

Helpdesk Research Report: Social Exclusion Approaches to Poverty Analysis

06/09/12

Query: Please review a selection of quantitative, qualitative and participatory tools and methods used by development agencies to undertake macro-level poverty and social exclusion analysis. Identify the scope and intended application of these tools, resources and skills required to use them, and any lessons learned.

Author: Anna Ormert

Contents

1. Overview
2. Social exclusion approaches to poverty analysis
3. Other social analysis approaches
4. Lessons learned
5. Sources

1. Overview

This report identifies and reviews a selection of tools and methods used by bilateral, multilateral and non-governmental development agencies to conduct social exclusion and other social approaches to poverty analysis. In recent years, development agencies have grown increasingly dissatisfied with income-only approaches to understanding poverty, and have begun to focus on the role of social factors in shaping development outcomes. As such, there has been growing consensus on the complementarity of economic and social policy in order to achieve development outcomes. In particular, understanding social exclusion has come to be seen as key to ensuring that *all* poor people benefit from poverty reduction interventions (DFID 2009). While exclusion can occur on economic, social and political levels, allocation of resources and access to goods and services across social groups is often shaped by social relationships and power relationships, which – in turn – affect the distribution structures themselves (Gacitua-Mario et al 2006). These are not dimensions that can be easily captured by quantitative measures. Donors – including DFID, SIDA, GTZ and the World Bank – have thus turned towards new approaches and methods for conducting social analysis of poverty. Some of the main trends include:

(1) **Growing consensus on the multidimensional nature of poverty.** This has, in turn, created a need for multidimensional indicators to measure aspects of poverty that cannot be easily captured by income-based data, such as social disadvantage, vulnerability and

powerlessness. (Gacitua-Mario and Wodon, 2001). These are intended to complement money-based measures by considering multiple deprivations and their overlaps.

(2) Increased understanding of the need for mixed-method approaches to analysing poverty. The acknowledgement that traditional economic measures are not adequate indicators on their own to measure poverty has also paved the way for approaches that combine both qualitative and quantitative tools and methods. Most donors strive to incorporate both types of data into their analyses (for example, the World Bank's Country Social Assessment, SIDA's Gender Assessment). In many cases this entails drawing upon existing quantitative data and supplementing with newer qualitative data.

(3) Growing popularity of participatory approaches. The popularity of Participatory Poverty Appraisals (PPAs) undertaken by a range of development actors (Norton et al) has had the knock-on effect that participatory approaches are built into many donor frameworks. For example, the World Bank states that their Social Assessment (SA) and Gender Analysis (GA) methods incorporate participation and social analysis into the project design process. These methods are also carried out in country economic and sector work to establish a broad framework for participation and to identify priority areas for social analysis. In some cases, it has been highlighted that the final analysis is less important than the participatory process involved in generating analytical categories and collecting data.

(4) Acknowledged value of integrated approaches to understanding the varying dimensions of poverty. These include social, political and economic dimensions. Some combine these dimensions within one framework (for example, the World Bank's Country Social Assessment). Others suggest using a given framework in conjunction with further frameworks that take different approaches. Drawing on multiple frameworks (for example DFID's GSEA, with Human Rights Assessment, Strategic Conflict Assessment and Country Governance Analysis; or the World Bank's Country Social Analysis and Gender Assessment) can help shed light on formal and informal power relationships that impact on poverty reduction interventions. Some donors also recommend drawing upon the frameworks developed by other donors where possible.

(5) A strong emphasis on gender. Gender equality is seen as a core dimension of work by development agencies. Whilst some, like SIDA, pledge to mainstream gender into all areas of work including social analysis (SIDA 2009), others have published detailed guidelines on carrying out standalone gender-responsive social analysis or gender analysis (GA) (DFID 2009, World Bank 2005).

(6) Need for flexible approaches. Whilst some donors have prepared detailed guidance on carrying out social analysis (for example, DIFD's Gender and Social Exclusion Analysis), others have produced purposefully general guidance to allow for flexible usage across a range of sectors and countries. Examples of general guidance include UN DESA's guidance on measuring social integration; SIDAs Multidimensional Poverty Analysis; and the World Bank's Country Social Analysis and Gender Assessment). Nevertheless, most donors emphasise the need for **flexibility** in using frameworks. They emphasise that there is no one-size-fits all approach and that indicators must be designed taking into account local country context as well as policy objectives.

