

**Day I**

---

**Plenary - Poverty Measurement**

**Eldin Fahmy (University of Bristol) - Poverty & Social Exclusion Survey**

**Mixed methods in poverty measurement: determining the 'necessities of life'**

*1) How do we use qualitative research in designing surveys and informing policy? How can we link the results of both methodologies?*

Qualitative research can improve questions and interpretation to some extent. It wouldn't be accurate to describe the conclusions of the focus group as a consensus, but it could be seen as a 'majoritarian' view. Establishing what counts as a necessity requires more than one method. Perhaps it's better to address this question with in depth qualitative methodology rather than additional survey questions as cognitive debriefing shows how rewording survey questions to improve them can introduce different problems.

*2) When you ask people what is important, do they take what they already have for granted?*

Yes, but that isn't a problem because we're trying to identify items that are useful to establish a poverty threshold so if 99% of people in the UK have it isn't worth including it as it won't distinguish who is poor from who isn't. We did ask about water – the example you gave – but we found it didn't work as a poverty threshold.

*3) How do wellbeing and poverty link?*

Exclusion and wellbeing is something we looked at but we found that people found it easier to talk about experiences of inclusion than exclusion.

*4) Should we include children in discussions of their poverty and wellbeing?*

Absolutely; we didn't ask children about their needs but that would be a useful exercise. We found differences between older and younger adults and younger adults were more likely to talk about material needs than social inclusion. Perhaps this is a cohort effect or due to lack of experience; nonetheless, we can't infer children's perspectives from this.

*5) What are the differences between results from focus groups and surveys; which do you feel produces the more accurate representation of public opinion?*

It's hard to say as survey approaches are more individualized – people's responses may not be generous or thoughtful. In focus groups people are being asked to discuss and express their views in public and what people say in public is as important as what they say in private and may be a better guide for poverty. Research is an interactive process so responses in surveys and focus groups do differ, although we haven't looked at this systematically.

## **Parallel session I - Poverty Measurement**

**Daniel Edmiston (University of Leeds)**

**Understanding the lived experience of deprivation and its effect on conceptions of Social Citizenship**

**Responses to questions**

*1) How did you sample? Was your sample representative? What challenges did you face in recruiting?*

Employment status, income and area deprivation were the three selection criteria used to identify my two sample groups. Secondary quantitative data analysis was undertaken of the Citizenship Survey and the two sample groups were considered to be broadly representative. This was followed by in-depth scenario-driven interviews and I sampled according to the selection criteria. Over 9,000 leaflets were delivered to households across Leeds in areas that were considered to be in the top and bottom 30% of IMD (i.e. most deprived and affluent areas). Purposive sampling ensured that the sample groups in the qualitative stage of fieldwork were also broadly representative of the sample groups in the true population. In the early stages of fieldwork, there was a minor response bias from individuals in the “non-deprived” sample group. Moderately prosperous public service workers often responded to the leaflet to complain about the direction of contemporary social policy with clear messages that they wanted to articulate. By recruiting participants within the sample group that were to a greater extent politically representative of their demographic group, I was able to rectify this response bias.

*2) What language did you find to communicate with seriously deprived people? How did they respond to the language of citizenship?*

Whilst social citizenship as a concept does not often directly feature in the social or political imagination of people (Lister et al., 2003), it is nonetheless a salient aspect of people’s self-identity and reasoning. Intuitions regarding the content and legitimacy of social rights and responsibilities often underpin attitude formation and responses to ‘real-life’ dilemmas. By using a series of vignettes, I was able to tap into ‘lay accounts’ (Mason, 2002). The interview schedule was designed so that the discussion moved from the specific and particular to the abstract and principled, with people able to interpret what they saw as a fulfilment of duty, the content of a right and the dialect between the two. As such, respondents were quite comfortable with these terms and concepts by the end of the interview.

*3) Were more or less deprived people prone to social desirability bias?*

For very different reasons the interview questions served as a form of catharsis for each sample group. The “non-deprived” (Guardian readers) were more likely to give normative responses and to some extent I do believe this was due to a social desirability bias. I addressed this in my future sampling however.

**Sarah Coulthard (Northumbria University)**

**Taking a wellbeing approach to fisheries research: insights from a Sri Lankan fishing village**

**Responses to questions**

*1) How did you find women’s position in the life cycle affected their subjective wellbeing?*

As we only interviewed 30 women it’s hard to tell. Clearly age was important, but so were other social components such as who their neighbours were and the quality of their relationship with them.

