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ABSTRACT
This study aimed to analyze the influence of family planning on intergenerational poverty of children's education level, the influence of Indonesian Family Planning Program (KB) on poverty, the influence of education, and the influence of husband's and wife's employment field on poverty. The population in this study was husband and wife couples of KB participants and non-KB participants and poor and non-poor people in Central Sulawesi Province. The data used was data from the 2015 National Socio-Economic Survey, which was sourced from BPS (Central Bureau of Statistics), Central Sulawesi Province. The analysis method used was Chi-Square and multiple regression analysis. The results of the study showed that KB influenced the breakdown of the intergenerational poverty chain of children's education level in Central Sulawesi Province. Chi-Square test results obtained $X^2$ count of 29.096 with p-value with sig of 0.000. Far below the alpha 0.05 which showed that there was a very significant relationship between parents' education level and children's education level. On the other hand, the influence of family planning variable on poverty was negative, namely -79338,086, the influence of husband's education level variable was positive and significant at 99088,078 on the average household income, while the influence of wife's education level on the average household income was 105930,163. The influence of husband's employment field on the average household income was 144715,717, and the influence of wife's employment field variable was positive, namely 54399,094 on the average household income. The contribution of the five variables to the dependent variable was 0.80 or 80 percent. This means the ability to explain the five variables in this study in explaining the dependent variable was 80 percent. On the other hand, the amount of other variable influences was 20 percent against changes in the rise and fall of income or poverty.
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As a national development goal, improving community’s welfare should be strived to improve from time to time. Such efforts, therefore, cannot be separated from the role of the government. This role has been formed in various strategies for improving community welfare. Among the strategies carried out by the government for the improvement of community’s welfare are marked by the formulation of policies through budget politics in the form of an increase in the state budget, including efforts to achieve economic growth targets that cover the improvement of society from poverty.

To reduce the number of poor people, the government implements it in the form of policy, namely by allocating funds through the state budget every year, which shows an increasing trend. Data from 2004 showed the amount of funds allocated from the state budget was 18 trillion rupiah. In 2010, the budget for the poor increased to 94 trillion rupiah.

Various policies and programs have been carried out by the government as an effort to improve community welfare. The example of various approaches and strategies for poverty reduction that can be carried out by the government, namely; a national policy that directly touches the poor in the form of direct cash assistance as an effort to encourage the supply side, the establishment of poverty reduction committees, etc.

The national budget policy for poverty must have been translated into smaller regions, such as in the Central Sulawesi Province. The Regional Budget (APBD) tends to increase, which is marked by an increase in the budget in 2012, from Rp. 1.78 trillion to 2.38 trillion in
2014. This increase was not necessarily an increase in economic growth, even economic growth fell from 9.53 percent to 5.07 percent. From another aspect, the budget trend has a positive impact on increasing people's income through the expansion of employment and various other economic activities, which is marked by an increase in per capita income from the population, namely from Rp. 22.62 million in 2011 to Rp. 31.88 million in 2014. Along with that, the number of those absorbed in employment increased from 1,250,485 people in 2011 to 1,386,103 people in 2014. An increase in the number of working people corrected the open unemployment rate from 4.27 percent in 2011 to 2.92 percent in 2014. (BPS/Central Bureau of Statistics, Central Sulawesi Province, 2016).

Government efforts in alleviating poverty are marked by the implementation of a national program in the form of Integrated Poverty Reduction Program Based on Village Improvement (PTPK-BBK). This effort is not limited to physical development, but extends to empowerment in the form of increasing human resources and providing KUR capital, and agriculture, hunting and forestry businesses by 23.69 percent. The government has also prepared funds of Rp. 40 billion, which is allocated to several regencies and cities in Central Sulawesi Province for village improvement programs (Bank Indonesia, 2015: 68). Along with the ongoing efforts to prevent people from poverty through the distribution of rice to the poor (raskin). The reduction of the poor population in Central Sulawesi Province from a total of 557,400 people, equivalent to 22.42 percent of the total population in 2007 to 387,060 people, equivalent to 13.61 percent of the total population in September 2014, has been a sign of the initial positive impact of the policy.