2. Social exclusion approaches to poverty analysis

Country Social Analysis (The World Bank)

The World Bank's Country Social Analysis (CSA) is a diagnostic tool that integrates social, economic, political and institutional analysis to understand the influence of a particular country's context on policy reform and development outcomes. The CSA assesses how power, institutions and governance affect relevant socio-economic variables, such as economic opportunities or access to services by different social groups. Additionally, it provides political analysis with a focus on how actors and processes contribute to political stability and their role in facilitating pro-poor reform. On this basis, the CSA identifies social and political risks related to the country context as well as the World Bank's portfolio, and it provides policy recommendations to manage these risks, to promote social inclusion and to improve governance. CSAs are primarily based on existing qualitative and quantitative data (such as the Bank's comparative database of social development statistics), supplemented with collection of new primary data on issues of particular concern in the specific case. The CSA approach has been piloted in 22 countries. (Holland 2007; Anis 2003)

The CSA framework consists of two key dimensions, which are linked analytically and operationally and should be mutually considered (Gacitua-Mario et al, 2006). These are:

- **Examination of social diversity, assets and livelihoods:** Impact of social diversity on economic opportunities (livelihoods) of different social groups (delineated by gender, age, ethnic origin, geography, culture); and
- **Analysis of power relations, institutions and governance:** A country's institutional and political economy context, linking it to dimensions of social inclusion and accountability.

Based on these two dimensions, the scope and emphasis of a CSA can be adapted to country context and the Bank's portfolio of policy interventions. Rather than presenting a range of possible analytical themes, this is intended to serve as a core framework whilst being flexible enough for use in different contexts. Analysis of livelihoods and institutional context should enable the CSA to assess social risks to the Bank's involvement in-country, including institutional risks, political economy risks (e.g. capture of benefits, opposition, distortion by influential stakeholders), exogenous risks (natural disasters, regional economic crises), and country risks ((political instability, violence, tensions). Risks that are created by development interventions should also be considered. The CSA framework also outlines three core areas of policy recommendations: (1) promoting sustainable livelihoods and asset equity; (2) improved governance and accountability; and (3) reducing social and political risks.

There are five different types of CSA:

- Stand-alone CSAs – conceptualised and conducted as independent reports, even if they provided inputs to other pieces of analytical work
- Joint CSA processes – in which the CSA was conceptualised and conducted while being integrated with another study, such as a World Bank Poverty Assessment

(Guinea-Bissau)

- CSAs conceived as inputs to other reports – such as the World Bank Country Economic Memoranda (CEM), Country Assistance Strategies (CAS), even if conducted independently (Angola)
- CSAs that evolved during implementation – which may yield multiple outputs (Haiti)
- CSAs that have been planned and conducted over a long period of time – which may produce multiple outputs feeding results into programming (Nepal)' (Gacitua-Mario et al 2006)

Social inclusion indicators (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs)

In 2010, UN DESA published guidance on analysing and measuring social inclusion (Atkinson and Marlier 2010). This guidance was aimed at international organisations, national and subnational governments, researchers, civil society organisations and development practitioners. It defines social inclusion as 'the process by which societies combat poverty and social exclusion'. It emphasises that the factors working against social inclusion (i.e. poverty and exclusion) need to be understood. Whilst the guidance assesses the scope and usefulness of social inclusion indicators, it refrains from identifying a single set of indicators, suggesting that the selection of indicators will depend on the country context and the purpose for which the indicators are to be employed.

Recommendations include:

- **Focus on measurement:** The guidance focuses on quantitative measures as essential to the analysis of poverty and social exclusion. It also suggests that quantitative indicators need to be accompanied by qualitative evidence to (1) help interpret the numbers; (2) serve as a starting point for understanding underlying mechanisms; and (3) because there are key elements of human experience that cannot be quantified.
- **Multidimensional approach:** Indicators need to measure economic resources and employment, as well as dimensions of health, education, affordable access to other public services (e.g. justice), housing, civil rights, security and justice, wellbeing, information and communications, mobility, social and political participation, leisure and culture.
- **Principle-based approach:** Indicators should (1) identify the essence of a problem and have an agreed normative interpretation; (2) be robust and statistically validated; (3) be interpretable in an international context; (4) reflect the direction of change and be susceptible to revision; (5) not impose too large a burden on countries, enterprises or citizens.
- **Subjective and objective indicators:** The key indicators used should be 'objective' – for example, the status of individuals/households is to be verified by documentary evidence and not based on subjective judgement by respondent. However, since

exclusion is a personal experience, broader subjective indicators (e.g. lack of political voice) may prove useful for analysing certain aspects of poverty and social exclusion. There are several instances which may require social indicators with subjective dimensions: (1) when the standard or target is set on the basis of citizens' responses to survey questions (e.g. questions about the minimum household income needed to make ends meet); (2) when poverty levels are determined by respondents' own subjective standard (e.g. what level of spending is needed to keep your family out of poverty?); (3) when people are asked to provide a subjective evaluation of own situation (e.g. how do you feel about 'making ends meet?'); (4) subjective measurements of 'life satisfaction' or 'happiness'.

