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Abstract

This thesis takes as its starting point the question of how child poverty can be best measured and understood in the sub-Saharan context. Taking Lesotho as a case study it investigates child poverty in the framework of the conceptualisation of poverty and methodological challenges in its measurement. Further to this, however, it examines these issues by locating child poverty in the experience of children themselves and the nature of a Basotho childhood.

This thesis shows how child poverty tends to be measured (and therefore defined) differently in the global South and the global North and has been based on indicators which may or may not have relevance to children's lived experience of poverty. The thesis therefore asks four specific research questions:

1. Are there commonalities between children's experience of poverty in the global North and the global South and how may this be measured in a way that reflects this commonality?
2. Is there any evidence that poverty amongst children in Lesotho is quantitatively different from poverty among adults?
3. What do children in Lesotho say about poverty and how do they experience it?
4. How can qualitative and quantitative methods be combined in the measurement of child poverty?

Two waves of a longitudinal survey of 328 households with children were therefore conducted in Lesotho, along with discussion groups with children on the theme of poverty and a small tracer study of those children who were no longer in the original households. The survey showed considerable economic mobility of households over the nine year period but it also showed that income and other forms of wealth such as livestock and land were not necessarily correlated. For households, adults and children there were few predictors of poverty status except those to do with human capital such as education and composition of the household.

The thesis concludes that child poverty in a developing country such as Lesotho is broadly similar to child poverty in industrialised nations such as the UK in that children are concerned about the same issues wherever they are. However it differs in terms of scale and in terms of the context. In order to fully understand child poverty therefore cognisance has to be taken of the cultural, societal, policy, child and practical contexts in which it is being measured.
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Chapter 1 - Measuring Child Poverty in Lesotho

Introduction

This thesis takes as its starting point the question of how child poverty can be best measured and understood in the sub-Saharan context. Taking Lesotho as a case study it investigates child poverty in the framework of the conceptualisation of poverty and methodological challenges in its measurement. Further to this, however, it examines these issues by locating child poverty in the experience of children themselves and the nature of a Basotho childhood. Thus it draws on both positivistic and interpretivist approaches to propose better understandings and measurements of child poverty in a southern hemisphere country.

Poverty has always been a contested concept partly because it is a 'political' concept and commands some sort of moral imperative (Alcock, 1997). The word 'poverty' always describes some sort of unacceptable state and begs the question 'What are we going to do about it?' As Alcock states:

'We cannot sit on the fence on the poverty problem and suggest that the problem is merely one of academic or political debate, because implicit in the disagreements about the definition of poverty are disagreements about what should be done in response to it – intrinsic to the notion of poverty itself is the imperative to respond to it.' Alcock, 1997, p 4).

Over the last century there have been repeated attempts to agree a definition of poverty that adequately captures the reality of people's experience and is measurable (Alcock, 1997). These attempts have ranged from quantitative measures of income (Townsend, 1979; Piachaud, 1979; Bradshaw, 1993), to measures of capability and entitlements (Sen, 1990) and measures using proxy indicators such as those used by the Physical Quality of Life Index (Morris, 1979) or the more recent Human Poverty Index used by the United Nations Development Programme. In addition in recent years there has been a move towards including 'softer' data such as vulnerability and access to various assets including social and human capital (Carney, 1998; Baulch, 1996) in defining poverty status as well as moves towards using poor people's own definitions of their state in Participatory Poverty Assessments (Narayan, 1999).
Most of these studies have been concerned with either poverty in industrialised countries or with poverty in the developing world but seldom both. This has meant that often very different definitions of poverty are used depending on the industrial status of the country. The measurement of poverty in industrialised countries has tended to be comparative in nature and explored the relative deprivation of their citizens. In developing countries poverty is more often measured against some more absolute standard such as ‘a dollar a day’. This has been exemplified in concepts such as ‘overall’ poverty which is a measure of relative poverty within a country and ‘absolute poverty’ which measures poverty against some objective scale (Gordon et al, 2000). There has, however, been a growing literature in comparative studies and the interest of the large multi-lateral agencies, such as UNICEF, has been increasingly on cross-cultural comparisons.

For this the growing interest in the 1990s in globalisation and its impacts on all the world’s economies and people’s must be partly responsible. For some writers globalisation and the growing realisation of the inter-connectedness of all nations is the latest ‘great transformation’ on a similar scale to that of the industrial revolution (Allen, 2000). The study of globalisation has brought with it a desire to study social (and economic and environmental) phenomena within global rather than purely national or regional limits (Allen, 2000). On the basis of the study of globalisation, Korten along with many others, have identified a global threefold crisis facing humanity of ‘deepening poverty, social disintegration and environmental destruction’ (Korten, 1995, p21). This move towards using global indicators is slowly being reflected in studies of social phenomena and means that it is not always appropriate to concentrate only on either the industrialised world or the developing world (Rahnema, 1997).

The large multi-lateral agencies, such as the World Bank and UNICEF do present global statistics for comparison purposes and there is an increasing move towards presenting poverty data in its global context. The problem with this is that in certain countries the poverty statistics can appear to be overwhelming and in others it can appear that there is little or no poverty at all. Although these comparisons are therefore essential in terms of arguing for a fairer distribution of global resources they do not always tell us much about the experience of poverty in a particular country.
Although increasingly poverty is being seen in a global context few studies have included children as a separate unit of analysis to adults. Children have tended to be placed together with the families they belong to or the institutions they frequent (eg. CPAG, 2000; DSS, 1999) and, again, many of these studies are based on data from industrialised countries. In addition participatory exercises in poverty assessment have very rarely included children's views. Yet children are increasingly being seen as social actors in their own right (Qvortrup, 1994). In the context of developing countries, and some industrialised ones, children often have to develop survival skills, are subject to many of the same stresses and responsibilities as adults (for instance if they are working or heading a household) and are victims of the same conflicts or natural disasters (Harper and Marcus, 1998).

Examples of how analysis of household data using the child as the unit of observation and as the unit of analysis can change the nature of the data can be seen in various studies (Saporiti, 1994). When children do become the centre of analysis then inter-generational inequalities become clearer along with inequalities in resource distribution in populations (Cornia and Danziger, 1997). Studies so far in industrialised nations have shown that children tend to bear a disproportionate burden of poverty within countries in that a greater proportion of them are likely to be living in poverty than their adult counterparts (Cornia and Danziger, 1997). This is just as likely to be true in a developing country context although little analysis has been done from this perspective on the existing data. It has also been suggested that children's vulnerability to poverty in a global context is linked to the sustainability of their livelihoods, their access to human development opportunities and the ability of their family and community to protect and nurture them (Harper and Marcus, 1998). This links with notions of human, physical and social capital (Putnam, 1993; Carney, 1998).

However, although re-analysis of existing data using the child as the main reference point is important there is no guarantee that present studies even contain data that covers the full experience of children living in poverty. Children need to be consulted on their views of poverty for two reasons. Firstly recent years have seen a move towards a much more participative approach to social research and an understanding that quantitative data must be interpreted through the lived experience of its subject (Chambers, 1993). Children have not so far been asked what are the most meaningful aspects of poverty for them and their views on possible measurement.
Secondly, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child gives children the right to participate in all matters which affect their welfare (Article 12, UN CRC). Any policies which are based on data about children but which have not included children’s views are therefore contravening this Article. In addition studies of gender differences have shown how it is important to look at the intra-household distribution of resources and this has rarely been done in the case of children (Qvortrup, 1994). The fact that children have been frequently left out of surveys and often more qualitative research is well documented (Christenson and James, 2000).

The question for this thesis therefore is how is child poverty investigated and understood in developing countries as well as industrialised nations? The question will be asked particularly in relation to the country of Lesotho. Lesotho is a small sub-saharan country completely surrounded by South Africa. It has a population of about 2 million people and its main exports are water, labour and increasingly textiles from the newly founded textile industry. In many ways it is typical of many other countries in that it is slowly changing from a country based solely on subsistence agriculture to a more heavily monetised and industrial economy. The advantages of using Lesotho as a case study is that it has not been a victim of major upheaval or civil war in the recent past, it is resource poor so that its people have to be quite resourceful in ways of making a living and it has a fairly homogenous population comprising the Basotho people. In as much as any country is ‘typical’ Lesotho is a fairly typical developing country and one that is well-known to the author. I lived and worked there for 6 years in the first half of the 1990s whilst working for Save the Children and then being part of a newly formed small research company, Sechaba Consultants.

Lesotho has also undertaken various poverty surveys in the past and therefore there is the opportunity to build on work already done. In particular, national surveys were undertaken in 1993 and 1999 (Sechaba Consultants, 1994 & 2000). As this data was available, it was possible to follow up some of the households surveyed in 1993 and so learn about what happened to children and poverty over time. In pursuit of this I visited Lesotho three times in 2002 and 2003 for a total of three months. The dearth of longitudinal data from the developing world means that the opportunity to trace and re-survey households and children should not be missed if the opportunity becomes available. Of course two waves of data do not have the predictive strength of three or more waves but they are nevertheless better in terms of looking at children's poverty
over their lifespan than purely cross-sectional studies. Longitudinal studies also have
the ability to describe patterns of change and to assess the direction and magnitude of
causality (Menard, 1991). By re-visiting some of the households who were first
surveyed in 1993 and who had young children at the time, it was hoped that
information could be obtained as to the life courses of the children involved and some
of the causal factors which influenced whether these children were still poor or not
nine years later.

The question of child poverty in a place like Lesotho is not just a substantive question
but also one of methodology. This thesis therefore, also uses quantitative and
qualitative methods and attempts to combine them to give a meaningful result. It has
long been realised that both types of data collection are necessary to give a rounded
picture of an issue (Bryman, 1995). In researching poverty amongst children in
Lesotho in 2002 qualitative data from group discussions with children were used
alongside a quantitative household survey which then led to further qualitative
interviews with children. The qualitative data was used to inform the analysis of the
quantitative data, rather than its collection, and led to the development of the Child
Poverty Index which is discussed in chapter 7. However, both types of data – that is
qualitative and quantitative - were analysed in their own right as well and so this thesis
presents a mixture of different types of data which are conjoined at various points.

The measurement of child poverty is, therefore, both a conceptual and a
methodological issue. The questions this thesis will be attempting to answer therefore
encompass both issues and can be briefly expressed as follows:

1. Are there commonalities between children’s experience of poverty in the global
   North and the global South and how may this be measured in a way that reflects
   this commonality?
2. Is there any evidence that poverty amongst children in Lesotho is quantitatively
different from poverty among adults?
3. What do children in Lesotho say about poverty and how do they experience it?
4. How can qualitative and quantitative methods be combined in the measurement of
   child poverty?
A key premise of this thesis is that child poverty must be seen in context. In particular there are five contexts in which children operate and which have a direct impact on whether and how they experience poverty. Firstly, in the debate about poverty one of the key themes is how much poverty excludes people from participating in the cultural life of the society around them. Exclusion, which is very closely linked to poverty, is often portrayed as being exclusion from participating in normal everyday life (Townsend, 1979). Any exploration of poverty must therefore take into account the meanings that poverty carries and the rituals and customs it excludes people from. Poverty must therefore be seen in its cultural context and this means understanding the cultural mores of the society in which children are living and growing.

Secondly, poverty has to be placed within the society against which it is being measured. In the UK, society is relatively wealthy and absolute poverty, whereby life is in jeopardy, virtually unknown at the beginning of the twenty first century. In addition society imposes certain rules and expectations. In common with much of the rest of the world, the family is still seen as the primary caring unit for children but the state has a wide range of relationships with children mediated through compulsory education, surveillance and monitoring from compulsory registration of children at birth through to census inclusion and more indirectly through regular health and social care monitoring and recording.

In developing countries there is not always the same societal framework and children may not have such a direct relationship with the state. But children may live with other members of the extended family or, as in the case of Lesotho, there may be an extensive and formalised migrant labour system which impacts directly on children’s well-being. The study of poverty, therefore, must take into account the structure of society, how it contributes to or mitigates the effect of poverty and whether the way poverty is measured has to incorporate structural elements of that particular society.