Poverty is not right if judged based on the number of poor people alone, because there is a poverty dimension that needs to get serious attention in the form of chronic poverty, namely poverty that occurs due to poverty derived by parents to their children. Hartoyo's findings (2014) in Indramayu showed that most of the respondents surveyed experienced the same conditions as the parents: they lived in poverty like their parents. In line with the findings of Maarten Van Ham (2012), who previously found in Sweden that children who lived at home with poor parents would experience a poor life like their parents at the time they became adults. Both of these findings have corroborated the evidence of chronic poverty.

Poverty reduction efforts are therefore not free from population planning activities such as family planning program, namely a family program to reduce population growth. This program has a positive influence on the productivity of the population and state budget. Studies conducted by a non-governmental organization (Countdown Europe, 2015) showed that family planning program could help prevent household poverty. Countries with low fertility rates and slower population growth experienced high productivity growth, more savings and more effective investments. In addition, financing for the family planning program will provide significant benefits in the state income burden. By financing contraceptives for US $ 3.6 billion per year, it has had an impact on the reduction in health care costs for newborns and their mothers by US $ 5.1 billion per year, as well as the cost of providing post-abortion care by US $ 4.140 million per year. Every US $ 1 spent on a family planning program will save at least US $ 4 which should be spent treating complications from an unwanted pregnancy.

A large population and high growth rate can be a cause of poverty, therefore reducing the rate of population growth can be a major effort to reduce poverty. National family planning program is considered as a proven program to reduce birth rates so as to inhibit the rate of population growth in Central Sulawesi Province. Although the results of population census (SP) in 2010 and 2013 population registrations showed that the population of Central Sulawesi people has increased from 2,635,009 people to 2,7785,488 inhabitants, but relative population growth during 1980-1990, 1990-2000, and 2000-2010 tended to decline from 2.87 percent to 2.52 percent and finally to 1.95 percent.

Therefore, this study aims:
- To analyze the influence of family planning program (KB) on poverty in Central Sulawesi Province;
To analyze the influence of family planning program (KB) on the breakdown of intergenerational poverty chain of children’s education level in Central Sulawesi Province;
To analyze the influence of husband’s education level on poverty in Central Sulawesi Province;
To analyze the influence of wife’s education level on poverty in Central Sulawesi Province;
To analyze the influence of husband’s employment field on poverty in Central Sulawesi Province;
To analyze the influence of wife’s employment field on poverty in Central Sulawesi Province.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Poverty is defined as the inability of the population to meet the minimum food requirements equivalent to 2100 calories per capita per day coupled with the minimum non-food needs (BPS, 2016). Poverty in terms of income is a level of income or revenue of a person, family and society that is below the certain poverty line, mainly due to the low mastery of assets such as land, capital and business opportunities.

The poor are always in a state of helplessness or inability to meet basic needs, namely inability to (1) carry out productive business activities, (2) reach access to socio-economic resources, (3) determine their own destiny and always get discriminatory treatment, and (4) free themselves from poor mentality and culture and always having low dignity and self-esteem. This helplessness and inability create a poor behavior and mentality which leads to the loss of independence in trying and enjoying dignified welfare (Arsyad, 2010: 300)

According to Ludwig and Mayer (2006), there were three main variables that greatly affected intergenerational poverty, namely education, environment and family. School, in this case, education, was seen as an institution where children could get knowledge and skills that were very important for long-term economic success. Families had an important role to play in supporting and stimulating children’s achievements in education. Their results also revealed that there was a relationship between parents' characteristics and their children's income after adulthood. Furthermore, the results of this study also showed that there was no correlation between religious obedience of parents and intergenerational poverty.

Jenkins and Siedler (2007) explain that the process of poverty begins at the family level. The ability and education of parents will affect the future conditions of children through the passage of time and consumption given by parents to children. In this case, the ability of parents to provide quality food consumption with good nutrition to children will affect the child's ability and quality in the future. Health and education are included as transferred human capital.

Stenberg (2000, in Sugiyarto, 2008) suggests three explanations of intergenerational poverty transmission, namely through the factors of culture, behavior, and economic structure related to economic policy. In the behavioral-cultural factor, it describes the transmission of poverty culture such as lack of proper education, poor finance, and lack of social participation in poor families. Policy factor is related to the welfare system in society. Welfare benefits for poor families can stimulate a culture of poverty and trap poor families in poverty.