- **Gender and child mainstreaming:** Gender mainstreaming should be implemented at every stage of the process. With regards to social indicators, gender is important not just in terms of disaggregation but in the definition of indicators. Designing indicators should also be guided by attention to children. This should entail not just disaggregation by age but asking what indicators would best serve the needs of children.
- **Participatory approach:** The construction of performance indicators needs to be based on a participatory approach, involving regional and local public authorities, NGOs working to combat poverty and social exclusion, grassroots organisations and citizens themselves. Citizens' ownership is key to promoting social inclusion.
- **Use existing data:** Full use should be made of household data surveys and other potential data sources.

SIDA's Power Analysis (SIDA)

Although SIDA's Power Analysis (SIDA 2006) gravitates towards political analysis it also deals with power issues related to people's relationships with institutions in a given setting. Power analysis is based on an understanding that sustained poverty reduction requires that poor people have access to political power and resources (Holland 2007). SIDA's integrative approach focuses on the links between human rights, democracy and poverty reduction; formal versus informal institutions and agents, and the importance of process. Power Analysis therefore analyzes actors, interest groups, and structures to uncover where the real power in a society lies and how power is distributed geographically, institutionally, and socially. Depending on how it is carried out, it might also provide insights into what kind of power is being exercised and how, in addition to how this power is perceived by others. Issues that should be analysed are actors, structures, processes, relations, and hierarchies.

The degree and types of participatory processes involved in Power Analysis will vary, depending on the country context (degree of authoritarianism/ semiauthoritarianism/ democracy) and the primary objective of the study. SIDA has found beneficial impact from facilitating discussions between groups that do not normally interact around issues of power. Though promoting public debate and dialogue has not been at the forefront of past efforts, this has been identified as an issue that deserves future attention (SIDA 2006).

Gender Analysis (World Bank)

The World Bank aims to integrate gender-responsive social analysis into social analysis at all levels, as well as carrying out stand-alone gender analysis (GA) where deemed appropriate (World Bank 2005). The World Bank's Gender Analysis (GA) focuses on understanding and documenting the differences in gender roles, activities, needs, and opportunities in a given context. Gender analysis is used in the formulation of country economic memoranda, country sector strategies, structural adjustment, country portfolio management, poverty assessments, environmental assessment, and in sector-specific project planning, monitoring, and evaluation; thus, many variants of policy and sector-specific gender analysis tools are available. The purpose of GA is to: (a) identify gender-based differences in access to resources to predict how different members of households, groups, and societies will participate in and be affected by planned development interventions; (b) permit planners to achieve the goals of effectiveness, efficiency, equity, and empowerment through designing policy reform and supportive programme strategies; and (c) develop training packages to sensitize development staff on gender issues and training strategies for beneficiaries.

Key concepts in gender analysis include:

- *Practical gender needs* (those that relate to women's traditional gender roles and responsibilities and are derived from concrete life experiences);
- *Strategic gender needs* (addressing empowerment of women and focusing on systemic factors that discriminate against women);
- *Intrahousehold dynamics* (understanding interdependent relationships, the rights, responsibilities, obligations and patterns of interaction among household members with regards to development assistance); and
- *Interhousehold relations* (the social organisation of these larger networks and the gender differences in roles, functions and access).

GA involves the disaggregation of quantitative data by gender. The gender analysis framework does not provide specific guidance on which information to collect, since it suggests that this should be determined based on country context and availability of existing information. It argues that the flexible framework allows for design that is consistent with project and policy goals. However, it emphasises that data collection and analysis must be focused on priority issues, rather than being general data collection exercises that are not necessarily tied to project or policy concerns. As such, the framework incorporates five main, but general, categories of information for analysis: needs assessment, activities profile; resources, access, control profile; benefits and incentives analysis; and institutional constraints and opportunities.