2) *Were fisheries the most important thing to people? What was the impact of poverty at the national level on people's wellbeing?*

Although we could have asked about wellbeing in a broad sense, we felt it was important to use the boundary of the fishery to better understand wellbeing in this particular context, recognizing that general and context specific answers can be quite different.

3) *Were there any sources of credit?*

There were few opportunities for saving or loans which meant that fishers were dependent on loans from middlemen. One intervention that would benefit fisheries is the establishment of savings groups.

4) *How did you ask sensitive questions?*

Timing was important so we asked first about people's resources and need satisfaction using a questionnaire and then about more personal matters.

5) *How did you combine qualitative and quantitative methods?*

Sarah - We found contradictions between high scores on subjective wellbeing measures and high incidences of alcohol-related violence which makes these scores hard to interpret. Relationships are often the aspect of their life people most want to change so we use tools to capture what these relationships mean. There are limitations, but triangulation across the different wellbeing domains helps to get a full picture of what's going on, e.g. satisfaction with family relationships despite low need satisfaction.

Daniel – I didn't feel many people who perceived themselves as poor were happy, although feelings of happiness can easily change. Both the quantitative and qualitative methods showed people were experiencing multiple deprivations and they didn't have a high level of support. I think we need to recognize that there is no one measure of their life so I never ask people how deprived they are but instead ask them to talk about their everyday experience.

#### *Comments*

Mary - the danger of quantitative methods is that you have one question printed but people are actually responding to a different one. Their and your understandings change but questionnaires aren't flexible enough to capture this and then it's hard to challenge quantitative results.

Eldin – we need to be critical of quantitative data as questionnaires can encourage socially desirable responses.

### **Parallel session II - Poverty Measurement**

**Sameen Zafar (University of Nottingham)**

**Multidimensional poverty in the Punjab province of Pakistan**

**Edna Bautista & Maria Torres (Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá)**

**Advances in Mixed Method Poverty Research: Lessons Learned in a Colombian Case Study**

*1) Did you try to talk to policy makers about the findings of your research?*

Bautista & Torris: When we presented our results to the mayor, we focused on things that local government could respond to. This is how tried to make the findings relevant for policy makers.

*2) How did you construct the quantitative framework for your research?*

Bautista & Torris: We used a database that was already available in the small municipality in which we did our research. For the purposes of our framework, we took the main dimensions as developed for the multidimensional poverty measure in Colombia. We added a few local dimensions to this framework through the fieldwork.

Zafar: I used the Alkire & Foster framework and applied an equal weighting scheme. Changing the weighting scheme is very difficult as it is highly normative.

*3) It is interesting to see how weights in the dimensions are cemented in people's thinking. My question to Bautista and Torres is about selection of the municipalities and households - where did you do your qualitative research. I am interested to know why you chose that municipality and particular households? My question to Zafar is about the combination of quantitative and qualitative findings – you might be able to do more with qualitative research than merely provide a human story behind the numbers. It could, for example, influence the quantitative analysis such as use of weights.*

Bautista & Torres: This research is linked to a particular programme; mayors of various municipalities applied for the programme and we selected one municipality from those. Within the municipality, we identified 7 families after which 3 were selected for ethnographic research. Gender appeared a problem in doing this research; husbands in 2 of the 3 families refused to let researches come to their house or refused to talk to researchers.

Zafar: The qualitative research could indeed be used for a different purpose, including gaining information on weights. The weighting scheme is very political, however, which is why it is equal in the current methodology. Changing it is very problematic.

*4) This question refers to the issue of nutrition and food security. How did you capture, for example, nutrition or food indicators in qualitative or quantitative work? Also, could you comment on the cost of this work and about how you gained access to the data?*

Bautista & Torres: In terms of data access, the national planning department provides the database, which is public information. We had to talk to the relevant authorities to get access to data to identify each participant for the qualitative research. Regarding the cost - we travelled once a week and travel was not expensive. But compensation to the participants was very costly and poses a challenge to the research. There was no information in the data on food security.

Zafar: The dataset used for the quantitative analysis is publicly available online. Unfortunately it also holds no information on food security.