The policy to expand opportunities to get education for the poor is not a guarantee for them to get out of poverty if there are no jobs for them to work. Todaro also states that getting a higher degree does not necessarily mean increasing the ability to do productive work. Education that is oriented towards modern urban sector work will not always have an impact on job creation. Skill-oriented education can help the poor to create their own jobs. Therefore, investment in skill education is more suitable, especially at the high school level and higher education level so that the poor can create their own jobs.

Family planning is essentially a program that plays an important role in creating future generations of Indonesian people who are qualified and able to compete with other nations. If
each family plans the birth of a child responsibly, we will have a future generation of high quality and ready to be used by country.

Frame of Reference. The purpose of family planning is to regulate the desired pregnancy, which is the ideal number of children, namely 2 children. With a total of 2 children, parents have the ability to raise and care them well. With a small number of children for parents, there is a lot of free time that can be realized for economic activities outside the home. The results of research conducted by (Nurdyana, et al. 2012) showed that the variable number of children less than 3 (2 children) had a negative influence on poverty and was significant at 1% confidence level. Conversely, the number of 3 children and above had a positive influence on poverty.

Housewives being active at work will provide additional income for the family. The increase in household income will have an impact on increasing the purchasing power on the education and health of children. The increase in education will affect the quality of human resources. Quality human resources will have an impact on increasing productivity. By increasing productivity, it directly increases their income and thus they will get out of the circle of poverty. This is in line with Becker (1995), who stated that investment in education and other human capital was one of the most effective ways to increase decent income and health of the poor.

Expansion of employment is a factor that contributes to poverty reduction. Quality education will make it easier for the poor to get jobs that can provide high income so that they can get out of the poverty trap.

Hypotheses. From a framework that is built from the theories adopted in this study, the researchers formulated the research hypotheses, as follows:

- Family Planning Program (KB) influences the breakdown of intergenerational poverty chain of children's education level in Central Sulawesi Province;
- Family Planning Program (KB) has a negative influence on poverty in Central Sulawesi Province;
- Husband's education level has a positive and significant influence on poverty in Central Sulawesi Province;
- Wife's education level has a positive and significant influence on poverty in Central Sulawesi Province;
- Husband's employment field has a positive and significant influence on poverty in Central Sulawesi Province;
- Wife's employment field has a positive and significant influence on poverty in Central Sulawesi Province.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

The data used in the study were secondary data from the National Socio-Economic Survey in 2015. While the data sources were from the BPS/Central Bureau of Statistics of Central Sulawesi Province. Other sources were obtained from the BKKBN/ National Population and Family Planning Agency of Central Sulawesi Province.

Operationalization of Research Variables:

- Family planning is the participation of respondent’s households in family planning. KB membership status was measured using a nominal scale, namely 1 for KB participant and 0 for non-KB participant (dummy variable);
- Intergenerational poverty is poverty from parents who are passed on to children. This study used a proxy of children's education level to see the existence of intergenerational poverty;
- Parent education is the education level that is completed which is indicated by a letter of graduation;
- Revenue is the average amount of per capita income obtained by households in this study;
• Employment field is the field of employment of respondents in the work grouped in: 0 = does not work; 1 = agriculture field and 2 = non-agriculture field;
• Poverty Size used the average per capita income approach per month with reference to the poverty limit criteria of BPS in 2015. The poverty line indicator used was Rp. 338,443 per capita per month.

**Data Analysis Method.** Data analysis method used to analyze the data of this research was descriptive analysis and associative analysis. Descriptive analysis used cross tabulation analysis and continued with Chi-square analysis, while associative analysis used multiple regression analysis approach. To answer:

- The first research question, the researchers used Chi-Square analysis method with the following formulation:

\[ X^2_0 = \sum \frac{(f_0 - f_e)^2}{f_e} \]

Where: fo = Frequency of Observation; fe = Frequency of Expectation.

Criteria for testing hypotheses:
• Ho = 0, there is no difference in children’s education level between KB participants and non-KB participants.
• Ha ≠ 0, there are differences in children’s education level between KB participants and non-KB participants.