Gender Analysis (SIDA)

SIDA mainstreams gender analysis into the overall mandatory poverty analysis. The scope of SIDA's gender analysis can vary. (For example, it can serve as a baseline for an intervention, but is also a point of departure for the choice of the strategy to apply). It can also be carried out using different methodologies.

GA includes both quantitative and qualitative data to shed light on division of labour, roles and responsibilities, productive and reproductive work, access to, and control over, resources,

and their relative condition and position in society. It also involves looking at other norms for how gender may be expressed, including norms relating to sexuality and identity. GA also includes social variables such as ethnicity, culture, age, social class and sexual orientation. SIDA's GA always has an empowerment perspective, highlighting the agency and potential for change for each group. (Wennerholm 2009)

3. Other social analysis approaches

The Multidimensional Poverty Index (UN Human Development Report and Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative)

The Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) is an international measure of poverty, covering 109 developing countries. The MPI complements income poverty and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) measures by reflecting the acute deprivations that people face at the same time, based on micro data from household surveys. It identifies people who contend with multiple deprivations across three dimensions: education, health, and living standards. The MPI was developed by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) and the United Nations Development Programme Human Development Report Office (UNDP HDRO) for the UNDP's flagship Human Development Report.

This index has, however, been criticised for collapsing multiple dimensions into one (unidimensional) index (Ravallion 2011). Since no index can capture 'all that matters in all settings' a proposed alternative is to use 'multiple indices' rather than a 'multidimensional index'. Examples of useful multiple indicators can include poor health, lack of education, inadequate living standard, lack of income (as one of several factors considered), disempowerment, poor quality of work and threat from violence. (OPHI website)

Multidimensional Poverty Analysis (SIDA)

SIDA's Multidimensional Poverty Analysis (MPA) approach (SIDA 2005) was developed primarily for undertaking or designing poverty reduction analyses at the country level, although can also be used for developing Swedish strategies for development cooperation or national strategies for PRS development. The guidelines are purposefully general, rather than tailored to specific circumstances. The framework is seen as a tool, rather than a blue-print.

The guidance suggests that MPA at country-level should be carried out in a cooperative manner with partners in country as well as with other donors in order to feed into the debates about development and the PRS process. The analysis should be considered as key inputs into the cooperation strategy process, rather than as isolated exercises undertaken every few years.

SIDA emphasises an integrated approach to analysis, covering economic, social and political aspects of development as well as environmental and gender dimensions. For example, an analysis of power relations should be seen as an important part of the political analysis, but is also closely linked to both social and economic analyses. Social analysis pertains to social structures, processes and development within societies as well as to the provision of collective and individual welfare by public and other institutions. Environmental and gender dimensions need to be incorporated and given due importance in all these types of analyses.

In countries affected by conflict or HIV/ AIDS, these issues should also be core dimensions of analysis. This requires different types of expertise. The economic, political and social analyses may be undertaken in parallel or sequentially depending on the circumstances, but must feed into each other.

Multidimensional Poverty Analysis involves four main steps:

(1) **Poverty mapping:** This explores who the poor are, where they are found, what their key characteristics are (e.g. income, education, distance to urban centres, access to water, dependency ratio). Attention should be paid to age, gender relations, ethnicity and disability, as well as underlying norms and values. This can draw on Living standard measurement surveys (LSMS). These are undertaken in an increasing number of developing countries and provide a wealth of demographic, educational, health-related, economic and other individual and household based information. Aggregate demographic, economic and social statistics are also useful for putting this information in an overall national and developmental context. Studies undertaken in the partner country, particularly by other donors and NGOs, provide a main source of information. The poverty assessments undertaken by the World Bank and other donors often also provide a good entry point for poverty mapping. (SIDA 2005)

While poverty mapping relies on quantitative data, these should be complemented with participatory processes to shed light on other aspects of poverty (e.g. lack of legal protection, vulnerability to power or force, denial of rights) that are key but less easily measured in quantitative terms.

(2) **Deconstruction of causal chains of poverty:** This step requires a multidimensional approach, which marries micro and macro analyses as these can help shed light on each other.

(3) **Exploration of poverty dynamics:** Determinants of poverty dynamics can be divided into (i) life cycle factors (often core causes of poverty, but need to be separated from other causes); (ii) common factors that can have an impact on countries, societies or regions (e.g. external economic shocks, natural disasters, violent conflict); (iii) individual factors (that impact on individuals or households irrespective of developments at national level, e.g. illness that results in loss of income); and (iv) group specific factors (e.g. gender, caste, ethnicity).