*5) This question refers to combining primary qualitative data with secondary quantitative data. In this case, the*

*parameters within you operate are set by the quantitative data that you have, raising questions about the extent to which quantitative and qualitative methods can truly be integrated. With respect to your research, can you say something more about the next step, particularly in terms of integrating information- maybe use qualitative data to inform different weighting schemes and test those or work towards the selection of context-specific indicators and thresholds?*

Bautista & Torres: The qualitative information would allow us to construct more context-specific MPI and compare with the international ones.

Zafar: It would be interesting to develop participatory weights for the indicators.

### **Day I Closing session – wrap up by Laura Camfield**

#### **Comments**

James – It's important to think about how methods are sequenced and how samples are selected. Drawing on existing quantitative research enables you to maximize the impact of the qualitative research.

Keetie – When people can't collect qualitative and quantitative primary data then they need to decide which is more important and what role the different methodologies play. For example, is it about triangulation, interpretation, getting to the nitty gritty, etc.

Sarah – we also need to think about what policy makers want and how policy decisions actually get made.

Eldin – there are interesting differences between results from survey and deliberative, consensus based methods – which one is most appealing to politicians? Which is the best predictor of how people act? Policymakers in the UK are dependent on quantitative evidence and always say that qualitative data is not representative, however, reports based on qualitative data do have an impact on the public who tend to distrust 'scientific' research.

Susan Steward – we need to know which age groups we're talking about as social attitudes are influenced by generation.

Mary – politicians have cleverly made even poor people feel that they are undeserving; the shame of being on benefits is as strong now as it was 20 years ago.

We need to also consider unintended consequences – research shouldn't automatically entail intervention as sometimes we just need to understand more.

Sarah – For example, how choices are made. We need to understand this through research rather than tell people what they need to do. Essentially development is about expanding choices.

**Plenary – Impact Evaluation**

**James Copestake (University of Bath)**

**Credible accounts of causation in complex rural contexts: exploring confirmatory and exploratory qualitative impact research methodologies**

*1) It is very interesting to hear that the budget proposed is £5,000 per project. Can you elaborate on this cost estimate? In addition, do you think that there is a risk of de-contextualizing the people, of not paying enough attention, especially given the complexity of the context?*

We have come up with £5,000 figure because we want to be open about how much this type of work might cost. Our motivation is the observation of many NGOs that are spending huge amounts on this type of work and hiring very expensive consultants but the information and data they get in the end is not always good enough. So this is why we want to ask a question - can this be done better? Of course we have to keep in mind that in this case we are piggy backing on very good evidence already. Also we are saving significant funds because we do most of the analysis ourselves, rather than through hired researchers - but this is only because we are testing this tool. Essentially, what NGO's will get for the approximate budget of £5,000 is a set of narrative reports. There is of course more further work could be done with it.

*2) This question refers to the focus of the impact assessment. I was wondering why you did not consider micro-finance groups for testing of impact? As these groups have been found to be successful in the past, would such a focus allow for more comprehensive understanding of the impact?*

When we designed the QUIP for the micro-finance context it was much easier contextually; this time we wanted to choose more challenging options. Also there is already a lot of evidence with regard to micro-finance, so we decided to test our approach in different contexts too.

*3) It is very interesting to hear about the left/right brain hemispheres in relation to our approach to impact evaluation. I am wondering whether you have also considered your ideas in relation to other work on conservative versus liberal outlooks, with the possibility that liberals suffer more from cognitive dissonance.*

I would like to emphasize that I am extremely aware of labeling and the dangers of doing so, and I want to avoid it. As I am not aware of the other work that is being referred to so it is difficult to comment.

*4) You have mentioned that there is an assumption of having very good monitoring system in place already and the possibility of building on that. At WFP, we often have to operate in emergency situations when we do not always have well established monitoring systems and base line data. How would we deal with that?*

Yes, the assumption of good monitoring is not always available. We are lucky to have programmes where there is already a strong monitoring structure in place, but we understand that it is not always the case. We decided to pilot the QUIP with households which are part of the programme but also as households outside of the programme. We should be able to compare on the global level, rather than to compare within one programme, and it remains an open ended question.