Testing criteria:
• Ho, is accepted if \( X^2 \) count ≤ \( X^2_{0.05(n-1)} \);
• Ha, is accepted if \( X^2 \) count > \( X^2_{0.05(n-1)} \).

- The second, third, fourth, and fifth research questions, the researchers used multiple regression analysis with the following equation model.

\[ Y = a_0 + b_1 D + b_2 X_2 + b_3 X_3 + b_4 X_4 + b_5 X_5 + e \]

Where: Y = Average income per capita; a = intercept (constanta); \( b_1 \) = regression coefficient for D (KB); D = a dummy free variable with two categories; \( b_2 \) = regression coefficient for \( X_2 \) (Husband’s education level); \( b_3 \) = regression coefficient for \( X_3 \) (Wife’s education level); \( b_4 \) = regression coefficient for \( X_4 \) (Husband’s employment field); \( b_5 \) = regression coefficient for \( X_5 \) (Wife’s employment field).

- Testing of Partial Regression Coefficients (t test). This test was conducted to see the significance of the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. The hypothesis used were as follows:
  Ho: \( b_i \) = 0, KB does not influence poverty;
  Ha: \( b_i \) < 0, KB has negative and significant influence on poverty;
  Ho: \( b_i \) = 0, Husband’s education level does not influence poverty;
  Ha: \( b_i \) > 0, Husband’s education level has negative and significant influence on poverty;
  Ho: \( b_i \) = 0, Wife’s education level does not influence poverty;
  Ha: \( b_i \) > 0, Wife’s education level has negative and significant influence on poverty;
  Ho: \( b_i \) = 0, Husband’s employment field does not influence poverty;
  Ha: \( b_i \) > 0, Husband’s employment field has negative and significant influence on poverty;
  Ho: \( b_i \) = 0, Wife’s employment field does not influence poverty;
  Ha: \( b_i \) > 0, Wife’s employment field has negative and significant influence on poverty.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The relationship between participation in Family Planning and Children’s Education Level. The more children, the greater the burden on parents to raise their children. In households that have a small number of children will have the ability to educate their children
at a higher education level. Conversely, in households that have a large number of children, they will experience barriers in sending their children to a higher level. The results of this study confirmed this statement, as seen in Table 1.

Table 1 – Cross Tabulation Between Children’s Education and Family Planning Status

| Children Education Level | KB Status | Total |
|--------------------------|-----------|-------|
|                          | With KB   | Without KB |     |
| Low/Primary              | 563 (62.9) | 1508 (52.8 %) | 2071 |
| Middle/Secondary         | 293 (32.7%) | 1217 (42.7) | 1510 |
| Higher                   | 39 (4.4%) | 127(4.5%) | 166 |
| Total                    | 895 (100 %) | 2852 (100%) | 3747 |

Source: Data is processed from the results of the National Socio-Economic Survey (Susenas), Year 2015.

Table 2 – Results of t-test with Chi Square Test

| n/n | Value | Df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
|-----|-------|----|-----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 29.096* | 2 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio   | 29.535 | 2 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 20.625 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases   | 3747 | |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5.
The minimum expected count is 39.65.

Table 2 shows the difference in the number of children with secondary and higher level of education from households that participated in family planning and households that did not participate have family planning. The absolute and relative number of children who were able to reach up to secondary and higher education levels was found more in households with family planning compared to households without family planning. In secondary education level, the number of children from non-family planning households was 293 or relatively 32.7%, while for households with family planning, there were 1,217 people or 42.7%. The same grouping pattern also occurred in higher education. Households with family planning were slightly higher compared to the children education’s level from households that did not participate in family planning.

This difference was further strengthened by Chi-square analysis where the chi-square test results in a Pearson chi-square (χ² count) of 29.096 with a p-value of sig 0.000 was far below the confidence level of 0.05, this means rejecting the null hypothesis and accepting the alternative hypothesis which stated that there was a significant difference between children’s education level from families who participated in family planning and families who did not participate in family planning to access education. Thus it can be said that family planning was able to break the intergenerational poverty chain in the field of children’s education level.