Thirdly, and following on from above, the policy context will have an effect as to how poverty is measured and what has an impact on it. In chapter 2 we will see how discourses of poverty depend on the policy context and how for example in the UK welfare benefit lines are often used as poverty lines without necessarily assessing how closely they relate to other measures of poverty. Similarly school exclusions are often used as an indicator of deprivation because policy in the UK dictates that all
children aged between 5 and 16 years must attend school. In Lesotho, and other developing countries, government policies are often based on where they can access money and so they adopt the interests of powerful donors. For instance, lack of sanitation (in this case meaning latrines) is used as a measure of poverty by UNICEF. The Government of Lesotho has had a major sanitation programme running for at least 15 years now, partly funded by UNICEF, and access to latrines has become part of the poverty measures of that country. The policy context therefore has an impact not only on poverty measures but also on how poverty is conceptualised in the first place.

Fourthly, when considering child poverty, its relationship with adult poverty has to be taken into account. This means that differences, and similarities, between adults and children need to be assessed both universally and within the particular cultural and societal framework that the measurements are taking place. It is now fairly widely accepted that childhood is not only a biological phase but also a social construct (James and Prout, 1990). Different societies will therefore construct childhood differently and this has implications for the definition and measurement of child poverty. For instance, industrialised countries have tended to use age as the defining factor for the start and end of childhood and children are allowed to participate in full adult life once they have reached a certain age (often 18 years). In countries like Lesotho, although modern laws tend to use age related definitions, the activities and position of a person tends to define their status with regard to adulthood. Hence, a married man is always a man even if under 18 years but an unmarried boy living at home will remain a boy until he is married and moves out at whatever age this occurs. In this thesis I use age definitions in order to enable comparisons with other countries, and even within villages, but quite a few of the people we call children almost certainly would not be regarded as such in their own village and others whom we regard as adults (because they are over 18 years) would still be considered children.

Fifthly, the practical context has to be taken into account. Although sophisticated ways of measuring poverty can be developed, they are of little use if they cannot be put into operation. In most industrialised countries it is possible to reach most people and indeed to ascertain, even before this, what kinds of people live where owing to well kept databases and statutory government records. In many developing countries, where there are often few or poor population records (for instance only 51% of
Lesotho's children are registered at birth), the ability to carry out accurate large scale surveys or find a particular population group can be severely limited. The actual physical terrain and access to logistical support such as four wheel drive vehicles and fuel may also curtail widespread research. There are also ethical considerations when trying to research issues such as child poverty in countries where there are few support systems for the disadvantaged and there is some doubt if and how people will benefit from this kind of research. The ability to give immediate assistance to distressed children can be limited and has to be borne in mind when considering research with this group.

Before commencing the main body of the thesis, a brief overview of Lesotho will be given and an outline of each chapter. The second part of this chapter therefore presents data on Lesotho – economic, social and geographic and focuses particularly on the place of children in Lesotho and the basic national statistics. The final part of this introduction presents an outline of the whole thesis.
Figure 1.1  Map of Lesotho
1.1 Lesotho: An Overview

Lesotho is a small country of only 30,355 square kilometres with a population of just over two million. Two-thirds of the country is sparsely inhabited, comprised of rugged mountains and deep valleys with small, scattered villages. The remaining third, consisting of a lowland strip, is inhabited by 70% of the population. The country is entirely surrounded by South Africa, with no coastline (see Figure 1.1). The majority of the population (80%) lives in rural areas, but has strong links to urban centres in both Lesotho and neighbouring South Africa. The people of Lesotho are known as the Basotho who speak Sesotho. Although having ties with other ethnic groups, especially the San who inhabited the mountains before the Basotho arrived in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, the people of Lesotho are an ethnically homogenous group but one which extends far beyond the boundaries of Lesotho and into South Africa.

Lesotho has a constitutional monarchy and two houses of legislature one of which is democratically elected and the other which comprises the traditional chiefs. Originally this system was based on the 'Westminster model' of first past the post but in 2002 an element of proportional representation was introduced in order to try and ensure all parties had a voice (Mamatlere, 2001). Lesotho is divided into 10 administrative districts and 18 health service areas. Local government is fairly weak and problems of corruption and instability rife. For this reason, amongst other, the traditional chieftainships are still powerful and village headmen and area chiefs exercise a considerable amount of authority. The King is the Paramount Chief of the Basotho nation.

1.1.1 Economic Context

Lesotho has few natural resources – sandstone and water being the most prevalent. As yet the potential to export sandstone has not been fulfilled but Lesotho now regularly exports water to South Africa, in particular to the Gauteng area. This is done through the development of a series of dams which were constructed in the 1990s and which have also had a major impact on the mountain communities in the areas where they have been built.
Rangeland in Lesotho has rapidly declined due to overgrazing to the extent that, whereas mohair and wool was once a sought after product, it barely shows up in the country's export figures. Similarly arable land has declined from 13% to 8% in the 1990s alone and so Lesotho cannot be self-sufficient in food. In fact crop production which used to be the mainstay of Lesotho's economy has dropped dramatically and is now about 27kg per capita per year. The degradation of the land, mono-cropping, the use of chemical fertilisers and increasingly lack of inputs in terms of labour, tillage etc. have all contributed to the decline of arable farming. Livestock have tended to decline in quality and many families have been victims of serious stock theft, which has become endemic in much of Lesotho and neighbouring South Africa.

Human resources have therefore been one of Lesotho's main exports. This has been in various forms. Up until 1994 Basotho tended to receive a better education than black South Africans. This has meant that since 1994 many have been able to sell their skills in a South Africa which is trying to encourage a more multi-racial workforce. They have been helped by the fact that Sesotho is an official language of South Africa and many Basotho have been eligible for South African citizenship but it means that Lesotho has often lost many of her most skilled citizens.

However, the mainstay of Lesotho's cash economy up until recently was the migrant labour system, in particular work in the gold mines of South Africa. In 1990 127,000 Basotho men worked in the mines 'the best choice for a livelihood a Mosotho could make but the worst for a human being' (Sechaba Consultants, 2000 p.30). By 1999 this number had dropped to 56,000 with a major effect not only on the employment of Basotho men but also on the remittances the miners used to send back to their families. The causes of this drop in the number of Basotho employed are several. Worldwide the price of gold has dropped, new labour saving mining technology has been introduced, South Africa has dropped her policy of only employing migrants in the mines and internal problems in Lesotho, such as the telecommunications strike in 1997, all had an impact on the numbers employed.

However, despite the decline in nearly all Lesotho's traditional export activities, the 1990s saw a rapid rise in GDP and GNI. Between 1987 and 1997 the average year-on-year growth was 6.2%, much higher than most other sub-Saharan countries. This was due to the building activity for the Lesotho Highlands Water Project and in the
later stages the sale of water to South Africa and to a growth in the manufacturing industry. In 1998, due to the unstable political situation, there was widespread rioting and burning and South Africa sent in troops to quell the trouble. This led to a dramatic drop in GNP, estimated to be up to 7.7% (Maope, 2000), from which it is unlikely to recover to its former levels of growth. The rapid growth in GDP was partly attributable to a growth in manufacturing. Lesotho has encouraged textile firms in particular to base themselves in Lesotho in return for tax breaks and subsidies. These firms were highly successful in terms of productivity but the wages were low, conditions bad and the owners (all foreign – mostly from the Far East) had little stake in the country itself. The troubles of 1998 saw many leave, and it has only been in the last few years that investment has started to pick up again. Growth in GDP has therefore picked up again to about 3.3% (Moeketsi and Sejanamane, 2001).

Inflation in the decade up to 2001 averaged at about 8%, good compared to many sub-Saharan economies but even so the poor did not manage to keep up, as will be demonstrated later.

Because of Lesotho's economic growth up until 1998, Gross National Disposable Income also showed real growth. However it became apparent from the 1999 poverty survey that this growth was only benefiting a few probably the wealthiest citizens of Lesotho as the rural people in particular had seen their incomes drop during that period. Re-distribution of wealth and the best way safety nets can be provided for the long term poor and vulnerable is therefore a key challenge for Lesotho.

1.1.2 Demographic Context

The population of Lesotho is approximately 2 million people of whom 95% live in households and about 80% live in rural areas. Because fertility is relatively low only 36% of the population is aged under 15 and 6% over 65 (Government of Lesotho, 2001). Migrancy for work is a fact of life in Lesotho as can be seen by the fact that nearly one in five male heads of households were not present in the household but working/living away. This was not true for female heads where the vast majority were present in the household. Households are made up of both related and unrelated persons – the latter being more common in the urban areas than in rural areas, except for the presence of herdboys who are often unrelated to the family.
The concept of 'extended household' is sometimes used to try and encompass those households who are based in the rural areas but where one or more members work away (Kimane & Ntimo-Makara, 1998). Although these members do not live for any appreciable time in the rural household if they are women they often leave their children there (usually with the parents-in-law) and they regularly send back money and they often consider themselves part of the rural household. Children also are increasingly living in households without their own biological parents and sometimes without any adults at all (Ansell & Van Blerk, 2004). The AIDS epidemic has meant that children's migration has become more prevalent and many children have moved between several households by the time they reach adulthood (Young & Ansell, 2003).

Around 10% of the population has migrated to South Africa for work. These migrants are predominantly men and mostly in the 20-49 years age group. They also tend to be the better educated. There are differences in the proportions of the population migrating with the more successful urban areas in Lesotho and the very remote mountain areas providing less migrants than rural areas in the lowlands or close to the South African border. Very few Basotho migrate to countries other than South Africa.

With regard to labour migration (where the migrant returns), about 12% of the population have worked in South Africa in the past and about 7% are currently working there. Again this is predominantly men. Internal migration, both life-time and period, is also common but here it is women who predominate. In particular women move to the three main lowland towns where there are clothing factories causing a drop in the populations of the more mountainous rural areas. For instance the female population of Maseru, the capital is growing by about 9.5% a year whilst that in Mokhotlong (a remote district) is falling by 11.3%. There is a similar pattern for men but on a smaller scale - +5.9% for Maseru and -6.4% for Mohkotlong. Again education implies more movement and, as we shall see, women in Lesotho are better educated than men.

1.1.3 Overview of Poverty in Lesotho
Lesotho ranks 127th out of 174 countries on the UNDP's Human Development Index with a GNI per capita of $590. The poverty line in Lesotho was set in 2001 at M124.00 (about £8 per month) which means that about 68% of Basotho are poor.
The poverty line was set by pricing a basket of goods but many Basotho survive by a mixture of subsistence agriculture and income and so it is important to take other means of survival into account when considering poverty related issues. Basotho society is also very unequal with a Gini coefficient of 0.6. This would explain why the economic growth seen in Lesotho in the 1990s did not significantly reduce poverty. Some of Lesotho's social indicators are better than those of some other sub-Saharan countries. It has high literacy and school enrolment rates but by secondary school its enrolment rates are worse than other countries indicating a high drop out rate. In terms of population per doctor the average is 20,000 which is double that for the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region as a whole and the health sector's share of Government resources steadily declined during the last five years of the last century.

In 2001 only 18.1% of people over 10 years had regular waged work (Government of Lesotho (a), 2001) and a further 10% were either employers, worked for themselves or were casual workers. 25.7% were students but the remainder of the population were not involved in income generating activity. The general economic activity rate is therefore about 28%. Women were less likely to be earning an income than men.

Official Development Assistance to Lesotho was twice the average for the sub-Saharan region in the last decade at $70 but has now dropped to $15 per capita, well below average. One of the reasons behind this may be that donors are re-focussing their resources on South Africa.

A series of poverty studies conducted in the 1990s (1991, 1993, 1999, all Sechaba Consultants) demonstrated that Lesotho's urban areas were significantly better off than the rural areas by almost all measures. These studies however were cross-sectional in form and so up until now there were no longitudinal data to work from. The divide between urban and rural areas in Lesotho has heightened over time, with the rural agricultural sector stagnating and the urban secondary and tertiary industrial sector thriving. Indeed, the contribution of the industrial sector to gross domestic product has more than tripled since the mid-1980s, while agriculture has gone into severe decline. As a reflection of this diverging economic base, over 30% of households in the mountains fall into the lowest household income bracket, compared to only 5% for the urban areas.
The proportion of households defined as poor has increased significantly since 1990. Two thirds of the poor live in destitution with barely enough cash income to satisfy basic food needs. By contrast, there is evidence to suggest that the relatively small proportions of the population who still have access to waged employment have benefited from the economic growth. The combination of declining waged employment - due primarily to the retrenchment of mine workers - and the increase in real terms in civil service and private sector salaries, has contributed to Lesotho having one of the highest levels of income inequality on the continent.