5) *How are consultants chosen? The position of the interviewer is very important.*

Absolutely - action research position is very important. Good qualitative researches are not cheap and not always available in some places. There is always a risk that we might not be able to recruit the good researches. Usually we are looking for the people with the anthropology and/or social science background. We have an academic leader in each country who is helping us with this process. Obviously there are limitations, since we have decided to cap the costs to £5,000 - such as, we will not going to be able to take people through the detailed training. It is important to remember that the biggest source of bias in data is down to the quality and authenticity of the interview.

### **Parallel session I – Impact Evaluation**

**Jaideep Gupte (IDS)**

**Households amidst urban riots: The economic consequences of urban riots in India.**

1) *How were qualitative methods used in this research?*

We used survey methods to ask households about their experiences and their coping strategies and then used this information to develop a profile of extremely victimized people who we then interviewed (or interviewed their parents, if they were underage). We selected purposively rather than randomly and spent a lot of time talking to victims to find out what violence meant to them and whether the two minute perimeter we had identified statistically had any meaning to them. We also spoke to perpetrators as our interest is not just in how people experience violence but also how they commit it. Grouping them both together was not popular when we presented this to criminologists but we didn't want to just focus on the victims.

2) *In my research in the UK I have found that electoral boundaries are arbitrary and don't have any meaning to the people living there – did you find that the spaces you identified had an identity as a neighbourhood?*

These demarcations were meaningful to the police as they shaped how they saw the areas and created silos of police interventions. By choosing voting booth zones we were able to access areas long forgotten. We could also have used bespoke neighborhood algorithms to profile areas and aid in sampling, however, there are very expensive. Next year we hope to spend time interrogating these results using qualitative methods.

**Vera Mironov (University of Maryland)**

**Ethnic Diversity and economic behavior. How does minority status affect investment in Bosnia and Herzegovina?**

1) *Was the business survey conducted where people live or where they operate?*

It was conducted where they worked and was mostly among small business owners, e.g. shopkeepers, who would have started businesses wherever they had moved to.

2) *Were levels of investment in the game lower than they would have been in reality?*

We don't have conclusive evidence, although it is possible that participants were displaying high levels of trust to all in front of foreign researchers.

*3) Were you or other researchers identifiable as from a minority or majority group and how did this affect the way people behaved?*

We used local researchers from the same group so people would identify with them. Personally, I realized that my Croatian accent was affecting participants' behavior so I had to pretend that I didn't speak the language. Participants were also paid for participation so there was a strong incentive.

**Inka Barnett (IDS)**

**Understanding the causes and consequences of injuries to adolescents growing up in poverty in Ethiopia, India, Vietnam and Peru: a mixed method study.**

*1) What proportion of the injuries related to child labour?*

This is country-specific, however, in most countries they were caused by recreational activities.

*2) What were the challenges of doing longitudinal research?*

We found it hard to maintain researchers and participants, especially as we don't pay participants. Every year we say we are doing research that will change your life but nothing changes and it becomes harder to convince people to participate.

*3) How do you maintain ethical standards?*

It varies from country to country. In Ethiopia there's a lot of research fatigue because there is so much research going on.

*4) Could you comment on the tension between wanting to protect the data that has already been collected and experiment with new methods?*

The quantitative data is openly accessible so anyone can look at it and then try to access the communities concerned to conduct a different study. This could be a challenge, particularly if there is a lot of research in one area.

*5) Was the sub-study on injury part of the longitudinal qualitative research?*

Yes.

*6) How were the countries chosen?*

This was done a long time ago by a different team and unfortunately some of the countries are now middle income and so not DFID priorities.

*7) Does the way young people were injured and how they remember this affect its impact on them?*

In the questionnaire our definition was very specific; however, in the qualitative analysis we used a much broader understanding of how adolescents see injury and what they understand by it, only excluding crime.

## **Parallel session II – Impact Evaluation**

### **Sally Burrows (WFP)**

#### **Challenges and Insights from a Series of Mixed-Method Impact Evaluations in Protracted Refugee Situations**

*1) This is a question of clarification. You mentioned that a revolution of the model in protracted refugee situations didn't occur. Can you elaborate what you mean with that, and why this didn't happen?*

Burrows: The model is based on the premise that food aid reduces as people build their own livelihoods and become self-reliant. This did not happen and many refugees remain dependent on food aid. WFP still provides 3 meals per day, but livelihoods aren't built meaning that people are still food insecure. Part of the reason for this lack of change was the agency's habit of providing food aid in this kind of way for many years.