The family planning program is a program implemented by the government with the aim of reducing population birth rates, this program will in principle limit birth to fertile age couples (PUS), so that in the long run it is expected to contribute to the improvement of community welfare. This view is a consideration for the importance of expanded family planning program and it is expected that more and more people will participate.

To increase family planning participation, at the beginning of the launch of this program, the government has issued a policy in the form of procuring contraceptives (Alkon) which was distributed to the KB participants for free. However, along with increasing needs and limited government budgets, the government only provided long-term contraceptives, on the other hand the needs of the community increased so that its availability became very limited. This situation had an impact on the increasing number of couples of childbearing age who wanted to participate in family planning but did not have the ability to get it (unmet need).

One of the prerequisites for building an ordinary least square (OLS) multiple regression model is by first going through a classic assumption test.
Multicollinearity test aims to test whether the correlation between independent variables is found in regression model. Testing the presence or absence of multicollinearity can be seen from the values of Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The value commonly used to show the presence of multicollinearity is if the Tolerance value is <0.1 or VIF> 10. Based on Table 4.20, it can be seen that the Tolerance value of the five independent variables in this study was greater than 0.1 and the value of (VIF) also showed the number smaller than 10. This means that the multiple regression model used in this study showed no correlation between independent variables or there was no multicollinearity.

Table 3 – Results of Relationship Test between Independent Variables Using Collinearity Test

| Independent Variable         | Collinearity Statistics | Remarks          |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
|                             | Tolerance   | VIF     |                 |
| KB                          | 0.999       | 1.0001  | No multicollinearity |
| Husband’s Education Level   | 0.574       | 1.743   | No multicollinearity |
| Wife’s Education Level      | 0.580       | 1.724   | No multicollinearity |
| Husband’s Employment Field  | 0.834       | 1.200   | No multicollinearity |
| Wife’s Employment Field     | 0.913       | 1.095   | No multicollinearity |

Based on data processing through the use of the SPSS program, the standard and non standard regression coefficients were obtained as shown in Table 4.

Table 4 – Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

| Model            | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig.  |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|
|                  | B  | Std. Error | Beta |       |       |       |       |
| (Constant)       | 141278.587 | 43019.248 | - | 3.284 | .001 |
| KB (X1)          | -79338.086 | 28371.183 | - .043 | -2.796 | .005 |
| Husband’s education level (X2) | 99088.078 | 13268.779 | .151 | 7.468 | .000 |
| Wife’s education level (X3)    | 105930.163 | 13453.497 | .158 | 7.874 | .000 |
| Husband’s employment field (X4) | 144715.717 | 25711.060 | .094 | 5.629 | .000 |
| Wife’s employment field (X5)    | 54399.094 | 14976.005 | .058 | 3.632 | .000 |

The Influence of KB participation variable (X1) on poverty. The results of this study showed that the coefficient of the direction of family planning variable on poverty was negative at -79,338.086 which meant if there was a reduction in children by 1 person, it would have an impact on increasing the average family income by 79,338.06. Or in other words, a group of husband and wife who participated in family planning would have an
impact on the increasing average household income as a result of the reduced number of children they had. The results of this study were in line with research conducted by Faturochman, et. al. 1998 who showed that the correlation between income and number of children was -0.41, which showed that family planning was negatively related to income, but affected the reduction in household expenses as a result of the small number of children. The results of other studies conducted by Natsir, et al (2016), Arianti, et al. (2012), and Nurdyana et al. (2012) stated that there was a negative relationship between income and number of children. This means that the more children in a household of reproductive age couples, they would be more likely to be trapped in a circle of poverty. Thus it can be said that the participation of households of reproductive age couples in family planning can increase income. In line with this statement, the research conducted by (Budiono, et al, 2012) concluded that the number of household members under the age of 15 years had a positive influence on poverty at a 1% significance level. The marginal influence value was 0.0347, which can be interpreted that the addition of one person to the number of household members under the age of 15 from the average would increase the likelihood of households falling in poverty by 3.47 percent.

The results of this study were also in line with the results of research conducted by Countdown 2015, which showed the benefits for countries that run family planning program if the cost of the need to meet the needs of unmet need for modern contraception in developing countries increased by US $ 3.6 billion per year. The existence of these costs has had an impact on the reduction in the cost of health services for newborns by US $ 5.1 billion per year, and the cost of providing post-abortion care decreased by US $ 140 million per year. The results of this study also proved that Central Sulawesi Province needed to continue implement KB program as a strategic program in alleviating poverty in this area.