The growth of rural poverty in particular has meant that the number of households able to assist poorer relatives and neighbours is in sharp decline and traditional support mechanisms will not be able to maintain the increasing number of destitute households. The failure of the market-driven economy to distribute wealth to the poor has not been compensated for by official safety net projects or social welfare efforts. These remain insignificant in view of the increased need, particularly as the HIV/AIDS pandemic leaves an increasing number of aged household heads caring for orphaned children. Government partnerships with NGOs experienced in working with the destitute exist but these are woefully inadequate (Save the Children, 2005).

Despite the high levels of unemployment and the inequality in cash income Basotho tend to have well-established homes with gardens and trees; relatively equitable access to water, land and other natural resources; reasonable plot and field sizes and relatively high levels of livestock ownership. Access to primary schooling has resulted in high levels of literacy, while a well-established system of primary health care has virtually eradicated polio and other impoverishing diseases that plague many African countries. These assets have made it possible for many households to survive the recent down-turn in the economy as well as sudden shocks such as retrenchment. Political conflicts have not reached the point of displacing people and causing separation from their asset base.

1.1.4 Vulnerable Groups
Although much of Lesotho's population could be deemed poor, particular groups are especially vulnerable to long-term and deep poverty. These include:
The long term sick and disabled

National statistics set the disability rate at 4.2%. The survey analysed for this thesis found a much higher rate of about 10% which is hard to explain given that the Lesotho Demographic Survey (2001) found lower rates of disability in the rural areas than the urban areas. Both surveys relied on subjective self-reported assessments. Men are more likely to be disabled than women particularly in the rural areas which may be explained by the fact that the cause of disability most often given was mining accident (31%). For women the leading cause was illness. As would be expected disability increases with age. Amputations, blindness, severe deafness and mental problems are the most common causes of disability.

HIV/AIDS has become a major scourge. In 2000 the HIV prevalence rate amongst ante-natal attendees in the capital was 42.2% and amongst patients with sexually transmitted diseases, 41% (Government of Lesotho (b), 2000). Nationally the HIV/AIDS rate has been set at 31% - the highest in Africa (UNICEF, 2005). Life expectancy in Lesotho has already dropped from 60 years in 1991 to 35 in 2003 (UNICEF, 2005). Income loss is projected to be one per cent per capita per year and there are already many additional burdens on the health sector and individual households due to this cause. These catastrophic figures may well plunge families into poverty as they lose breadwinners and cause households who are on the margins to become poorer as they use their assets to pay for treatment. In addition the poor are more likely to contract the disease as they often cannot afford treatment for STDs and cannot afford condoms for protection.

A high proportion of Basotho children were found to be stunted (low height for age) (estimates vary between 42% and 50%) in 1993 and about 20% were found to be wasted (weight for age) in the same year. Both stunting and wasting drastically increases in the second year of life and probably shows the effect of weaning and the lack of adequate nutrition at this age. In 1999, the mountain areas show a much higher rate of stunting (55.6% vis-à-vis 40.6% in the urban areas) and underweight (21.8% vis-à-vis 8.3% in the urban areas) (Sechaba Consultants, 2000). Malnutrition was also connected to income with 53.5% of the children in the lowest income quintile being stunted compared to 39% in the uppermost quintile.
Rural women are also twice as likely as their urban counterparts to be energy deficient (BMI less than 18.5) (Government of Lesotho (c), 1995) which has a direct impact on infant and maternal mortality.

**Orphans and dependent elderly**
Historically there have been few homeless orphans in Lesotho as the extended family has normally protected children whose parents have died. However the high HIV infection rate will mean not only that more children will find themselves orphaned but also the family will be less able to care for them. In 2003 it was estimated that there were 100,000 AIDS orphans in Lesotho – that is children who have lost at least one parent to AIDS. In addition, although some of these children may also be orphans, about 22,000 children under 15 years are living with the HIV virus (UNICEF, 2005). There is some limited provision for orphans in Lesotho and experiments are being done with fostering but increasingly children are living in child only households or on an informal basis with other villagers (Save the Children, 2005).

The high HIV rate also means that there are less younger people to look after the frail elderly. Poverty studies have shown how it is often the elderly who live alone, or without another younger adult, who are most vulnerable to poverty (Turner, 2001). At present there is no provision either in terms of care or cash income for these people. The 1938 Pauper Law, which gives the very poor a minimal income should in theory cover the frail lone, elderly but it is rarely put into practice. At present such elderly are often fed by neighbours and other villagers but as the rural areas in Lesotho become poorer this system may well be put under strain. The 1999 Poverty Study found that the ratio of those in a position to help others to those who would otherwise be destitute was about 1.8 to one. This meant that social cohesion could be maintained and the very poor assisted by informal means. However a shift in this ratio by even 10% would seriously affect the Basotho's ability to prevent destitution with the associated social breakdown. As will be shown later rural Basotho are getting poorer in real terms and this, along with households' loss of labour due to such factors as AIDS, may well start to undermine the precarious balance between helper and receiver. Turnbull shows how the loss of material support can decimate coherent social entities with traumatic results but the question is at what point this social cohesion begins to break (Turnbull, 1993).
1.1.5 Children and Health

Child mortality for the under 5s in Lesotho is better than in many other African countries partly because Lesotho’s altitude is too high for malaria to be a risk. In 2001 the child mortality rate was 84 per 1000 live births but it is likely that AIDS will cause this to increase and certainly older children are dying because of their HIV status. The main killers of children are diarrhoeal diseases and acute respiratory infections. Tuberculosis is also a major problem. The World Bank recorded 450 new cases per 100,000 in 2002 but various medical professionals feel this figure is too low and suggested there were about 550 new cases for every 100,000 people in 2003 which gives Lesotho one of the highest TB rates in the world (Ntsekhe, 2003 comm). This might be expected given the high AIDS rate and the history of migrant labour and is why living in overcrowded conditions is so detrimental to children’s health.

74% of the rural population have access to clean water and 32% have access to sanitation facilities (UNICEF, 2005). Again the lack of these two facilities has a major impact on diarrhoea rates, one of the most prolific of killers in the developing world.

Children’s nutritional status in Lesotho tends to be highly correlated with geographical area with children in the mountains suffering worse malnutrition than their lowland and particularly urban counterparts as was seen in the previous section. One of the reasons for this is the inability of most Basotho households to grow sufficient food to feed themselves. In 1993 only 8% of Basotho households were self sufficient in food and this had dropped to 3% in 1999 (Turner, 2001).

Lesotho is served by a system of health clinics which are supervised by 18 hospitals. Some of these hospitals are little bigger than large clinics and only have one or two doctors. Nurses or even nurse assistants staff the clinics. All these staff have been trained in western style medicine (UNICEF, 1999). However, Lesotho also has a system of Traditional Healers (ngaka ea Sesotho) who are locally trained and use herbal and ritual medicine. Most villages also have traditional birth attendants who act as midwives. Traditional healers are widely used and children may well be treated by a mixture of western and traditional medicine.
1.1.6 Children and the Law

There are two legal systems in operation in Lesotho – the traditional or customary and the civil. The civil law is based on Roman-Dutch Common Law which was used to govern the Cape Province and the traditional law is based on a set of laws codified by the Basotho King Lerotholi in 1903 (Gill, 1994). In order to ascertain which laws should apply to a case a ‘style of life’ test is applied whereby, if the defendant leads what is considered a modern lifestyle, they will be tried under civil law and if they lead a traditional lifestyle they will be tried under traditional or customary law. In practice, the chiefs, who administer customary law, often deal with the more minor cases and the magistrates’ courts deal with the more serious cases (Maqutu, 1992). By and large, customary law is based on a system of restitution whilst civil law is based on retribution. Lesotho did not have any prisons until she became a British Protectorate in 1884.

But the dual system of law can also lead to anomalies in the administration of justice with people being ‘double punished’. For instance, in 1995, a 14 year old shepherd in the Qacha’s Nek district of Lesotho accidentally killed another boy. Under traditional law the shepherd’s parents had to pay the family of the dead boy 20 cattle in compensation. Under civil law the shepherd was liable to be arrested and imprisoned for manslaughter. Because both punishments were applied, the family of the shepherd not only lost their son because he was in prison but were also financially ruined by payment of the cattle.

This dualism affects the legal situation of women and children in particular. Under traditional law a girl/woman is a perpetual minor. Until marriage she is her father’s responsibility, whilst married, her husband’s and on his death the responsibility of her eldest son. Under civil law a girl is a minor until she is 21 (the age of majority in Lesotho). She then attains her majority until she marries, when she then becomes legally a minor again, but regains her majority on widowhood. In contrast, under traditional law, boys gain their majority on marriage and keep it until their death. Under civil law they become majors at the age of 21 (unless married before that age). However, even civil law is not clear on the age of majority. Whilst 21 years was set by law in 1829, the 1980 Children’s Act declared anyone under the age of 18 years as a child without making it clear what happened to those aged between 18 and 21 years (Gill, 1994)
Under customary law children are always the member of a family and children are thought of as belonging to the husband of the mother irrespective of the biological father. Children born out of wedlock belong to the father of the mother, but may in fact become part of the woman's husband's family by agreement between the families on the future status of the child. Children born to a widow are also regarded as belonging to the husband's family (Poulter, 1981):

‘One may well argue that the concept of the illegitimate child does not apply in customary law. Every child is the legitimate member of a family, even though its biological parents may not be married. The extended family system and the custom of addressing all adults of the age of parents in a similar way tends to provide all children with a similar status and does not stigmatise illegitimacy' (Gill, 1994)

In terms of inheritance, under customary law a girl or woman can never inherit whilst under civil law she may. However, in practice, many women in the rural areas do inherit, or at least gain control over resources such as land and livestock, under the traditional system (Letuka et al, 1998). These women tend to be widowed or never married, rather than married or separated and this can mean considerable hardship for children if the father has deserted the family.

In fact, all land in Lesotho technically belongs to the King. In the rural areas chiefs are responsible for allocating land holdings to families and they also have the power to remove land from those who do not use it productively and re-allocate it to someone else. In reality it is rare for land to be removed from a family and the right of people to inherit the use of land is mostly respected (Chaka-Makhooane et al, 2000). In the urban areas a more formal system of leasehold has been introduced.

Under customary law there is no formal adoption procedure and children are just incorporated into the new family. Civil law also does not provide for Basotho to adopt (but foreigners may). This gives rise to potential problems for Basotho wanting to adopt orphans (from AIDS or otherwise) who are not members of their own families. However, they can foster under the terms of the 1980 Children Act. In reality, children
who move into households with people to whom they are not related have very little status or protection under the law.

1.1.7 Children, School and Work

As with the legal system there are two educational systems in Lesotho but, again, they tend to overlap. Traditional education involved boys and girls staying at home until they were in their early teens. The girls would learn to garden and to perform certain agricultural tasks, cook, collect water and fuel and keep house and also engage in income generating activities such as beer brewing. Boys would be sent to herd cattle, sheep and goats, often spending the summer up in the mountains and would also be expected to help in the fields. At early puberty boys and girls would be sent to initiation schools. Initiation Schools are highly secretive schools which can run for anything up to six months at a time. They tend to be run by Traditional Healers and the school involves taking a group of teenage boys or girls away from their village and training them in 'how to be men' or 'how to be women'. Sometimes known as 'Circumcision Schools', circumcision almost certainly plays a part in the male schools but not in the female. Little is known about these schools outside the initiates as it is death for anyone to either divulge the secrets of the schools or to be caught spying on them. Although actively discouraged by the colonial administration before independence in 1966 and by the churches, there is some evidence that these schools are growing in popularity as parents find the cost of western style schooling increasingly prohibitive (Mathot, 2003). In addition the political changes in South Africa in the 1990s created increasing interest in Lesotho's identity as a nation state and in the culture and history of the Basotho people. As part of the research conducted for this thesis, an interview was conducted with a young man who had just returned from initiation school:

Q. 'I am not going to ask you anything about the school because I know it is a secret. But what I want to know is what encouraged you to go there?'