(4) **Identification of remedies:** Since causes of poverty 'tend to be found in the interplay between various factors that combine to create vicious circles, an identification of remedies should focus on breaking these vicious circles and on triggering positive development processes.'

Socio-cultural Country Studies (BMZ)

These aim to provide a brief analysis of country-level social and political issues for designing country strategies. The analytical focus is on social groups, legitimacy and functioning of public institutions and civil society, structural impediments to development (Gacitua-Mario et al 2006). Given the time frame for this report, more information on these studies was not able to be identified.

Sustainable Livelihoods Analysis (Various donors including DFID, Oxfam, UN International Fund for Agricultural Development)

Sustainable Livelihoods approaches to development became popular in the 1990s and have been used by different agencies. As a multidimensional analytical framework for understanding poverty, the framework focuses not only on problems and obstacles but also on capabilities. Rather than considering what people in poverty lack (e.g. money, work, skills), this approach starts by considering people's assets that can be strategic for people's livelihoods (SIDA 2002). These assets can include social capital, physical assets (e.g. a car, or the tools of a trade), human capital, and the resources that people can draw on because of where they live, such as public services. This analysis of capabilities is carried out within an asset-vulnerability framework. In considering what impacts on people's decisions to pursue new livelihoods strategies – to take up training, to start a new job, or to move in pursuit of one – it is important to take account of risk and vulnerability. Livelihood decisions can put existing assets at risk (Haddad 2011). Such analysis provides entry points and opportunities for effective development interventions grounded in people's own realities and efforts (Haddad 2011).

Moving Out of Poverty Study (World Bank)

The Moving Out of Poverty Study was a large-scale longitudinal, participatory study following on from the World Bank's seminal study on Voices of the Poor (Narayan, Pritchett, and Kaoppor, 2009). It explored pathways out of poverty as well as the 'roadblocks' caused by economic and social exclusion. The study was guided by three principles: (1) individuals are the experts on their own lives; (2) local context matters; and (3) change over time gives deeper insights into the dynamics of poverty mobility.

Included in the study were more than 60,000 people in 15 countries in Africa (Malawi, Morocco, Senegal, Tanzania and Uganda); South Asia (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka); East Asia (Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand); and Latin America (Colombia and Mexico). In some countries more than one study was conducted (each with its own focus), bringing the total to 21. Local research institutes carried out the multidisciplinary study, and the researchers held dialogues with government, civil society, academics and World Bank staff to determine the key policy questions. Between 8-20 communities (chosen through randomised sampling) were also studied in more depth in each country (and more in each of the Indian states).

Ten different data collection methods were used, including questionnaires, life survey interviews, focus groups, 'ladder of life' exercises and household interview questionnaires. Statistical analysis was used to analyse data but this was also located in 'thick description' of the stories gathered. The data was analysed both manually and using an anthropological software package (Nudist). Expert literature (from technocrats, policy makers, world leaders, economists, political scientists, philosophers, and anthropologists who have influenced the poverty debates) was also referred to, but used sparingly. The ladder of life tool, exploring issues related to freedom, democracy and people's perspectives on poverty, was found to be particularly innovative.

The analytical framework for the Moving Out of Poverty study was broad. It explored the relationship between actors-as-agents and the opportunity structures within which they operated, and assessed inequality embedded in institutional relations. It also examined the relationship between the existing opportunity structure, people's agency and their mobility patterns. The framework aimed to aid understanding of the key factors and processes that facilitated or constrained poor people's efforts to improve their own wellbeing. Several different wellbeing measures were used to measure mobility: income- consumption-expenditure data; assets index; food security or hunger measures; occupation; and a measure of subjective wellbeing (Ladder of Life).