The number of children had a positive influence on poverty because a large number of children would affect the average household income. Research conducted by (Natsir et. Al, 2016) showed the relationship that the increasing number of children who lived would increase the weight of household burden in meeting the basic needs of children under five. The results of logistic regression showed that the odds ratio was 0.701. Then the probability of children under five who lived in households that had children over 1 (one) was 1/0.701 = 1.427 times became absolute poor compared to children under five who lived in households that only had one child under five. The high opportunities that occurred in households with more than one child under five illustrated that the regulation of birth spacing was one of the dominant factors in the occurrence of absolute poverty in children.

The Influence of Husband's Education Level variable ($X_2$) on poverty. Education and health have had a significant influence on poverty reduction and China's economic growth. Education influences fertility decline and is supported by the policy of 1 household 1 child which has contributed to the reduction in fertility rates. Improving education and improving health have an influence on increasing the quality of human capital skills and the quality of human resources of the Chinese population. This has affected the increase in productivity and the decline in poverty rates in China. In line with this, it has an impact on China's economic growth (Sen, 1999).

Improving the quality of human resources through education can have a long-term impact on the termination of the cycle of poverty. The higher the education level of the husband, the greater the knowledge he has, especially the knowledge related to behavior by how to build a household to be free from poverty. Higher education has the opportunity to get higher jobs than those with lower level of education. The results of this study indicated that the magnitude of the coefficient of education direction on the average household income was 99,088.078. The direction of the influence of the husband's education level on the family's average income was positive and significant with a p value of 0.000 far below the confidence level of 0.05. The results of testing this hypothesis gave the meaning of rejecting the null hypothesis and accepting an alternative hypothesis which stated that the husband's education level had a positive influence on income. This means that the higher the education level, the higher the average household income level.
The Influence of Wife's Education Level variable \((X_3)\) on poverty. Like husband's education level, wife's education level contributed to household income. The higher the wife's education level, the greater the opportunity to get a job. The results of this study indicated that the influence of the wife's education level variable on income was positive at 105,930.163 which showed that the higher the wife's education level, the more likely it was to get a better job and the greater the possibility of an increase in income. Research conducted by (Arianti, et al, 2012) showed that there was a positive influence between education and poverty. The results of the regression coefficient were 494884,059 which mean that if there was an additional one year of education, it would increase monthly income by Rp 49,484,059.

Research conducted by Jonaidi (2012) showed that there was a negative relationship between literacy and poverty. The result of the regression coefficient between literacy and poverty was equal to -0.3024, which meant that every increase in population literacy by 1 percent caused a decrease in the number of people living below the poverty line by 0.3024 percent.

The results of this study were in line with the results of studies conducted by economists who show that education is one of the factors that can release the population from the confines of poverty. The study conducted by Schultz et al (1964) stated that one of the several important factors that led to the rapid growth of the American economy was education financing which was relatively always increasing. This study showed that the dollar invested in education brought a greater increase in national income than the dollar used for other infrastructure development because there was no meaning of physical capital built without the support of the existence of quality human capital.

The results of this study were also in line with the statement (UNFPA, 2011) which stated that to break the intergenerational poverty chain; it can be done through investments in education and health, especially education and health for women and girls. By investing in education and health, it will have an impact on increasing family productivity in the long run. Todaro (2011) stated that women’s involvement in alleviating poverty was not only as a complement, but women’s involvement must be made the most important and consistent and effective basis for alleviating poverty.

The Influence of Husband’s Employment Field variable \((X_4)\) on poverty. The husband is a household head who has the responsibility to fulfill all the needs of the child and his wife. To be able to reach a more prosperous life, a husband as the head of the household always makes every effort to get something to meet the needs of his family. For husbands who have a job, fulfilling their family's life needs is not as difficult as an unemployed husband. The results of research conducted by Nurdyana, et al. (2012) revealed that the variable household heads’s employment in the agricultural sector had a significant influence on poverty.