R. 'I wanted to learn about the culture of the Basotho. Men who have not been to the school are incomplete men. At the school we learn how to manage a family when we get married and how to take responsibility in the community. The best leaders in the villages are men who go to Initiation School.

Q. 'I see. Was it your decision to go there or somebody decided you should go?'

R. 'It was my decision'
However, most children aspire to attending western style schooling in place of, or often in addition, to attending initiation school. Nearly all the schools are run by the churches but with government trained and paid teachers. Nationally 62% of boys and 68% of girls of primary school age attend primary school. Gross enrolment figures for primary school are however a lot higher because many children of non-primary school age attend primary school. For secondary school the figures in 2003 were 30% of boys and 38% girls (UNICEF, 2005). It can be seen therefore that girls, and therefore women, are considerably better educated than boys which is highly unusual in the developing world.

In 1999 the Government of Lesotho began a rolling programme to abolish fees in primary schools and there is evidence that this has led to an increase in enrolment figures. One of the problems with this policy has been the lack of physical infrastructure and qualified teachers to cope with the increased demand for primary schooling (Leboela & Turner, 2002).

Children who are at school will normally help with household chores as well and some even will act as herd boys and miss out on substantial amounts of schooling as a result. However, there is a group of children who work instead of attending school. For boys the work is normally in the form of herding animals sometimes for their own families but more often for other wealthier families. Herding is tough work involving many months spent out in the mountains with limited food, shelter and security. For girls they are most often hired out as domestic workers. A 1999 study found that the highest proportions of children paid for their work were in the poorest and richest groupings (Sechaba Consultants, 2000). This is probably because the poorest groups provide the labour and the richest take these children in as workers and as members of their households. In total, amongst under 16 year olds, about 2.4% of boys and 1.6% of girls were engaged in paid work but an additional 11% of boys were shepherds (who are often paid in kind rather than with cash). This is almost certainly an underestimate due to the fact that Basotho adults are well aware that Basotho law forbids child work and probably were hesitant to admit to the fact.
Conclusion to the Overview

Lesotho is typical of many other sub-saharan countries with the exception of possibly being more resource poor than many. To compensate for this she has a relatively high level of female literacy which means her children have a relatively better start in life than those in other countries. Like most other sub-saharan countries she is experiencing rapid economic change whilst the ability of rural people to feed themselves is diminishing. HIV/AIDS is particularly high in Lesotho and this will seriously damage the social and economic health of the nation in the foreseeable future.

Much of Lesotho’s social and cultural life is dominated by parallel structures. In terms of politics her Parliament comprises democratically elected members and traditional chiefs, and similarly at village level there are elected village development committees working alongside the traditional leaders. In terms of schooling there are the western style schools who undertake internationally recognised education and also the very localised initiation schools. In law children come under both traditional family structures and are a legal entity under Romano-Dutch law, and in health children can be treated by a western trained doctor or by a traditional healer.

Developing countries such as Lesotho have at times been said to be ‘agrarian’ or ‘proto-industrial’ whilst countries in the North are ‘industrialised’ or even ‘post-industrial’ (Allen & Thomas, 2000). This oversimplifies the situation of countries like Lesotho where a dual system operates in most spheres of activity. The dualistic nature of much of her social and cultural life is also seen in her economy, particularly on a micro-economic scale, whereby families need and use money to engage in the modern world and yet also depend for survival on traditional structures and activities such as subsistence farming. Any study of poverty must therefore take this dualism into account and explore how livelihood strategies relate to one another in order to gain an accurate picture of what it means to be poor in Lesotho.

1.2 Outline of the Thesis

In this section I will give a brief outline of the chapters before we move on to the main body of the thesis. The thesis comprises nine chapters in all and is based on a survey
of households in Lesotho which took place in 1993 and then in 2002. Although the 1993 survey comprised some 1800 households the 2002 survey attempted to follow-up 500 of these households and succeeded in gaining 328 interviews. In 2003 a small tracer study was also conducted with children who were present in the 1993 survey but not in the 2002 survey.

In chapter 2 we will be looking at the literature around the measurement of poverty, in particular in the UK and the developing world, that is contrasting the way poverty is measured in the global North and the global South. Although the concept of poverty has its roots in history its scientific measurement only really started in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century with Seebohm Rowntree. We will then trace the different ways poverty has been measured, and some of the different concepts of poverty behind these different methodologies, up until the present day. Perhaps the most controversial aspect of poverty measurement is whether relative or absolute measures are used and this is discussed along with the different methods for measuring which range from large scale surveys to participatory poverty assessments to ethnographic studies.

In chapter 3 this theme is continued but the focus here is on children. The first part of the chapter asks the question as to why poverty amongst children should be measured separately from adults and looks at the way childhood has changed in sociological terms over the last 50 years. There then follows a brief overview of the different ways child poverty has been defined and measured in the UK and then internationally. In particular the definitions and measurement of poverty in children in the developing world are discussed and the relative merits of the various forms of poverty measurement assessed. The dearth of studies which talk with children about poverty is noted as is the sparsity of longitudinal studies with children in the South. This section concludes that child poverty indicators are often more likely to reflect policy makers emphases than poor children’s concerns.

Chapter 4 first describes the 2002 household survey including the sampling frame, the process of the research, attrition rates and some of the issues which arise from the use of longitudinal data. There follows a description of the 8 group discussions which were held with children around the topic of poverty and also of the tracer study where attempts were made to trace those children no longer in the original households.
Chapter then continues with a description of the analysis techniques used for the qualitative and quantitative data. The chapter then finishes by exploring the problems of combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies and data as this thesis uses both. It then moves on to look at some of the issues that arise in researching children in both theoretical and practical terms and the particular issue of ethics.

Chapter 5 is more reflective and reflexive in character and discusses some of the issues around conducting research in a developing country and the problems with this study in particular. The ethics of researching very poor and potentially vulnerable people are discussed along with some of the logistical issues which arose and those appertaining to field staff and problems of translation. The chapter then moves on to considering the problems of maintaining methodological rigour under these circumstances and some of the problems around measurement of poverty in a country like Lesotho, including its' analysis. There then follows two sections which are a reflection on the process of the group discussions and the tracer study and how some of the problems of conducting qualitative research across boundaries of language, culture and space could or could not be overcome.

Chapter 6 deals with the poverty status of households using income and other measures such as ownership of livestock and land. In particular we look at the economic movement of households over the nine year period between 1993 and 2002 by assigning them to one of four groups – the never poor who were above the poverty line in both years, the ascending poor who were below the poverty line in 1993 but were above it in 2002, the descending poor who were above the poverty line in 1993 but were below it in 2002 and the chronically or always poor who were below the poverty line in 1993 and have remained below it. The chapter shows that there has been considerable economic movement (as well as geographical movement) of households in Lesotho over this time period and that economic status is fairly volatile in a country such as Lesotho which is vulnerable to shocks but has also seen fairly rapid economic growth through the 1990s. The chapter also shows how wealth in the form of livestock and land is often inversely correlated with income.

In chapter 7 we report on a basic sociography for children in Lesotho using data from the survey and initially using income as the main determinant of poverty status. Although the use of income statistics are useful in certain contexts we demonstrate
that they have little predictive power within the Lesotho context and do not necessarily relate to children's expressed concerns. Using data from discussions held with children we can define poverty more widely and bring in aspects such as health, opportunities and the kind of care children receive, as well as income and material assets. These factors can them be drawn together into an index using latent class analysis and children assigned to a group depending on the probabilities of them experiencing deprivation in one of these areas. This index is related to income but does not correlate directly to it. If one uses these criteria, in fact, three groups of children are identified – those high up on all these factors, those low on all these factors and those high on most but who are unlikely to be cared for by a biological parent or parent like figure.

Chapter 8 starts with some quantitative analysis of children who moved in and out of the households between 1993 and 2002. It was discovered that nearly a third of the children who were under 10 years of age in 1993 were no longer in the same households in 2002 and it was decided to try and trace some of these children to find out what had happened to them. This was also following up on the theme of ‘care’ as an indicator of some kind of poverty. There follows an analysis of the discussions held with some of the children who had moved out and shows the wide variety of life paths that poor children can take in Lesotho. Many of these children were living with other relatives or with no adult at all in the household and they represent the different ways that Basotho parents may try and mitigate the effect of poverty on their children or try and improve the life chances for them. The data in this chapter is largely qualitative in nature but shows how qualitative and quantitative data can be combined to produce a richer picture.

The thesis concludes in chapter 9 by summarising the empirical findings from the survey and tracer study and then discussing the different indicators used to measure child poverty and comparing them to those used elsewhere particularly in the UK. In particular the aspect of suitable parental care is discussed and whether or not the lack of care by a parent like figure constitutes poverty. This is especially critical given the very high AIDS figures for Lesotho and the prevalence of one parent or no parent households. The importance of contextualising indicators of poverty is also stressed and examples given of how those selected for Lesotho fit into the five contexts listed above. It is only by listening to those who suffer poverty themselves in their particular
context and using a variety of methods that we can gain an accurate picture of the situation they are experiencing.
Chapter 2 - Poverty

Introduction

Poverty as a source of research and debate has been present for the last hundred years and there were many writers, such as Adam Smith, with an interest before that. The role poverty played in people's behaviour and in the 'evils' of society were also amply described by writers such as Dickens and Gaskell in the nineteenth century and the likes of Orwell, Lawrence and Potter in the twentieth. However it has been in the last 30 years that poverty as a global issue has attracted the interest of many academics throughout the world. Whilst there have been fierce political debates as to the best way of dealing with poverty both at national and international levels there have been almost as many debates as to how it should be conceptualised and measured, the one of course, being dependent on the other.

This chapter starts by looking at a brief history of the study of poverty, particularly from a UK perspective. It then moves on to consider the major debate that has accompanied the study of poverty throughout – that of whether poverty can be conceptualised in absolute terms or whether it is always a state relative to some other state. There then follows some of the different definitions of poverty, which are most commonly used now, and how they translate into different ways of measuring. The political context of the poverty debate is then briefly outlined together with an overview of some of the discourses that surround the issue. The following section looks at the way poverty is measured globally and what some of the differences between North and South are and also how poverty has been conceptualised in Southern Africa, before going on to consider how poverty can be conceptualised over time. The final section looks at who, at a global level, are most likely to be affected by poverty. Although children belong to this group they are considered in more depth in the next chapter on children's poverty.

2.1 A Brief History of Interest in Poverty

The history of research into poverty tends also to be the history of policy. In terms of the industrialised nations, Novak argues that poverty (as a social condition) only
became a reality during the industrial revolution. As workers were separated from the land so they lost the means of production (Novak, 1988). So those who could not earn wages became poor. In this argument capitalism is therefore responsible for producing poverty and promotes the fear of poverty in order to maintain a good supply of labour. Although this seems simplistic it is true that in industrialised societies poverty is often linked with the lack of ability to earn wages. However Poor Laws were passed in Britain as early as 1349 (which restricted vagrants from providing unfair competition for labour), through the Tudor period which saw the beginnings of the split between the ‘deserving’ and the ‘undeserving’ poor (Golding and Middleton, 1982) through to Victorian times when this became more crystalline and the Workhouse system was set up.

The nineteenth century system was aimed at making those in receipt of ‘relief’ of less status than the lowest labourer because poverty was being increasingly seen as a product of indolence and vice. The modern social security system in the UK is largely based on the same principle. In fact various studies have shown that poverty is not only caused by lack of work but also by low wages (Bowley and Burnett Hurst, 1915; Gosling et al, 1994; Gordon & Townsend, 2000).

However, the nineteenth century also saw the beginnings of research into poverty with studies by Booth and Rowntree. Rowntree in 1901 was one of the first researchers to try and establish a poverty line below which a person could be deemed to be in absolute poverty. He therefore drew up a ‘basket’ of goods which he considered the minimum that a person could live on, priced it and by this means established a poverty line. By trying to assess how many calories a person needed to live on and the absolute basic necessaries for life, Rowntree hoped to establish a line below which life would not be sustainable. What he termed ‘primary poverty’ was when people literally did not have the means to acquire the necessities. ‘Secondary poverty’ was when people had the means to acquire the necessities but did not do so leading the family to be in want. Rowntree recognised the extreme frugality of his ‘basket of goods’ because it allowed nothing for entertainment or travel or communal activities – it did however include tea, and so even this attempt to establish the absolute minimum was subject to some cultural influences. Rowntree later became more explicit about the need to include items other than basic food and clothing in any budget for the poor. He recognised that people needed to be able to participate more fully within
their societies in his follow-up study in 1936 when he established a much expanded list of items necessary for a full life. In this Rowntree was returning to his Victorian roots as Charles Dickens, in Hard Times, graphically demonstrates what happens when only the most basic of physical needs are taken into account.