Newer approaches to measuring 'subjective wellbeing' include:

Wellbeing Approach (DFID/ESRC)

This is a model of 'wellbeing assessment' being developed and applied by Wellbeing and Poverty Pathways (a DFID/ ESRC research project) in the context of a two-year research project in Zambia and India. The approach is integrated (using both subjective and objective indicators while considering the broader environment in which people live), multidimensional (relying on eight key interrelated dimensions), and contextual (considering cultural, political and socio-economic situations). It uses a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. These include surveys with 700 respondents across the two countries (each respondent interviewed twice to capture changes over time), interviews (to provide in-depth qualitative evidence) and community meetings to generate discussions about wellbeing and poverty and gather information about the broader contexts of people's lives. (Wellbeing and Poverty Pathways 2011)

Shame and humiliation indicators (Oxford Policy and Human Development Initiative)

This set of proposed indicators aims to fill a gap in existing assessments. It posits that although shame and humiliation are central to the understanding of poverty, internationally comparable data on this dimension do not exist. Based on existing indicators from related fields, OPHDI suggests a number of indicators to measure specific aspects of shame and humiliation. These include:

- Whether respondents would feel shame if they were poor
- Levels of shame proneness
- Perceptions of respectful treatment;
- Unfair treatment and prejudiced treatment
- Whether respondents perceive that their ethnic, racial or cultural background affects their chances of accessing jobs, services and education
- Whether respondents perceive that economic conditions affect their chances of accessing employment and public services
- Levels of accumulated humiliation. (Zavaleta Reyles, 2007)

4. Lessons learned

The growing popularity of multidimensional poverty analysis has challenged other methods, especially poverty assessments based on economic indicators. Adopting a broader

perspective than that of monetary assessments generates a more complex view of poverty. Where different approaches have been used, discrepancies have been noted. For instance, high levels of poverty (where poverty is measured by isolation from the community) has been documented, even where levels of income suggest otherwise (Ruggeri Laderchi 2001).

The benefits of both qualitative and quantitative methods (known, in combination, as Q-Squared) have been acknowledged by leading experts of both traditions, and lively debates have emerged on how to best combine the two. Each approach has strengths and weaknesses. For example, numerical information is more easily aggregated, but can omit nuance and texture, whilst general coverage aids representation, but can result in ambiguous context. Nevertheless, discussions around Q-Squared have resulted in some agreement (Kanbur 2001), such as that some numerical information could – and should – be collected in participatory poverty appraisals. It has also been acknowledged that the introduction of more subjective and open-ended questions in a standard household survey might provide more insights on defining, and measuring poverty. Qualitative work could also explain statistical anomalies and help identify causal connections to be econometrically tested. Moreover, initial participatory exercises could suggest questions for inclusion in the standardized surveys. While there seems to be agreement on the benefits of mixing the two methods, there seem to be few examples of where this has been done successfully in practice (Lawson, Hulme and Muwonge 2007).

The following lessons have been documented based on a World Bank review of some of the key donor frameworks for social and political analysis (Gacitua-Mario et al 2006).

Firstly, **defining clear analytical objectives** is crucial for enhancing effectiveness. Linking analysis clearly to policy processes / dialogues has resulted in specific programming recommendations, whereas using more general objectives has limited the policy recommendations and operational linkages.

Secondly, certain dimensions are key to future analysis:

- **Non-economic inequities, which are not readily observable**, including different types of assets, the different values assets hold over time and existing mechanisms for intergenerational transfer of assets.
- **Processes that lead to livelihood and human security risks** faced by poor and vulnerable social groups as well as building institutional arrangements to prevent these.
- **Relevant factors for sustaining the stability of the political system**, including factors that generate conflict (e.g. elite capture, inequality, patronage, corruption) and elements that might contribute to negotiated settlements and/or social change.
- **Existing institutional channels for different social groups to engage in the political process and hold public institutions accountable** (including the capacity of civil society and the private sector to enable or inhibit development).

- **Factors that promote or hinder existing political, governmental, and civil society institutions to deliver goods and services to their stakeholders.**
Analyses should be tailored to take into account social norms and arrangements that might influence formal and informal institutions.

Thirdly, **social approaches should be integrated with other approaches** in order to maximise analytical value, given existing overlaps between the different approaches. Integrating political and social analysis with economic analysis strengthens the development of macro-level policy. Further, analysis is more effective when done in **collaboration or consultation with other development agencies** in order to avoid duplication of work and enable more consistency in policy dialogue with the government. By identifying areas of specialisation, different agencies can contribute through the experience of their most suitable programmes. Joint social analysis work between donor agencies can help promote harmonisation and policy impact.

Fourthly, macro-level social analysis should **consider the potential impacts of development interventions** themselves. (Gacitua-Mario 2006)

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, **the process of conducting social analysis is as important as the analysis itself.** The effectiveness of the analytical process is dependent on integration with the policy dialogue process and policy makers should be included at key stages of analysis. Engaging government and civil society also strengthens ownership of the findings, which in turn enhances policy impact. Dissemination should be tailored to the audience and can take multiple forms (including interactive workshops and briefings during the process). In the end, the policy impact of macro social analysis will not necessarily derive from the final report but from ‘the way the questions, analysis and interpretations are presented and discussed with internal and external stakeholders in the course of preparations’ (Gracitua-Mario et al 2006).

