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

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

Abstract

While th… f
producti… any sub-
Saharan … materialise,
and grow… ecure even
minimal … esponse is to
target s… on the
level … the bottom
half of th… ficiary
selection … as 'the
poorest … even below
the welf… s reshuffling
of the in… he 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 extended discussion of these and related policy arguments around social protection can be found in Ellis et al. (2009, especially Chapters 1 and 9).

2. The te [illegible] mply with a simple c [illegible], some writers p [illegible] o a category of the po [illegible] fers may have exc [illegible] pension to recei [illegible]

3. This d [illegible] hoose not to participa [illegible] n as pensions [illegible] ded.

4. This o [illegible] ial 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 (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 ... ge, the
purpose ... mies of the
type rep ... d average
that wou

12. T ... ottom decile
tends ... sibly low, in
addition ... verty of
househo ... s always
display ... that they
contain ... ations (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 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 fo llis et al.,
2009

Relat