Most of the studies of the early twentieth century attempted to establish objective 'poverty lines' below which people could be considered poor and this has continued up to the present day with groups such as the Child Poverty Action Group (CPAG, 2005) using a similar approach. The 'poverty line' approach was also being used in a variety of other countries and the 1960s saw the establishment of a poverty line in the USA by Orshansky which is still the basis of the United States' measurement of poverty (Orshansky, 1969). Up until this point, measuring poverty was also nearly always linked to money metric approaches whether at the micro eg household level or by linking it with the development of macro-economic indicators such as Gross National Product. The 1970s however saw an expansion in the concept of poverty, largely as a result of the work of people such as Runciman and Townsend who have been credited with introducing the 'relative' approach to poverty (Runciman, 1966, Townsend, 1979). Townsend (1979) saw the inability of people to participate in their own society as the main determinant of whether they were poor or not and hence drew up an index which included basic nutritional requirements but also a large number of other items by which people participate in society such as the ability to celebrate special occasions. Townsend put forward the view that just as human beings are social creatures so all requirements by humans carry a social element and even items such as food are dependent on the function it is designed to fulfil. Townsend's work has therefore usually been seen as placing him firmly in the 'relativist' camp as opposed to the 'absolutist'. By calculating families' expenditure on the items in his index Townsend could set a poverty line which at the time of his writing was about 140% of the Supplementary Benefit level. Townsend has further refined his thinking on the differences between deprivation and poverty as will be explained later in this chapter.

At the same time as Townsend was writing about poverty in the UK other thinkers remained firmly in the absolute camp and politicians such as Sir Keith Joseph roundly rejected any kind of relative definition for poverty.
'An absolute standard means one defined by reference to the actual needs of the poor and not by reference to the expenditures of those who are not poor. A family is poor if it cannot afford to eat' (Joseph and Sumption, 1979, p 27).

From the 1970s up until today both conceptualizations of poverty – relative and absolute have been widely used with various writers (eg Murray, 1990; Fiegehen et al 1977; Atkinson, 1990) either continuing to use the concept of absolute poverty or showing how it is still the basis for defining a basic minimum eg the Income Support levels in the UK. The past thirty years have therefore been characterised by this debate about the exact nature of poverty which in turn has a direct impact as to how it is measured. The past thirty years have also seen sociologists join with economists in this debate and writers such as Sen have been very influential in how we think about poverty. Sen began to explore the concept of poverty as not just a failure to meet certain nutritional and subsistence standards but rather a failure to meet certain given standards set by society. He then went on to envisage poverty firstly as a lack of capabilities and entitlements and then as a denial of freedoms (Sen, 1999). Sen’s contribution to reconciling the relative-absolute debate will be dealt with more fully later. However one main problem with his definitions has been in operationalising them in terms of concrete measurement.

In 1984 the EC adopted a definition of poverty which defined the poor as those people who did not have the resources to enable them to fully participate in their own society (or in this case the Member State concerned) (European Commission, 1985). The EC, however, later went on to measure poverty by establishing a poverty line at half the mean (and then median) income of each Member State. This was convenient in that it enabled each Member State to measure the degree of poverty within its boundaries and also enabled some cross country comparisons (EC, 1991). However it did not give any indication of the level of deprivation poor people in each of the countries were actually suffering.

Internationally the International Labour Organisation (ILO, 1952)) was also pioneering work on widening the concept of poverty to include not just income poverty but lack of access to such essentials as health and education and these new concepts were reflected in the World Bank’s 1974 publication ‘Redistribution with Growth’. The 1970s also saw considerable interest in the development of indicators of poverty
beyond purely money metrics and Morris' 'Physical Quality of Life Index', which established three indicators covering health, education and income are an example of this (Morris, 1979).

The 1980s and 1990s saw new concepts being added to the poverty debate. These included the incorporating of non-monetary aspects such as powerlessness and isolation (see the work of Robert Chambers, 1993); work on vulnerability and the ability to withstand shocks such as drought or famine and a broadening of the concept of poverty into constructs such as 'livelihood' whereby the concept of sustainability could be incorporated into definitions of poverty (Scoones, 1998). These are still very much part of the current debate and will be discussed in more detail later. However, throughout the 1980s the concept of social exclusion also started to be incorporated into concepts of poverty, particularly in Europe, and this also found expression in later EU declarations. Social exclusion stresses the holistic nature of poverty and its effective exclusion of people from 'mainstream' life. The emphasis was therefore on rights, resources and relationships (Maxwell, 1999).

The UN had also become actively involved in the poverty debate with the United Nations Development Programme developing a Human Development Index broadly based on Sen’s work (and indirectly Morris'). This index includes basically three indicators – life expectancy, education and literacy and GDP combined into an Index. Countries who are low on the Index are considered poor (UNDP, 2003). In addition the UN has developed two poverty indexes – the Human Poverty Index for Developing Countries (HP-1) and that for OECD countries (HP-2) which incorporates indicators on life expectancy, illiteracy, health and malnutrition. At the same time UN bodies in particular had been increasingly refining their thinking on Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child was finally established in 1989 (Minujin et al, 2005). This meant that one way that deprivation could now be framed was as a lack of 'rights' and so poverty could be measured by assessing the number of people, in this case children, who were being denied their rights.

European thinking on poverty and the UN's increasing refinement as to its conceptualization of the issue finally came together at the Copenhagen Summit in 1995. The Summit recognised two definitions of poverty – absolute poverty and overall poverty in an attempt to draw together the more 'relative' nature of most
European measures of poverty and the `absolute' nature of the UN's poverty measurement which included many developing countries (UN, 1995). The recognition of the `absolute' nature of poverty particularly in certain parts of the world led to the establishment in 2000 of the Millenium Development Goals. There are eight goals, five of which deal with survival, one with education and two with other forms of empowerment (UNDP, 2005). All the members of the UN subscribe to these goals and the progress towards them is regularly monitored.

The next section therefore looks in more detail at the absolute/relative debate and at some of the attempts to combine these different ways of looking at poverty.

2.2 Relative or Absolute Poverty?

Traditionally discussions of the measurement of poverty have revolved around two major issues – what indicators are used and is it ‘absolute’ or ‘relative' poverty which is being measured. The concept of absolute poverty is based on the notion that there is a point below which life is not sustainable. If a line is drawn at that point then those below it can be deemed to be in absolute poverty. Subsistence, although sometimes being seen as the absolute poverty line is actually the line of minimum functioning for a healthy life and the point at which life is sustainable but only just (Lister, 2004). The UN has historically adopted an ‘absolute’ approach and the Millenium Development Goals show that the notion of some minimum standard for survival is still a very powerful one in thinking about poverty. For instance five of the goals deal with eradicating poverty and hunger (defined as people living on less than a dollar a day); reducing child mortality; improving maternal health; combating HIV/AIDS, malaria etc and ensuring environmental sustainability (by increasing access to clean water and sanitation both of which have an immediate impact on human survival). Failure for an individual to meet these goals nearly always results in death so they do provide minimum standards.

In the UK it has been argued that Rowntree was one of the first to try and develop an absolute poverty line through his attempts to measure the minimum that a person in York would need to survive at the turn of the last century. However, as we have seen, even Rowntree included items such as tea which had no nutritional value but were
seen as 'essential' for a person's well-being. In addition he had great difficulty in
deciding what were the appropriate calorific values needed for men, women and
children as it all depended on what they did during the day and the type of work they
undertook (Rowntree, 1901). Most 'absolute' measures of poverty, particularly in the
global North, therefore are related in some way to the social context in which they are
measured. That this was well recognised was demonstrated by writers such as Smith
and even Marx. Both Smith and Marx defined poverty in these terms:

'By necessaries I understand not only the commodities which are
indispensably necessary for the support of life but whatever the custom of the
country renders it indecent for creditable people, even of the lowest order, to
be without (Smith, 1776, p 691).

'Our desires and pleasures spring from society, we measure them therefore by
society..... they are of a relative nature (Marx, 1952, p33).

Both these early writers therefore realised that it is extremely difficult to define what is
an absolute minimum and also this only tells us about survival – not about the
experience of living in poverty. Rowntree was also aware of this but Townsend was
one of the first to clearly express the 'relative' nature of most 'absolute' measures of
poverty. For him, people were in poverty if they could not participate in the normal life
of the society in which they found themselves (Townsend, 1979). For Townsend, at
this point, all poverty had to be 'relative' to the social context if it was to be a
meaningful term.

Relative poverty, as Lister (2004) points out is categorised by two broad concepts.
The first of these is the comparative element which is introduced into the debate. This
can be either historical, cross-national or intra-national. Lister shows how people who
lived through the Depression of the 1930s sometimes feel that 'real' poverty does not
exist today but the point is that the deprivations which cut them off from mainstream
society in the 30s are apparent today even if they take different forms. Similarly within
a country deprivation may isolate people from mainstream society and in a global
context also certain countries may have much greater access to resources than
others. The problem with making these kind of comparisons however can be that they
become more a measure of inequality or exclusion than of deprivation per se. The
second element is that of understanding human needs. As societies change so do human needs and these can cover both material needs and the symbolic/relational meaning that material resources normally imply (Veit-Wilson, 1999). Different needs will be constructed differently in different societies. Lister quotes Jock Young who describes the process of cultural inclusion and structural exclusion as defining who is poor and who not particularly in the global North. However, as later chapters will show, the ability or lack of it for people to participate in their own societies depending on their access to resources is not confined to the wealthier nations of the world.

But even when using the concept of relative poverty problems of measurement exist. Piachaud argues that any relative poverty line is always arbitrary (Piachaud, 1981) and Sen takes this one stage further by arguing that relative poverty lines can move up and down and so give absurd results (Sen, 1999). For instance, the EU current measure of poverty which designates households living on less than half the average income of their nation state as being poor means (as many right wing politicians have pointed out) that very wealthy states have high poverty lines which don’t necessarily denote deprivation (an attempt to overcome this has been made by using the figure of 60% of the median income as a poverty line). Sen argues that there is an absolutist core to poverty and that death and starvation are at the centre of that core. However, he saw human functioning in terms of capabilities and so poverty was something which denied or reduced those capabilities. This could then be expressed in terms of commodities which would be relative in type as different societies would require different capabilities (Sen, 1985). As avoidance of shame would be an ‘absolute’ requirement for a person poverty lines should be set at the point where the lack of a commodity destroys a person’s dignity or shames them. The lack of capability which the shame exemplifies makes a person poor. It is this lack of capacity which is absolute and constitutes poverty even though the commodities needed to make up that lack may differ from society to society. The concept of ‘lack’ is based on ideas of social justice. However, attractive though this theory is, even when starvation is universally seen as socially unjust, it doesn’t help define an adequate diet and being able to put this concept into operation has been one of the main drawbacks to the wide take up of these ideas. Sen went on to consider poverty in terms of lack of ‘freedoms’ an approach which has proved even more difficult to operationalise (Sen, 1999)
The Copenhagen Declaration attempted to bring together the two concepts of poverty — absolute or relative — in one statement. Absolute poverty was seen as that in which people were without basic human needs of food, drinking water, sanitation, health, shelter, education and information. (UN, 1995). Overall poverty (or what might be termed relative poverty) was when lack of income or resources led not only to hunger, increased morbidity etc but also is ‘characterised by lack of participation in decision making and in civil, social and cultural life’ (UN, 1995 p57). Gordon and Townsend have been at the forefront of trying to use these definitions to measure poverty internationally as a way of making meaningful comparisons between countries.