*2) I wonder if there were any assumptions underlying the results you found. You mentioned that one reason was funding shortage. Can you clarify how this reason came about? I wonder whether this assumption could have been rejected with the evidence that you found.*

This research was very much of exploratory nature. Information came from a wide range of stakeholders (including donors themselves) as well as secondary data such as programme reports and so on. We were investigating contextual factors from an exploratory perspective and lack of funding came out repeatedly with many other data and confirmed from the programme data.

*3) Could you elaborate on some of the assumptions that you listed as part of your model. What are the criteria for such assumptions?*

Assumptions are based on our Theory of Change (ToC) and are grounded in previous studies and monitoring data. But we found that such assumptions need further testing. For example, we found that women receiving the food becoming indebted. They were using the food as credit in order to buy other things and therefore did not consume the provided calories. This finding came out of qualitative research. We know of this happening, but we don't know the scale of this. Another example refers to teenage girls selling sex. Teen aged girls were found to sell their body because nobody provided clothing in the camps. We notice this in our work and research. The agency's ToC was based on the assumption that somehow refugees will get what they need in the camp or that they will be sent home after the first week. But in protracted situations, the 1<sup>st</sup> week doesn't exist anymore. We didn't develop an alternative logic for such protracted situations, but we work heavily on the assumption of short medium and long term. And we find incredibly unexpected results. You will be surprised how very similar negative effects are found in the completely different context over and over again.

### **Keetie Roelen (IDS)**

#### **Evaluating outside the box: Mixing methods in analysing social protection programmes**

*1) Feedback to learning loop is challenge for us (WFP). How can we make sure that lessons learned about programmes are fed back into its design and implementation?*

The possibilities for doing so depend on who you work with. In our case, we were able to influence some of the redesign program; fortunately we were engaged in the design and implementation process. In other instances, this is

more difficult to achieve. Seeking continuous involvement and trying to provide information at key decision-making moments is important.

*2) You describe a targeting model whereby 10% of the poorest are included in the programme and how this leads to exclusion of other poor and vulnerable groups. Is there any discussion to adopt other model such as rotational model?*

Both programmes are pilot programmes so they are very keen to show the impact of the program to convince government, donors and other stakeholders to keep the programme. Concentrating efforts on a small group only will increase the likelihood of the programme having an impact on the beneficiaries' lives. In both cases, the tensions that may arise from exclusion have been recognized.

**Jennifer Leavy (UEA)**

**The Wider Impacts of Social Protection: Research on the Views, Experiences and Perceptions of Social Cash Transfer Programme Recipients and their Communities**

*1) You have access to the secondary data collected through the programme's RCT conducted by another research team. How will you combine this secondary data with the range of different sources primary qualitative and quantitative data?*

We haven't had the opportunity to use the RCT data and combine it yet. We need to have a closer look at the data but most likely use it to inform analysis and triangulate findings.

*2) This question relates to the links between social networks and wellbeing. How does one's social network contribute to their wellbeing? How would relationships contribute to the wellbeing also in terms of social protection (i.e. having other people around you to pick up the benefits for you if can't)?*

The interaction between social networks and wellbeing is one of the big drivers of this research in terms of relationship wellbeing (one of the three dimensions of wellbeing in the 3D wellbeing framework). There is a delicate balance there as social relationships can have positive and negative effects, depending of the types and nature of those relationships. This research aims to investigate that in more detail.

### **Plenary - Poverty Dynamics**

**Janet Seeley (University of East Anglia)**

**Poverty dynamics across the life course**

*1) It is interesting that respondents say "There are still things I can rejoice in" - to what extent this is due to religious faith?*

Religion is very important. When we are asking people about support, the questions usually focused on material support but people often end up speaking about the spiritual support. It is an integral part of life for people. People take it very seriously.

*2) Very interesting point. It makes me think - in South Africa fishing communities are given rights to fish and there is a strong feeling that what you've got is so much better than what you used to have. I wonder, how does this*

*acceptance restrict people's achievements?*

Land ownership is very important. When a woman has to put up with abusive relationships for the sake of her children we think it's not fair but this can be seen in a broader view - it is securing the future for their children. It is very easy to see things from our own point of view and not understand how other people see their situation. When we look at interventions it is important to see at what people are already doing for themselves. In all that we do, we must try to understand more about the context, that is most important.

