

1,982 Views

50 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  
Economics, Finance,  
Business & Industry Journals

>> **Sign in here** to start your access  
to the latest two volumes for 14 days



Full Article Figures & data References Citations Metrics

Reprint

## We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 872 partners store and access personal data, like browsing data or unique identifiers, on your device. Selecting "I Accept" enables tracking technologies to support the purposes shown under "we and our partners process data to provide," whereas selecting "Reject All" or withdrawing your consent will disable them. If trackers are disabled, some content and ads you see may not be as relevant to you. You can resurface this menu to change your choices or withdraw consent at any time by clicking the ["privacy preferences"] link on the bottom of the webpage [or the floating icon on the bottom-left of the webpage, if applicable]. Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. [Here](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

...

I Accept

Reject All

Show Purpose



Abstract

While the

producti

Saharan

and g

minin

target so

level of

half of th

selection

poorest

the welf

of the in

any sub-

materialise,

ecure even

response is to

s on the

on the bottom

ficiary

as 'the

even below

s reshuffling

of the income distribution. The article identifies critical trade-offs between the cost and

coverage of different types of social transfer, their social acceptability and their political 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

1. A more detailed discussion of the design of the social protection interventions is provided in the main text.
2. The test results are available upon request. To comply with a simple cost-benefit analysis, we assume that the intervention writers have not been able to identify the most vulnerable of the population. In other words, the intervention writers have excluded some of the most vulnerable from receiving social protection. This is a conservative assumption as it implies that the intervention writers have chosen not to provide social protection to those who are most in need. This is a conservative assumption as it implies that the intervention writers have chosen not to provide social protection to those who are most in need.
3. This discussion is based on the assumption that the intervention writers have chosen not to provide social protection to those who are most in need. This is a conservative assumption as it implies that the intervention writers have chosen not to provide social protection to those who are most in need.



4. This occurred during the implementation of some of the Zambia pilot social cash transfer schemes, and is reported by CARE Zambia ([2007](#)) and Ellis ([2007](#)).
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 ([2006](#)).
10. The ... into \$US  
were: fo ... ia 8.6  
birr = \$U ... this  
exercise ... ries is  
intended
11. L ... ge, the  
purpo ... mies of the  
type rep ... d average  
that wou
12. The ... ottom decile  
tends to ... sibly low, in  
addition ... verty of  
households in that decile. It is also the case that the bottom and top deciles always



display considerably more variation than the intervening deciles, reflecting that they contain extreme low observations (bottom decile) and extreme high observations (top decile).

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 aggregated, such as

18. An e... was critical of setting... and the chief... could perhaps be flexib...

19. It... to be 40-... ent for... urse, this... hese are... llis et al., [2009](#): 85



People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by  
50

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 updates  
by email



Copyright

Acc

Registered  
5 Howick Pl

or & Francis Group  
orma business