‘Thus absolute definitions of poverty necessarily involve relative judgements to apply them to any particular society and relative definitions require some absolute core in order to distinguish them from broader inequalities’ (Alcock, 1997, p 72)

In practice however most measurements of poverty use one or the other, that is either they are based on the establishment of a poverty line below which a person is considered to be in ‘absolute’ poverty or they are based on the relative distance a person is from a moveable unit ie relative poverty. The question then is how do relative measures of poverty relate to concepts of inequality.

2.3 Is Poverty the same as Inequality?

If most poverty is relative and even apparently absolute measures of poverty have some sort of relative component the question arises as to whether poverty is merely inequality by another name. According to writers such as Alcock poverty is not the same as inequality, although it is linked to it, because poverty carries with it a moral imperative to do something about it and describes an imperfect state. The term poverty therefore is a prescriptive term rather than descriptive (Alcock, 1997).

Sen argued that ‘poverty’ is a descriptive term in that it describes a given state but he agrees that poverty is different from inequality in that it implies some irreducible level below which it is harmful to go (Sen, 1981). More recently writers such as Gordon and Townsend have argued that as all poverty is relative it is inextricably linked with inequality (Gordon & Townsend, 2000). However most writers agree that
inequality is not the same as poverty because it is theoretically possible for a society to be very unequal without the people at the bottom suffering from deprivation (depending on how it is defined). Nevertheless it has been shown that where there is inequality there tends to be poverty however it is defined. In terms of relative poverty severe inequality implies poverty for those people in the lower echelons. In terms of absolute poverty even economic growth will not raise people above the most basic poverty line unless inequality is reduced (UN, 2005).

2.4 Current Common Definitions of Poverty

This section will consider some of the current ways of defining poverty and how they are being used today. Some are used more widely in the North and others in the South but there is considerable overlap and no particular measure has been used exclusively in only one area.

2.4.1 Income or consumption based definitions

Income or consumption based definitions of poverty are probably the most commonly used in the global North. Fiegehen states that poverty is normally set as a standard by a particular society, it is then expressed in terms of income and then applied to income distribution to reveal the proportion in poverty (Fiegehen et al, 1977).

Budget Standard measurements have attempted to set poverty lines by defining minimum needs and the cost of financing those needs. They are therefore absolutist in structure but represent socially determined needs (such as Rowntree’s perceived need for tea or Townsend’s need for a Sunday roast). This approach was used in both the UK and in the USA by the Bureau of Labour Statistics to set minimum income levels for Welfare payments. One of its main drawbacks is it depends on who sets the budget and decides what is the minimum acceptable standard of living and it has also tended to concentrate on recurrent needs rather than large capital needs.

One way of overcoming the problem of who sets the budget is to base the budget on actual expenditure patterns of the poor but this also carries some problems. In 1989 Bradshaw and Holmes (quoted in Oldfield and Yu) used people’s actual expenditures to set budgets. However, they found that the diet was deficient by 6,500 calories a
week and there was only 94p left to spend on clothing, haircuts etc (Oldfield and Yu, 1993). Since then the Family Budget Unit has tried to establish a minimum poverty budget but it has always been in excess of the Government assistance level (Parker, 1998). There is also the problem of whether to include what might be judged ‘non-essential’ or even ‘harmful’ expenditure such as on cigarettes and alcohol. Piachaud performed a similar task and set a budget level for children in 1981. This in some ways was more acceptable but only because it is assumed that others will determine the amount spent on children rather than children exercising choice themselves (Piachaud, 1981).

In order to overcome some of the problems mentioned above a more consensual or democratic approach has been taken by some researchers to establish a poverty line or threshold. Mack and Lansley first took this approach by firstly asking what the public see as social necessities, secondly identifying those who lack those necessities and then assessing what level of income those households would need to enable them to afford those necessities (Mack and Lansley, 1985). This was followed up in 1990 by Gordon et al. who took a similar approach (Gordon & Pantazis, 1997) and in 1999 by the UK Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey (PSE). In this most recent survey a representative sample of the public were asked not only about income levels necessary for the avoidance of poverty but also to specify from a list what items they felt no household should be without. Moving away from a strictly monetary approach to poverty, the sample were then asked what items they lacked because they could not afford them and those items on which more than 50% of the sample agreed (but people lacked them because of shortage of money) were included in the index. A poverty threshold was then calculated, which in this case was that families lacking two or more items from the index because they could not afford them were deemed to be in poverty. The advantage of the democratic or consensual approach is that it is based on consensus, or at least a majority view, of what constitutes poverty but the drawback is that it does not reflect concepts of ‘need’ in any particular systematic fashion (Gordon et al, 2000).

Income Proxy measures were first developed by Orshansky in 1965 and based on work by Engels. Orshansky found that poorer people spent a higher proportion of their income on necessities. A poverty line could be set at where the proportion spent on necessities starts to drop. For instance, if people on low incomes normally spend
about 30% of their income on food where this fraction starts to drop as a result of rising income could be the threshold between poor and not poor (Orshansky, 1969). However this approach is still a ‘behaviourist’ approach. It sees what people spend money on and bases the poverty line on that.

All the above types of measurement can work in highly monetised economies. However attempts have also been made to set poverty lines in monetary terms in developing countries. The most well-known is the World Bank's $1 a day poverty line which is based on the ability of people to buy the necessary food for survival (using Purchasing Power Parities at 1985 prices). Although there are serious problems with this approach it has enabled some very crude cross-country comparisons to be made (UN, 1995)

2.4.2 Relative Deprivation
Another definition which in its measurement is often closely related to income and consumption measures is that of relative deprivation. This places the definition of poverty not only firmly in the ‘relative’ camp but also acknowledges that income or money metrics are only part of the story. Townsend was one of the first to develop a methodology for measuring this approach. His survey in 1979 attempted to set a list of indicators the lack of which meant that people were relatively deprived with regard to their own culture and society. 40 of the 60 indicators used were found to be positively correlated with income eg lack of refrigerator, no holiday etc. and from this a Deprivation Index of twelve indicators was drawn up (Townsend, 1979). The deprivation scores for each household were then compared with their incomes (expressed as a proportion of the supplementary benefit entitlement). Townsend calculated that the point where deprivation began to increase more rapidly than income was falling marked a threshold or poverty line. In his case, as we have seen, this was at 140% of the supplementary benefit level. Piachaud criticised this approach on two grounds:

a) The indicators did not cater for varying tastes eg vegetarians would not want a Sunday roast.
b) The use of modal values did not take into account variations around the average. (Piachaud, 1981).
Townsend’s approach also still tried to monetise or express in monetary terms the deprivation experienced by poor people as did the first two Breadline Britain surveys which, when translated into monetary terms, found there was remarkable similarity between Townsend’s calculations and Breadline Britain’s – both at about 135 – 140% of the Supplementary Benefit level. Gordon’s most recent work however on the PSE did not attempt to express all the findings in monetary terms – just being deprived of two of the essentials on the list identified a household as poor although this was then compared to the household’s income and where the income was high the household was deemed not poor. (Gordon et al, 2000).

As we have seen, the concept of deprivation is less commonly used cross nationally with most countries in Europe using the percentage by which households fall below the average of the population. Hence those households living below half of the mean (sometimes median) average wage in each of the EU States are usually counted as poor (Gordon & Townsend, 2000). In developing countries income or expenditure quintiles are often used to determine the poorest group in a society (McKay & Lawson, 2002) which is a relative measure but tells us little about the actual deprivation being experienced by those in the bottom most quintile. Perhaps the greatest criticism of Deprivation Indices (whether expressed in monetary terms or not) to date is that they attempt to combine often very different kinds of deprivation (for instance is being unable to visit relatives in hospital comparable with a damp home). Spicker, in the cross-national arena, suggests one way to overcome this is by ‘profiling’ countries and comparing the profiles but this can only be done when dealing with a relatively few indicators of deprivation but he does show the problems of ‘treating them (indicators) as numbers, and subjecting them to quantitative methods.....most quantification is unnecessary; we can present the same information without applying techniques like averaging’ (Spicker, 2001, p159)

2.4.3 Social Exclusion

Poverty has often been linked with the notion of social exclusion and there has been much debate about how the two concepts are related and whether they do in fact represent two quite different concepts (Levitas, 1998; Lister, 2004). The concept of social exclusion was first developed in France and rose out of the work of Bourdieu. In the 1970s French thinking moved from discussing the problems of ‘les pauvres’ to
'les exclus' and so the aim of policy should be 'insertion' or integration. In Britain the term social exclusion is defined by the Government as:

'A short-hand label for what can happen when individuals or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health and family breakdown' (DSS, 1999).

In this definition the web of disadvantage often created by poverty is recognised (although some say this can also obscure the central issue of poverty). In 1987 Townsend had begun to explore this interconnectedness of disadvantage when he distinguished three forms of deprivation:

a) Lacking diet, clothing etc that are customary for that society.
b) Falling below the majority's acceptable standard of living.
c) Falling below what could be a majority standard given a better restructuring/redistributive function in society. (Townsend 1987)

Deprivation is therefore a complex web of lacks and disadvantage and Alcock argues that in 'complex societies', although poverty constitutes the lack of necessities, necessities in these societies cover housing, the environment, jobs etc (Alcock, 1997). This leads to the exclusion of the poor from mainstream society. Alcock goes on to argue that exclusion is about what others do to us and not what we do ourselves and so it is a different kind of poverty. Exclusion from leisure facilities, means of communication, financial services etc. are therefore all types of poverty inflicted by society on certain individuals. In some ways this echoes Sen’s ideas on entitlements (and later Freedoms) whereby being denied certain entitlements causes people to be excluded (Sen 1981 and Sen, 1999). Some writers argue that social exclusion is not in itself poverty but a result of poverty (Room, 1999) whilst others maintain that social exclusion leads to poverty and disadvantage (Sen, 2000) but few deny that the two concepts are closely linked.

The concept of a cycle of poverty or deprivation whereby the poverty of one generation is passed on to the next is also linked to ideas about the exclusion poor people experience from mainstream society. Writers such as Lewis (although writing
long before ideas of social exclusion had gained credence) used these ideas to explain why poverty appeared to pass from one generation to another and to explain his theory of a ‘culture of poverty’ (Lewis, 1965).

2.4.4 Sustainable Livelihoods

Because definitions of poverty in industrialised countries often rely on money metric measures or money proxy measure there have been increased attempts recently to try and define poverty without recourse to having to convert everything into monetary values. This is reflected in the Deprivation Index, UNDP’s Human Development Index and Gordon’s recent work and is also shown in the development of the concept of sustainable livelihoods. In particular researchers have tried to incorporate the concepts that a person’s own skills and education, their place in society and the environment in which they find themselves may have a direct bearing on their ability to live a poverty free life. The Department of International Development bases its definition of sustainable livelihoods on the work of Chambers and Conway and adapted by Carney:

‘A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain and enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future while not undermining the resource base’ (Carney, 1998)

Interest in livelihoods has mainly been restricted to the developing world where it was recognised that income based definitions of poverty often had very little relevance and where structural issues, such as people’s access to services and assets (either individual or collective), needed to be taken into account. Assets and access to services could therefore be seen to be forms of capital and these were expanded to include capabilities.

This way of looking at assets was mirrored in the North where ideas around social exclusion gave rise to concepts around the possession of certain types of capital (Cannan, 1997). Economists had long talked about financial capital as an asset and this definition was broadened to include other forms of often less tangible types of capital or asset. Scoones in 1998 developed a pentagon (see Fig. 2.1) which showed
the five types of capital he felt that people had potential access to. Their ability to own or utilise these different forms of capital would determine whether they could be deemed to be poor.

The pentagon has five points covering physical capital – ownership of goods or land and access to infrastructure; financial capital – ownership of money; human capital – education, health etc; natural capital – access to clean water, safe environment etc and social capital – the network of relationships and trust in a community. Individuals, households or communities could be scored against each of the five capitals.

Figure 2.1  The Livelihoods Pentagon

This paradigm has certain advantages over some of the narrower definitions of poverty. Firstly it recognises that physical assets are not the only critical assets in people’s lives and attempts to define and measure them. Secondly it introduces the concept of transferability between different types of asset and can include concepts of sustainability (Carney, 1998).
Carney argues that it is vital to take two factors into account when attempting to use the pentagon. Firstly the 'robustness' of each form of capital must be considered. The further people are from the point of intersection the more robust is the capital. It is also important to keep the pentagon shape as this represents balance between the various forms of capital. Secondly the 'vulnerability context' needs to be understood — that is the 'shocks', structures or processes which affect the acquisition, transferability and sustainability of each form of capital. Hence the pentagon must be assessed with regard to natural disasters, the national framework for the transferability of capital (eg. it is possible to use human capital to produce financial capital) and the global context eg are there sufficient financial institutions to protect people's financial capital.

