

The Journal of Development Studies >
Volume 48, 2012 - Issue 2

1,918 45

Views

CrossRef citations to date

29

Altmetric

Special Section in Honour of Michael Lipton

'We Are All Poor Here': Economic Difference, Social Divisiveness and Targeting Cash Transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa

Frank Ellis 

Pages 201-214 | Published online: 28 Feb 2012

 Cite this article  <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2011.625408>

Sample our
Social Sciences
Journals

>> [Sign in here](#) to start your access
to the latest two volumes for 14 days

 Full Article

 Figures & data

 References

 Citations

 Metrics

 Reprints & Permissions

Read this article

Abstract

While the production of cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa has increased significantly, the targeting of these transfers remains a challenge. This article examines the targeting of cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa, focusing on the role of social networks and social capital. It argues that social networks and social capital are crucial for the targeting of cash transfers, as they provide a mechanism for identifying the poorest and most vulnerable households. The article also discusses the importance of social capital in the implementation of cash transfer programmes, as it helps to build trust and ensure that the transfers are used for their intended purpose. Finally, the article concludes by discussing the implications of these findings for the design and implementation of cash transfer programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa.

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 845 partners store and/or access information on a device, such as unique IDs in cookies to process personal data. You may accept or manage your choices by clicking below, including your right to object where legitimate interest is used, or at any time in the privacy policy page. These choices will be signaled to our partners and will not affect browsing data. [Privacy Policy](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

Use precise geolocation data. Actively scan device characteristics for identification. Store and/or access information on a device. Personalised advertising and content, advertising and content measurement, audience research and services development.

[List of Partners \(vendors\)](#)

I Accept

Essential Only

Show Purpose

traction, helping to explain the reluctance of governments to adopt scaled-up poverty-targeted transfers as the preferred form of social cash transfer to those most in need in their societies.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Bob Baulch, Gabriel Demombynes and John Hoddinott for supplying me with the mean decile consumption per capita from recent household budget surveys in Malawi, Zambia and Ethiopia, respectively, on which the economic difference discussion of this article is based. Francesca Marchetta and Ed Anderson contributed considerably with additional data analysis. An earlier version of this article was presented at the conference Social Protection for the Poorest in Africa: Learning from Experience, held in Entebbe, Uganda, 8–10 September 2008. The article has benefited from comments by Stephen Devereux, Nicholas Freeland and Phil White, as well as two anonymous referees.

Notes

-

5. For a revealing account of these various social facets of targeting transfers to the poorest as experienced in the poverty-targeted distribution of fertilizers in Malawi, see Levy and Barahona ([2002](#): 11–14).
6. This article was not written specifically as a critique of the 10 per cent rule, which has made an important contribution to evolving practice in the targeting of cash transfers in SSA. Nevertheless in its conclusions it does return to the rule and identifies several weaknesses for its deployment as a targeting principle in scaled-up cash transfers.
7. Ultra-poverty in the IHS2 analysis is defined as insufficient income to secure enough food even if all income is spent on food, which differs from the Lipton ([1983](#)) definition mentioned earlier.
8. For a detailed account of how this is done in the Malawi social cash transfer pilots, see Schubert (2008).
9. The published analyses of these surveys can be found in Devereux et al. ([2006](#)), Government of Malawi ([2005](#)), Government of Malawi and World Bank (2006), World Bank ([2005](#)) and Woldehanna et al. ([2008](#)).
10. The exchange rates used to convert local currency data from the surveys into \$US were: for Malawi MK108.9 = \$US1; for Zambia ZMK4566 = \$US1; for Ethiopia 8.6 birr = \$US1. Purchasing power parity (PPP) exchange rates are not used for this exercise since no comparative analysis of purchasing power between countries is intended.
11. Lest this be misunderstood, the purpose of this type of report is not to provide a detailed average that would be representative of the entire population. Rather, the purpose is to provide a detailed average that would be representative of the bottom decile of the population, which is the target group of the pilot. The average is calculated for the bottom decile of the population, which is the target group of the pilot. The average is calculated for the bottom decile of the population, which is the target group of the pilot.
12. The average is calculated for the bottom decile of the population, which is the target group of the pilot. The average is calculated for the bottom decile of the population, which is the target group of the pilot. The average is calculated for the bottom decile of the population, which is the target group of the pilot.



13. The argument here has been developed from per capita expenditure data and magnitudes might differ slightly if household-level deciles were used instead, depending on the relationship between household size and per capita income across the income distribution.
14. This takes into account the impact of 59.6 per cent inflation on the purchasing power of the Zambia Kwacha between 2002–2003 and 2005 when the Kazungula scheme started.
15. Consumption per capita is MK1,750 for the sixth decile and MK2,047 for the seventh decile. These observations are made with respect to the mean rural consumption per capita in the bottom decile, and would vary in magnitude depending on how far below or above the mean consumption is any individual family.
16. The evolving design of these pilot cash transfer schemes is traced in Schubert (2005) and Schubert and Huijbregts (2006).
17. It is more common in such surveys for household samples within districts to be contributing to a statistically valid sample at a higher geographical unit of aggregation, such as the zone or province comprising several districts.
18. An evaluation of the Mchinji social cash transfer pilot conducted in 2008 was critical of setting a fixed guideline for precisely these reasons (Miller et al., [2008](#)) and the chief originator of the approach seems to have conceded that the proportion should perhaps be flexible across districts (Schubert, [2007](#)).

19. It is ... to be 40–
150 per ... ent for
poverty- ... urse, this
compari ... hese are
often fou ... llis et al.,
[2009](#).



Relate

Information for

- Authors
- R&D professionals
- Editors
- Librarians
- Societies

Opportunities

- Reprints and e-prints
- Advertising solutions
- Accelerated publication
- Corporate access solutions

Open access

- Overview
- Open journals
- Open Select
- Dove Medical Press
- F1000Research
- Help and information
- Help and contact
- Newsroom
- All journals
- Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

 Sign me up