Sources

Bibliography

Alkire, Sabina, and Foster, James 2011, ‘MPI Primer’, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, Oxford <http://www.ophi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/MPI-Primer.pdf?cda6c1>

Alkire, Sabina, and Foster, James, 2010, ‘Acute Multidimensional Poverty: A New Index for Developing Countries,’ Human Development Research Paper 2010/11, United Nations Development Programme, New York
http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2010/papers/HDRP_2010_11.pdf

Atkinson, A.B., and Marlier, E., 2010, Analysing and Measuring Social Inclusion in a Global Context, The Department of Economic and Social Affairs at the United Nations, New York
<http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/publications/measuring-social-inclusion.pdf>

Bennett, L., 2005, ‘Gender, Caste and Ethnic Exclusion in Nepal: Following the Policy Process from Analysis to Action’, World Bank, Washington
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRANETSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/Bennett.rev.pdf>

Bjuremalm, Helena, 2006, 'Power Analysis – Experiences and Challenges', Concept Note, - SIDA, Stockholm http://www.sida.se/Svenska/Om-oss/Publikationer/Visa-publikation/?iframesrc=http://www2.sida.se/sida/jsp/sida.jsp%3Fd=118%26a=24300&language=en_US&searchWords=power%20analysis

Anis, Dani 2003, Social Analysis Sourcebook: Incorporating Social Dimensions into Bank-Supported Projects, Social Development Department, The World Bank, Washington D.C. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTTISR/Resources/SocialAnalysisSourcebookFINAL2003Dec.pdf>

DFID, 2009, 'How to note: Gender and Social Exclusion Analysis', Department for International Development

Gacitua-Mario E., et al, 2006, 'Understanding Socio-economic and Political Factors to Impact Policy Change', World Bank, Washington DC, <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/244362-1164107274725/3182370-1164107324437/Socio-Economic-CSA-ESW-wb.pdf?resourceurlname=Socio-Economic-CSA-ESW-wb.pdf>

Gacitua-Mario, E., and Wodon, Q., 2001, 'Measurement and Meaning: Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods for the Analysis of Poverty and Social Exclusion in Latin America' World Bank, Washington http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2002/01/18/000094946_0201040949175/Rendered/PDF/multi0page.pdf

Haddad, Moussa, 2011, 'The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach: a bottom-up approach to overcoming poverty', IPPR <http://www.ippr.org/articles/56/8054/the-sustainable-livelihoods-approach-a-bottom-up-approach-to-overcoming-poverty>

Holland, Jeremy, 2007, Tools for Institutional, Political and Social Analysis of Policy Reform: A Sourcebook for Development Practitioners, The World Bank, Washington D.C. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTTOPPSISOU/Resources/1424002-1185304794278/TIPs_Sourcebook_English.pdf#page=136

IFAD, nd, 'Sustainable Livelihoods Approach', IFAD website <http://www.ifad.org/sla/index.htm>

Kanbur, Ravi, 2001, 'Qualitative and Quantitative Poverty Appraisal: Complementarities, Tensions and the Way Forward', Contributions to a workshop held at Cornell University March 15-16, 2001 <http://www.arts.cornell.edu/poverty/kanbur/qqz.pdf>

Khan, Seema, 2009, Topic Guide to Social Exclusion, Governance and Social Development Resource Centre <http://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/SE10.pdf>

Lawson, David, Hulme, David, and Muwonge, James, 2007, 'Methodological Issues Associated with Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches to Understanding Poverty Dynamics: Evidence from Uganda', Global Poverty Research Group, Manchester and Oxford <http://www.gprg.org/pubs/workingpapers/pdfs/gprg-wps-077.pdf>

Narayan, Deepa, Pritchett, Lant, and Kaoppor, Soumya, 2009, 'Moving out of poverty: Success from the Bottom Up', World Bank <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTMOVOUTPOV/Resources/Overview.pdf>

Narayan, Deepa and Petesch, Patti, 2005, 'Moving out of Poverty: Understanding Freedom, Democracy and Growth from the Bottom- Up', Methodology Guide, The World Bank, Washington D.C. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTMOROCCO/Resources/MOPMethodGuide.pdf>