The assessment of capital and therefore poverty status relies heavily on thorough knowledge of context and contextualisation of the forms of capital. Which means talking to the poor themselves.

2.5 Poverty in the North and South

So far in this chapter we have looked at the main dichotomy in the poverty debate — absolute and relative poverty and some of the definitions currently in use which are measured through income assessments, deprivation indices or capital flows. The question arises as to whether poverty can be thought of and measured in a similar way throughout the world. Broadly speaking consumption measures and income proxy measures have been traditionally used in the North whilst livelihood measures and deprivation indices have been found more useful in the South. However, this is by no means exclusive and there are examples of different means of measuring poverty in most places.

On a global level the World Bank used to use 'a dollar day' (at 1985 prices) as its poverty line (two dollars in transition countries). This was revised in 2000 to use 1993 PPP which gave a poverty line of $1.08 (Townsend & Gordon, 2002). This has the advantage of being easily measurable and politically powerful and the disadvantage of being fairly meaningless as it takes no account of local conditions, or whether lack of money is the major issue for poor people in the South. The UN, as we have seen, uses indexes which, as in the case of the Human Poverty Index, are divided between rich (ie OECD countries) and poor countries. UNICEF also has a set of indices for
children which will be discussed in the next chapter. Smaller areas of the world (e.g., the EU) may also devise a comparative standard, nearly always because there is some political need to make comparisons. However, apart from the data that is submitted to the UN most countries undertake poverty assessments using their own measurements and definitions so that some comparison can sometimes be made if countries have used similar methods but there is no guarantee of that.

In 2000 the World Bank decided that proper poverty assessment, as part of a Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, had to be made in each country that requested a loan. In addition this poverty assessment had to have a participatory element to it, in order to reflect the Bank’s growing realisation that money metrics alone did not convey the full experience of poverty or cover certain key issues that affected the poor. The 1990s had seen a growth in participatory poverty assessments partly as a result of the work done by Robert Chambers. Chambers had pioneered a means of assessing rural people’s situations by working alongside them to identify issues which they were particularly concerned about and as a way of conducting an audit of their communities (Chambers, 1993). It was only one step further therefore to use similar techniques to work alongside people to assess their poverty status and participative poverty assessments have come to mean when any given community defines for themselves how they understand poverty. They are therefore linked to relative deprivation but are totally subjective in nature. In 1999 the World Bank funded a study to analyse the 47 participatory poverty assessments which had been conducted in various parts of the, mostly developing, world (Narayan, 1999). The study found that people defined NOT being poor as; having material well-being, physical well-being, security ('knowing what tomorrow will bring'), freedom of choice and action, and social well-being ('being able to care for, raise, marry and settle children and being granted social respect'). In addition people saw poverty as being made victims of corruption, suffering from violence and conflict, being powerless and having an insecure livelihood.

The definitions the poor therefore give to the state they find themselves in is often much broader than in other ‘official’ definitions and in some ways may be said to describe the experience of being in poverty rather than defining it. However what the participatory appraisals have shown and also what the livelihoods approach has tried to address is that monetary measures do not give a full picture of poverty particularly
in the South where access to land and various forms of social services are also key to survival.

Participatory poverty assessments have been much less widely used in the North but the views of poor people themselves are increasingly being sought with often similar results to that found in the South. For instance, the theme of powerlessness and exclusion is echoed in a report by the National Commission on Poverty, Participation and Power which conducted poverty hearings in the UK throughout 1999 and 2000 (CoPPP, 2000).

One of the major issues between measuring poverty in the North and South has been whether to use monetary measures or deprivation indicators. Monetary measures are simple and allow comparisons cross nationally. In addition in most places where people are suffering from severe deprivation money would allow those people to improve their situations. Sen demonstrates how very few famines are caused by lack of food per se, they are caused by people's lack of access to food (Sen, 1981). However, many people in the world do survive long periods without monetary income because they have access to land, water, agricultural inputs and livestock which they do not need to pay for in money. If these people are counted as destitute because of their financial situation it does not give a true picture of the degree of deprivation they may or may not be suffering. The degree of correlation between indicators of deprivation and income is therefore highly significant when deciding how to measure poverty in a particular context (Baulch & Masset, 2003; Gunning et al, 2000).

### 2.6 Poverty Studies in Southern Africa

Partly due to the demise of apartheid various analyses of poverty were conducted in South Africa in the 1990s and early part of the 21st century. As the closest neighbour to Lesotho it might be supposed that these analyses would be reflected in what was happening in Lesotho at the time. Klasen used two measures of poverty – a relative measure based expenditure data from the South African Labour and Demographic Research Unit and taking the 40th percentile as the poverty line and an absolute measure taking the 20th percentile which he found to be closely allied to the ‘dollar a day’ measure used by the World Bank. Klasen also used a deprivation index based on 14 items of deprivation ranging from health and education to security and feelings...
of well-being (Klasen, 2000). Klasen found that the two scales (deprivation and monetary poverty) were closely correlated. However, the correlation was weaker for the most deprived or impoverished and highest for the richest on both scales. As race was a critical determining factor in poverty or deprivation status, Klasen concludes that some of the lack of correlation was due to the legacy of apartheid which restricted particularly the African population's access to public services. Klasen found that the critical factors affecting poverty status were sex of household head, location of household (ie rural or urban), education of household head and race. The strength of household size's correlation with monetary poverty depended on the equivalence scales used. Using the 40th percentile as the poverty line and the 20th as the severe poverty line Klasen found that 59% of the population were poor and 29% severely poor. The figures were slightly lower in terms of deprivation.

May and Norton analyse poverty in South Africa from a slightly different perspective by using the consultations with local people which were undertaken as part of the South African Participatory Poverty Assessment in 1995 (May and Norton, 1997). As this was a qualitative study, quantitative data was not generated. May found that there were broadly three different conceptions of poverty. The first was in terms of a lack of consumption items at the household level largely brought about by the lack of employment and education. The second was a more structural view as to the causes of poverty which were characterised by lack of security, crime and discriminatory policies. A third concept was to view poverty in terms of lack of access to basic services particularly in the rural areas. However, the inappropriate use of money, for instance on drugs or alcohol, was also seen as a cause of impoverishment and echoes Rowntree's concept of 'secondary poverty'.

The problem of using the above studies as comparators for a country like Lesotho is that the histories and political and demographic make up of the two countries are so different. As the people of Lesotho are by and large an homogenous ethnic group 'race' is very unlikely to be a causal factor in poverty status and Lesotho has never been under a structurally divisive regime such as apartheid. Nevertheless it might be supposed that the experience of African people's in South Africa may be reflected in the experience of the Basotho.
May and Roberts used data from the Household Budget Surveys conducted in Lesotho in 1986/7 and 1994/5 to establish a poverty line based on monthly expenditure (May and Roberts, 2005). This data had previously been used by Gustafsson and Makonnen to show how important on mine labour was in avoiding widespread poverty in Lesotho (Gustafsson and Makonnen, 1993). May and Robert's poverty line was established by taking the 30 most popular items of food and drink that appeared in the expenditure of the lower income families in 1986 and then adding in ten items which were most popularly home produced. By this reckoning Basotho were on average only consuming 1000 calories a day so the price per gramme of each of the foods was established and multiplied by 2200 to find a food poverty line. In addition non-food items were added appeared in the expenditure diaries of the sample and so a poverty line of M124 in 2001 prices was established. There are some flaws with using this technique. Firstly it is based on items of consumption of some 20 years ago. These may have not have changed greatly, on the other hand the on set of HIV/AIDS would probably mean that families are paying much more out in health care and funeral expenses than was the case then. Secondly the fact that the recorded calorific consumption was so low compared to what is necessary for life suggests that under-recording was a major issue with these surveys. This may partly be due to the fact that people ate much more home produce than they recorded. Thirdly, the food poverty line also comprises costed out home produced food items which have been added into the equation but in reality very few Basotho would have to pay for all their food (especially not in the rural areas). The result is that a poverty line of M124, whilst representing what someone with no land or home produce would need to survive, does not actually measure who is poor because it cannot measure how much people are producing themselves or receiving through barter. This is one way so many Basotho seem to manage to survive on very small monthly incomes and sometimes no income at all.

Be that as it may, May and Roberts found on this criteria 59% of the population were poor in 1986/7 and 58% in 1994/5 although there had been an increase in the ultra poor (calculated as 50% of the poverty line). The use of this poverty line is discussed later in chapter 4 but May and Roberts found that the incidence, depth and severity of poverty was highest amongst households in the rural areas with around 72% being poor (in 1994), households with female heads or older heads were also poorer (62% and 73% respectively) as were households that were larger. May and Roberts
conclude that the incidence of poverty in Lesotho slightly decreased between 1986 and 1994 but the depth and severity of poverty actually increased during the same time period. The fact that poverty in Lesotho had not decreased despite an average 1% growth in GNP per year indicates the need for structural change so that inequalities in the population can be overcome. The figure of M124 per capita per month was officially adopted by the Government of Lesotho in 2001 and is updated on a yearly basis for inflation.

Similar findings were made as a result of two national poverty surveys which were undertaken in 1993 and 1999 and supported by the World Bank, UNICEF and Irish Aid (Sechaba Consultants, 1994 and 2000). These surveys used 32 different indicators for measuring poverty including access to services such as education and water, ownership of durables such as radios and latrines, ownership of livestock and fields, children's weight, and income and access to waged work. The surveys found substantial correlations between lack of radio, low income, lack of education and crowding. However, ownership of fields and livestock was negatively correlated with income poverty. This suggests that, as Klasen found, income poverty alone can be a poor indicator of other types of deprivation and conversely households can be income poor but relatively wealthy in other respects. Using a poverty line devised from the 1985 Household Budget Survey the surveys found that 65% of the population of Lesotho was poor in 1993 and this had risen to 68% in 1999. However, the studies recognised that the very rich were not represented in the sample, mainly because of problems of access.

Sechaba Consultants then rated households by using a model by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and CARE International. This model imputes a monetary worth to each household based on the monetary value of each item the household possesses and includes income. Added to this measure of worth are the capabilities of the household to move forward by having wage earners or a business or educated children. Added to this is a variable concerning the access of a household to public services and contacts with the outside world and then a variable to do with the environment such as access to rangeland, rain, fuel etc. The second element of the model involves shocks and stresses the household has undergone and the third to do with the kind of activities a household engages in and the choices open to the household. These scores are then correlated with outcome variables such as
nutritional status, morbidity, economic prospects and live births. What this complex piece of analysis shows is that income poverty and even total household worth is not always correlated with other measures of deprivation such as access to good fields and better rainfall. However, there was a small group of people who were low on every measure and they must be some of the poorest in Lesotho society.

2.7 Politics and Poverty

The definition and measurement of poverty is a highly political act. Advocates of the 'absolute' approach have tended to be to the right of centre and have used that definition because it tends to reduce the number of people in poverty in wealthy societies (Joseph & Sumption, 1979; Murray, 1990). Lister would add that it encourages the notion of 'otherness' with regard to the poor and so makes them easier to marginalise (Lister, 2004). Those who advocate a more relative approach often are to the left of centre and are using definitions based on this concept to justify welfare spending or redistribution (Schulte, 2004). The political dimension to poverty definition is most evident when discourses of poverty are examined.

Veit-Wilson sees the history of thinking about poverty as being one of a muddle (Veit-Wilson 2000) because of its highly politicised nature. He describes seven separate discourses which he feels underpin the way poverty is defined and so predict the attempted solution. He divides the discourses into two categories – the 'humanistic' where 'poor people were assumed to have complex human individuality like other people' (Veit-Wilson 2000 p147) and the asocial where poor people are defined in economistic, statistical or legal terms. According to Veit-Wilson there are four humanistic discourses:

a) The Structural Discourse which sees poverty as a result of structural factors in society which dictate the level of income or the standard of living required. These structural factors also are responsible for the ability to access the necessary resources.

b) Social Exclusion which may have little relation to resource poverty but is concerned with those things which exclude people from the dominant culture. These may have categorical and spatial characteristics as well as material.
c) Behaviourist discourses which is to do with deviant or 'under-class' types of behaviour as it is more to do with people's power over their resources rather than whether those resources are sufficient.

d) Egalitarian Average which see the real problem as one of deviating from the average 'mainstream' style of living rather than poverty existing in absolute terms.