The status of work is divided into employed and unemployed, which has an influence on poverty in a household of a married couple. Those who are unemployed will have a great opportunity to be trapped in the confines of poverty. Conversely, those who have jobs, they are less likely to live in poverty. With the income earned by their work, they can meet the needs they want. The results of this study indicated a positive relationship between the husbands who works with the level of income. This means that a husband who has a job will have the possibility not to be confined to a circle of poverty.

The results of the regression coefficient in this study obtained a value of 144,715,717 which gave meaning if a husband works then he would give a direct influence on increasing the average income of their household by 144,715,717 rupiahs. Thus the higher the level of income, the greater the possibility of not being trapped in poverty. The results of this study were in line with research conducted by Putri et al (2013) which stated that the type of work had a positive and partially significant influence on the income of poor households. While the results of research conducted by Wirawan, et al. (2015) who stated that unemployment partially had a positive and significant influence on the number of poor people in Bali Province.

The Influence of Wife’s Employment Field variable \((X_5)\) on poverty. When the number of children in a household is small, a lot of free time is owned by the family to be able to earn
an additional income for their household. Thus the allocation of time for carrying out economic activities is influenced by demographic factors. A number of studies have found (Todaro, 2011) that if the share of women’s income in the household is relatively high, discrimination against girls will be smaller, and women will be better able to meet their own needs and raise their children. Conversely, if household income is very little, then almost all women’s income is used to meet the needs of family nutrition. Because the share of the contribution of men's income to household needs is smaller, the increase in male income is not proportional to the increase in funds needed to fulfill their daily needs.

Wife education is very influential on the jobs involved. Data from research showed that the higher the level of wife education, the more likely she was to be involved in work. That is to say, a high education level heightens the level of partitioning of women or wives in working primarily on non-agricultural employment. The results showed that the influence of women’s education in this case the wife had a positive influence on income. The result of the regression coefficient between the wife's employment field and income was positive at 54,399.094. This means that if a working wife would have an influence of 54,399.094 rupiahs on the increase in their household income.

The results of this study were in line with the time allocation theory that the fewer number of children born, then there would be more and more free time to do economic activities through work to increase income in the household. The wife has a double burden in the household. The wife has a double duty, in addition to earning a living through work as a housewife who employs domestic work, namely cooking and caring for children.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the results of the research and analysis conducted by researchers, it can be concluded that:

- Family planning program have influenced the intergenerational poverty chain in children’s education level in Central Sulawesi Province;
- Family planning program is identified as having a negative and significant influence on the average household income;
- Husband’s education level has a positive and significant influence on the average household income;
- Wife’s education level has a positive and significant influence on the average household income;
- Husband’s employment field has a positive and significant influence on the average household income;
- Simultaneously, the five variables namely family planning participation, husband’s education level, wife’s education level, husband’s employment field and wife’s employment field that were studied has a very significant influence on income (poverty);
- R Square of 0.123. According to Hair, et al (2010), R Square figure of 0.123 with a sample of more than 1000 (one thousand) equivalent to R Sguare 0.80 means that the contribution of the five variables to the rise and fall of poverty in Central Sulawesi Province is 80%. While the contribution of other variables is 1-0.80 = 0.20. This means that the magnitude of the influence or contribution of variables outside the variables analyzed in this research model is 20 percent.

Suggestions that can be submitted for specific policy makers of the National Population and Family Planning Agency are as follows:

- The results show that family planning program is able to break intergenerational poverty chain in the field of education. Therefore, it is necessary for the government, in this case, the National Population and Family Planning Agency, to maintain a free distribution program for contraceptives for sub-age couples, especially for the poor;
- Education is the highest variable in determining the rise in the level of income or poverty. If the poor have access to assistance in education, then they are likely to be
able to get adequate education and be able to get jobs which pay them better so they
can get out of the poverty trap. Conversely, if they cannot access education, then
they will not be able to pass on something to their next generation so they can be
trapped in poverty from one generation to the next;

- There is a need for policy efforts that focus on reducing poverty. With a more targeted
policy, it allows for the increase in income of poor people which can further stimulate
their demand or power for local products to meet their daily needs such as food and
clothing as a whole. Thus, it can move the wheels of the local economy.
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