

Table A1. Distribution of Sample 60 Years and Over According to Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics - Six Latin American Countries (in percents)

	Colombia	Costa Rica	Dominican Republic	Mexico	Panama	Peru
<b>Living Arrangement</b>						
Nonfamily	6	7	10	8	12	8
(solitary)	(5)	(6)	(9)	(7)	(11)	(7.8)
(no-family)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(0.4)
Empty nest	9	9	7	16	14	10
Simple with child(ren)	25	26	17	24	17	22
Complex family	60	58	65	52	57	60
(Extended)	(52)	(48)	(59)	(39)	(51)	(40)
(Multiple)	(8)	(10)	(6)	(13)	(6)	(20)
<b>Sex</b>						
Male	49	49	52	49	50	51
Female	51	51	48	51	50	49
<b>Marital Status</b>						
Married	52	55	53	58	49	58
(married)	(44)	(50)	(36)	(52)	(33)	(50)
(union)	(8)	(5)	(17)	(6)	(16)	(7)
Unmarried	48	45	47	42	51	42
(never married)	(8)	(7)	(2)	(4)	(5)	(3)
(widowed)	(30)	(28)	(26)	(32)	(27)	(32)
(divorced)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(.6)	(2)	(.1)
(separated)		(6)	(14)	(4)	(13)	(4)
(mar-spouse-absent)	(3)	(1)	(3)	(.7)	(5)	(3)
(unwed mother)	(3)	(2)	(.1)	(.3)	(.1)	(.2)
<b>Residence</b>						
Metro	10	30	42	19	38	18
Other urban	48	25		23	13	36
Rural	42	45	58	58	49	46
<b>Education</b>						
None	46	25	61		33	51
< primary	34	52	26		33	25
Prim. grad.	13	13	10		19	14
> primary	7	10	3		16	10
Sample size	2854	1364	2928	3985	1553	2348

Mailing Address:

Center for Demography and Ecology  
University of Wisconsin  
1180 Observatory Drive  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706-1393  
U.S.A.