Narayan, Deepa and Petesch, Patti, 1999, 'Consultations with the Poor: Methodology guide for the 20 country study for the World Development Report 2000/ 01', The World Bank, Washington D.C. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPOVERTY/Resources/335642-1124115102975/1555199-1124138742310/method.pdf>

Norton, Andy et al, 2001, 'A rough guide to PPAs: Participatory Poverty Assessment, Introduction to theory and practice', Overseas Development Institute, London
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPCENG/1143333-1116505707719/20509327/ppa.pdf>

OPHI, 2011, 'Multidimensional Poverty Index', University of Oxford, Oxford
<http://www.ophi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/MPI-One-Pager-Dec-2011.pdf?cda6c1>

Ravallion, Martin, 2011, 'On Multidimensional Indices of Poverty', Policy Research Working Paper 5580, The World Bank, Washington D.C. http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2011/02/28/000158349_20110228142416/Rendered/PDF/WPS5580.pdf

Ruggeri Laderchi, Caterina, 2001, 'Participatory methods in the analysis of poverty: a critical review', QEH Working Paper Series, Working Paper Number 62
<http://www3.qeh.ox.ac.uk/pdf/qehwp/qehwps62.pdf>

SIDA, 2005, 'Country Level Analysis for Poverty Reduction', Methods Document, SIDA, Stockholm <http://www.sida.se/Documents/Import/pdf/Country-Level-Analysis-for-Poverty-Reduction4.pdf>

SIDA, 2002, 'Perspectives on Poverty', SIDA, Stockholm
<http://www.sida.se/Documents/Import/pdf/Perspectives-on-Poverty.pdf>

UNDP, 2011b, 'Frequently asked questions about the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), United Nations Development Programme http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/FAQs_2011_MPI.pdf

Wellbeing and Poverty Pathways website <http://www.wellbeingpathways.org/>

Wellbeing and Poverty Pathways, 2011, 'An Integrated Model for Assessing Wellbeing', Briefing No. 1, Wellbeing and Poverty Pathways
http://www.eldis.org/vfile/upload/1/document/1104/briefing_1_small1.pdf

Wennerholm, Carolina et al, 2009, 'Gender Equality in Practice: A manual for SIDA', SIDA
<http://www.sida.se/Documents/Import/pdf/Gender-Equality-in-Practice7.pdf>

Whyte, Sarah and Pettit, Jethro, 2004, 'Participatory Approaches and the Measurement of Human Wellbeing', Working paper 08, Wellbeing in Developing Countries ESRC Research Group, Bath <http://www.unesu.org/piapobreza/Lectura16.pdf>

The World Bank, 2005, 'Gender-Responsive Social Analysis: A Guidance Note - Incorporating Social Dimensions into Bank-Supported Projects', Social Development Department, The World Bank, Washington D.C.
<http://www4.worldbank.org/afr/ssatp/Resources/HTML/Gender-RG/Source%20%20documents/Tool%20Kits%20&%20Guides/Social%20Analysis/TLAN2%20Gender%20Responsive%20Social%20Analysis.pdf>

The World Bank, 1996, 'Appendix 1: Methods and Tools' in The World Bank Participation Sourcebook, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/ The World Bank, Washington D.C., p.199-202 http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1996/02/01/000009265_3961214175537/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf

The World Bank, nd, 'Gender Analysis', World Bank Social Analysis website
<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALDEV/0,,contentMDK:21233807~menuPK:3291499~pagePK:64168445~piPK:64168309~theSitePK:3177395~isCURL:Y~isCURL:Y,00.html>

Zavaleta Reyes, Diego, 2007, 'The ability to go about without shame: A proposal for internationally comparable indicators of shame and humiliation', OPHI Working Paper Series
<http://www3.qeh.ox.ac.uk/pdf/ophiwp/OPHIWP004.pdf>

Experts consulted:

Robert Chambers (IDS)
Sebastian Silva Leander (Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative)
Anna Bjorkman (Kvinna till Kvinna)

Please cite this report as:

Orrnert, A. (2012) *Social Exclusion Approaches to Poverty Analysis*, (GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report). Birmingham, UK: Governance and Social Development Resource Centre, University of Birmingham.

About Helpdesk research reports:

Helpdesk reports are based on 3 days of desk-based research. They are designed to provide a brief overview of the key issues; and a summary of some of the best literature available. Experts are contacted during the course of the research, and those able to provide input within the short time-frame are acknowledged.