*3) Your reference to how wellbeing can change from one period to the next or even from point in the day to the next has similarities to the issue of wellbeing. On the point of the importance of timing - what are the implications in terms of research, how do you deal with knowing when is the low and a high time in terms of individual situation (feeling depressed etc)?*

If the sample is large enough there will be a possibility to even out some of these fluctuations and get the picture right in the end.

*4) Was there a time when HIV drugs became largely accessible and some people were still choosing not to take them?*

The story of the epidemic changes across time - the fear and the uncertainty, the awful way in which people died etc. There are enough times when people were taking drugs and it didn't work, so there is understandable degree of cautiousness about it. The older people have seen many others dying around them, and the knowledge of that affects the older generation view of HIV. There is that tension which alters people's perspective on the future.

*5) There is resistance to policies targeted at elderly. Did you or do you see any changes in that?*

Not yet, we are working with the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development. There is a very dynamic commissioner who is very interested in ageing. –Others have other priorities – in a country where the majority of population are under 18-19 years old, this is not surprising. The resources are few so they are concentrated on the young.

*6) Have the donors become persuaded in the necessity on both qualitative and quantitative research methods?*

Yes, and it is very positive. We have presented results of the first phase and they [donors] were very pleased with it. Now we will be presenting the second phase results.

*7) I was thinking about your relationships with respondents - having time to go back and not to rush - it is similar to the ethnographic work. But more factual less personal data is sometimes preferred. Is it slightly uncomfortable about being 'in the middle'?*

What we have to realise as researchers is that we are part of people's support networks- this is a grey area but something that one comes to accept if one is engaged in long-term research.

## Parallel session I - Poverty Dynamics

**Mary Smith (Shelter) and Jenny Truder (Crisis)**

**Robbing Peter to pay Paul: how participants in a qualitative longitudinal housing and wellbeing research project measure and reflect on poverty dynamics over time**

*1) When you mentioned the situation with respect to food security, the deprivation indicator was 2 meals a day. So presumably 90% of the people felt they should have at least 2 meals of day. So, for your group, would they say 2 meals a day would be acceptable?*

This is a complex issue. People talked about absence of the food, the choices they make and also about missing meals. We did not actually ask anyone about how many meals a day they thought they should have but what they thought was fair enough of food a day for more than once a week. And we also asked about the adults, not the children.

*2) People have been working with food security concept of developing countries for many years. There is a very negative coping strategy if you go without food for a day. So, I am kind of flabbergasted that this also seems to happen in rich countries? Is foregoing food for a day a common coping strategy?*

Different kinds of questions have been asked. One thing that came up was how many meals a day should be sufficient. This probably also depends on how you define a meal. This is a difficult question. In poverty survey in UK, it has been shown that people skip meal because they can't afford any or in order to give food to their children. People prioritize paying for energy costs rather than meals.

*3) In terms of sampling, how many people you interviewed and where?*

The study took place in 3 different regions in England. We worked in inner and outer of east London,

*4) With reference to the 25% attrition of your sample, were these all people who moved out of the area? If so, were you able to track them?*

We lost contact with them and they changed telephone numbers. We sent various kinds of messages. It was much harder to find people than we expected. Families had often broken up. In case of broken families, we tracked one adult from each household.

*5) This question relates to shame and stigma. Similar issues are seen in international context. One of the pictures of poverty in Great Britain is the way that poor are being stigmatized and the way it is internalized. So I wondered to what extent that came across in your interviews?*

A fundamental issue is how people have been treated. They were worried about being good parents, thought of educating their children, and were pleased to have housing, child care, and good housing budget management outcome. They didn't always think they were doing a good job, and they worried about it. There was a lot of pressure on family relationships.

**Keetie Roelen (IDS)**

**Analysing child poverty dynamics using secondary quantitative data and primary qualitative data: methodological challenges**

*1) I am surprised to learn of the inability to do a participatory ranking and household survey as part of your study. The multidimensional poverty index is relatively simple and data should be easy to collect.*

The problem primarily refers to timing. The process requires data to be collected, entered and analysed before it would provide me with the necessary information for the qualitative research. Unfortunately I don't have this time to go to the field twice.

*2) I was wondering whether there is an extra reason why there is a differentiation between multidimensional and monetary poverty index, particularly in Sub Saharan Africa Possibly due to social protection, households with low income may still have access to other services? Household may also hold assets that could cause this mismatch.*

You are right, the availability of physical assets may form an explanation. Social capital may also be an explanatory factor for the mismatch between monetary and multidimensional poverty.

*3) I was interested in your last comment about using different indicators in measuring child deprivation. Using different indicators is important to try and capture child deprivation. But it also introduces another layer of measurement. You can look at the characteristics of children living in poor households rather than looking at child deprivation.*

One of the potential explanations for this mismatch is at the household level and child specific analysis would allow looking at intra-household distributional issues. Then you have the challenges of indicators; not all indicators are available for children in all age groups. But it is interesting even when you try to look at primary quantitative data collection efforts. In Burundi, we tried collecting information on dietary diversity for children aged 0-5. However, nutritionists told us that this information only makes sense for children aged 6-18 months. In longitudinal analysis, this means that you will not have that information available for that child in 2 years time as they will grow out of that age bracket. So, it is tricky.

*4) How does the education sector handle measurement across stages of childhood?*

For education from grade 1 to grade 10, some indicators essentially reflect changes in age; enrolment rates refer to primary or secondary education, for example. The challenge lies in how to substitute one indicator for another if no comparable information is available across age groups.

**Neil Dawson (UEA)**

**Bringing context to multidimensional poverty: Measured and unmeasured dynamics in rural Rwanda**

*1) The context of Rwanda with authoritarian regime provides an interesting case study. When you look at the indicators of poverty such like the MPI, it is not in line with the reality of people. It shows exactly the importance of mixing methods, including people's own conception, experiences of what is going on. Personal experiences can be very different from what numbers show us.*

*I also thought your cluster analysis is interesting. To what extent you have triangulated against the community's own*

*household classification – the Ubudehe categories? There was quite a strict classification of household at community level. Have you done any community wealth exercise? How do they match against each other?*

I overlooked the category they did. Local level corruption means that people actually seek to belong to a particular category so that they can receive benefits. I got impression when people talk about categorization, they talk little bit negatively.

*2) This question relates to food security issue in Rwanda. WFP had 3 food security data collection exercises so it should be available on our webpage. When I was working in evaluation in Rwanda, they had striking chronic malnutrition. I wonder you had any qualitative or quantitative data on chronic malnutrition for poverty criteria. The Government prioritizes chronic malnutrition.*

A more extensive structured questionnaire would be good in capturing this issue. Measuring food security on a national scale can drive policy but experiences with local level food security were very different from national level.

## **Parallel session II - Poverty Dynamics**

**Lucrezia Tincani (OPM)**

**Vulnerability prevented: measuring the resilience of rural households in Burkina Faso.**

*1) How did you collect data in both regions? Were there other researchers helping you?*

I had two local researchers in each site who administered the questionnaire; however, I collected all the qualitative data myself as it was important to establish relationships with the local community.

*2) People can lose out through resilience building processes, even within a single household. How are these compromises made?*

In relation to food security, the household head controlled resources and would hand out food to their wives to cook. Some of the young people were reluctant to contribute to the family pot as it affected their own finances and women and children often ate less. There were struggles between individual and collective interests – people would hide food from other family members.

*3) In the UK resilience and wellbeing are conceptualized psychologically and on an individual rather than a collective basis – have we got this wrong?*

Different disciplines understand these concepts differently and psychological approaches are always individualized. I am interested in people making deliberate choices to sacrifice food to preserve social ties – a common saying is that the best way to save food is in your brother's stomach (i.e. they will then help you when you are hungry).

**Laura Camfield (UEA)**

**Youth entrepreneurship in urban Africa: What is the role of non-cognitive skills and are we measuring the right ones?**

*1) Where do non-cognitive skills come from can? Can they be taught?*

I am looking at life skills programmes in developing countries and initiatives like PSE in UK primary schools are also attempts to do this due to the assumption of greater malleability of non-cognitive relative to cognitive.

**Susan Steward (Kings College)**

**The potential of schools to take young people out of poverty: a case study of pupil outcomes in the City of Norwich in the mid 2000s.**

*1) How are your respondents experiencing social mobility?*

I don't have a positive story to tell – disadvantaged young people were often making great contributions to their community so defining social mobility as moving elsewhere is problematic, although I could understand why this would appeal. I can't draw strong conclusions as I only had 20 interviewees who were sampled opportunistically