The three asocial discourses are:

c) Statistical Inequality which sees poverty in terms of distance from an average or median and may have no relation to actual need.

d) Economistic discourse whereby poverty is seen as a result of 'irrational' economic choices or behaviour not necessarily at an individual level but also in macro-economic terms.

e) Legalistic discourse 'identifies poverty with pauperism' and is more to do with the state fulfilling its obligations to provide basic assistance and the dependency status of those deemed poor rather than their lack of resources.

As different governments adopt different discourses so they effect closure on other discourses and so their policies will reflect the dominant discourse. How poverty is defined (or Veit-Wilson even says 'socially constructed') is therefore a highly political act.

This theme is echoed by other writers, for instance Walker makes the point that both income proxy measures and relative deprivation measures ignore the political imperative of poverty lines ie 'Are people prepared to pay to eliminate them?' (Walker, 1987). What should be added here is that Southern governments sometimes adopt particular discourses according to which they feel would be best understood by Northern ones in order to access Aid.

2.8 Longitudinal Measures of Poverty

Over the last 30 years there has been an increased recognition of the need to take the temporal quality of poverty into account. Panel surveys were first introduced in the US and are now undertaken on a regular basis by most EU countries and other
industrialised nations (Cornia and Danziger, 1997). More recently there has been growing interest in establishing panel studies for the developing world (McKay and Lawson, 2002) but so far these have been relatively few in number and very different in content and style. Some such as those in China and Cote d'Ivoire have concentrated on expenditure per capita (Jalan and Ravallion, 1999; Grootaert and Kanbur, 1995), others such as in India have concentrated on income measures (Lanjouw and Stern, 1993) and others have looked at land ownership (Swaminathan, 1991). They all have had a different number of waves at different intervals and in different years which has made comparison between them difficult.

In 1994, Robert Walker, in his study of poverty dynamics first coined the phrase 'chronic poverty' to refer to those people who had been living in poverty over a protracted period (Walker, 1994). Hulme et al, (2001) take up these ideas and distinguish several different groups of poor from longitudinal data. There are those households who appear to be always poor or usually poor (ie their mean expenditure over the period of the study is below the poverty line even if they were not poor in every wave). These they term the chronically poor in order to include the temporal nature of the poverty experienced by these households. The never poor are obviously those who do not drop below the poverty line at any stage in the study and so can be excluded from the analysis. In between the chronically poor and the never poor there is however another group, the transient poor, who are either occasionally poor, that is their mean score is above the poverty line but they have experienced at least one episode of poverty, or they are the churning poor that is their means are at all times close to the poverty line but in some waves they are just over and some just under the line (Hulme et al, 2001).

The questions posed by taking into account the temporal nature of poverty include those around the drivers of entry into and escape from poverty (Sen, 2003), whether there is a critical time threshold after which it is extremely difficult to escape from poverty (Yaqub, 2000), whether factors underpinning transient poverty are the same as those underpinning chronic poverty (Muller, 1997) and which aspects of poverty are more amenable to change. In other words are certain aspects of poverty more dynamic than others in nature.
2.9 Who is Poor?

It has long been realised that poverty affects people differentially. In particular there is a wide body of literature demonstrating how women are often more likely to suffer from poverty than men (Glendinning & Millar, 1992; Bradshaw et al, 2003; DWP, 2003;). This is not only true in the North but also at a global level (UNDP, 1995). In particular female headed households – whether as lone parents or widows/pensioners are more likely to suffer from deprivation than men (Barnes et al, 2002). The predominance of women in poverty has sometimes been called the ‘feminisation of poverty’ although this can be a slightly ambiguous phrase as it could refer to increasing levels of poverty among women, a change in the gender balance of poverty towards women or just an increase in interest in women’s poverty (Millar & Glendinning, 1989). In 1995 UNDP claimed that 70% of the world’s poor were female. However most of the data that this claim was based upon came from household level data which had been adjusted (often using equivalence scales). The assumption therefore is that household resources are shared fairly equitably between family members. Various writers, however, have shown that this is not necessarily the case and that women’s poverty can be ‘hidden’ in households which would otherwise not be deemed poor (Pahl, 1989, Goode et al, 1998). It is important also to include the concept of ‘vulnerability to poverty’ when considering gender as women can sometimes lead a relatively affluent lifestyle based purely on their partner’s earning power (World Bank, 2001).

Women are not the only group to experience poverty differentially to men. Non-white groups in white dominated societies and minority ethnic groups around the world are more likely to be poor (World Bank, 2001; Tudawe, 2001)). In the UK this is demonstrated by Pakistani and Bangladeshi people of whom about 3 out of 5 are likely to be poor (DWP, 2003) and it is a well-known phenomenon in the US also (Proctor & Dalaker, 2003). Evidence from the South is less easy to find (except where racism has been structurally institutionalised such as in South Africa, (Aliber, 2001)) but there is a considerable amount of ‘grey’ literature suggesting that minority ethnic groups are more likely to experience poverty (eg Lao Youth Union, 1998). It might be added that factors such as caste also have an impact on the likelihood of suffering poverty (Bird et al, 2002).
Similarly disabled people are more likely to be poor, partly because of their restricted access to the labour market and partly because of the often additional cost of being disabled (Burchardt, 2003). Disability is a major cause and effect of poverty in the South (DfID, 2000). For many people in the South otherwise curable diseases such as TB and glaucoma can cause serious disability over a protracted length of time purely because the poor cannot afford the treatment.

Age also is a major differentiator between people in terms of poverty status. Older people have been shown to be on average poorer than their younger adult counterparts in most countries studied. In the North the degree of poverty tends to be related to their pension arrangements (Barnes et al, 2002). In the South old age has been increasingly associated in studies with poverty and is characterised by the chronic nature of its condition as few elderly people can get out of poverty once they have experienced it (Heslop, 2002). In addition, the lack of intra-household studies has often obscured the nature of old age poverty in otherwise affluent households. As with gender, much old age poverty is 'hidden' because of the 'absolute dominance of the family' (HelpAge International, 2000). This same argument applies to the other end of the scale when considering child poverty but this will be considered more fully in the next chapter.

Summary

Poverty has been a subject of research for over a hundred years. Rowntree's ground breaking study of the citizens of York was one of the first to aim for a scientific and objective measurement of poverty. By trying to establish the minimum a person could live on Rowntree attempted to locate a poverty line and so establish the numbers of poor in the city. His definition of poverty and to a large extent his methodology was dominant in the field until Runciman and Townsend re-conceptualised poverty as relative deprivation and stressed the importance of placing poverty within its social and cultural context. Their thinking, along with that of Amartya Sen who has envisaged poverty in terms of the lack of capabilities underpins most modern thinking about poverty. The tension between absolute conceptualisations of poverty and relative has been eased somewhat by Sen's thinking around 'absolute' cores of poverty expressed by relative deprivations, which lead a person to feel shame, and by Townsend's and Gordon's definition of two types of poverty – the 'absolute' which
encompasses where a person with regard to a minimum standard and the 'overall' which encompasses a person’s relative position compared to their peers.

Current definitions of poverty include budget and income measures, income proxy measures, relative deprivation and the concept of sustainable livelihood. Social exclusion is linked to poverty but is not synonymous with it. Measures of poverty in the North have tended to be based on income or income proxies, with the exception of Gordon’s recent work on the Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey, and measures in the South have often included other relevant data such as access to educational and social services. By and large also the North has relied heavily on survey data for the study of poverty, although there have recently been more studies looking at people’s experience of poverty. In the South participatory poverty assessments are a regular feature of poverty appraisal. On a global scale the UN collects poverty data from all countries but sometimes discriminates between the OECD countries and the rest of the world. In recent years also the link between time and poverty has been explored and recognition has been given to the temporal nature of much poverty.

In brief therefore there are a variety of major debates being held around the definition and measurement of poverty. The following are some of the major ‘fault lines’ in the debate (after Maxwell, 1999). They are not mutually exclusive and refer to various themes running through current debates on poverty rather than providing definitive categories:

- **Using individual or household measures** – what should be the basic unit of analysis?
- **Private consumption or private consumption plus publicly owned goods?**
- **Monetary or monetary plus non-monetary components of poverty?**
- **Snapshot or timeline** – in other words the incidence of poverty at any one time or the pattern of poverty over a life-course.
- **Actual or potential poverty** – the effect of ‘shocks’ in terms of coping strategies and vulnerability.
- **Stock or flow measures of poverty** – poverty is often seen as the flow of goods from one person or institution to another. Where does the idea of ‘capital’ or Sen’s ‘commodity bundle’ come into this?
• **Input or output measures** – income is an input and does not necessarily correlate with an output such as well-being.

• **Objective or Subjective measures of poverty** – who decides how to define poverty and what impoverishes people?

• **Absolute or Relative Poverty** – Possibly the most major issue.

Poverty carries with it a moral imperative which is why the definition of poverty becomes a highly political act and one of which governments’ are fully aware. Therefore different discourses are used depending on the political colour of the government concerned. However, notwithstanding the method used, women, minority ethnic groups, disabled people and the old and very young tend to be poorer than the more dominant groups in society.
Chapter 3 - Measuring Children's Poverty

Introduction
Most poverty measurements are based at the household level, despite poverty definitions often recognising the importance of measures of poverty at the individual level. It is therefore sometimes not sufficient just to understand the position of the household but the position of the individual within the household needs to be understood as well. That women often suffer disproportionately from poverty as compared to men has been well established (Lister, 2004). However, the impact of poverty on children within households has been less comprehensively studied until more recently.

At the beginning of the 21st century child poverty has become centre stage both in the UK and globally. The Prime Minister of the UK has made the eradication of child poverty by 2020 one of the main aims of his Government and, on a global scale, many of the Millenium Development Goals have particular relevance to children. However there has been little consensus so far as to a common definition of child poverty or how best it should be measured.

Measuring child poverty brings with it particular problems particularly if it is assumed that ways of measuring adult poverty can be used for children. Firstly, there is the issue about what constitutes a child and whether there is a universally agreed definition of childhood. Secondly, if fairly broad holistic definitions of poverty are used then the current definitions become a lot more complex when considering children. For instance, if one takes Sen's concepts of Freedoms what does political freedom or even economic freedom mean to children (Sen, 1999). What does the Sustainable Livelihoods approach mean with regard to children (Carney 1998)? Are children seen purely as a matter of cost to the family or as a capital asset? We know that children often earn their own livings (Marcus and Harper, 1996) and contribute to the income of the family, but how can this be included in, say, a livelihoods framework. On a more abstract level if one is considering the pre-requisites for well-being how can these be translated for children. There have been various 'lists' drawn up in recent years which try and encapsulate those most basic items necessary for human well-being (eg. Nussbaum, Finnis, Max-Neef, Schwartz etc.) but it is not always clear whether these
most basic necessities are applicable to children and if they are, how. For instance Nussbaum sees 'central human functional capabilities' as including control over one's environment which is both the right to political choice and the ability to hold property on an equal basis with others (Nussbaum, 2000). In most societies children do not have any political power nor are they entitled to legally own anything.

Various governments have devised ways of measuring child poverty in their own countries. For instance the Government of the UK published Opportunity for All in 1999 and has subsequently brought out a discussion document on indicators of child poverty (DWP, 2002). Many other countries also wrestle with the same issues both in the industrialised and the developing world. What is less frequently discussed is why children, and the conditions they live in, should be measured separately from adults – or at least accounted for separately even if the means of measurement are the same. Hitherto children have often been included in measures of family or household poverty and it has been assumed that children who live in poor families/households are likely to be poor themselves and therefore the converse to be also true.

This chapter gives an overview of measuring child poverty internationally. Section 1 briefly considers why it is worth looking at child poverty in isolation from that of other age groups. In section 2 we will then look at the different ways that are used to measure child poverty with particular reference to the UK. Section 3 looks at how child poverty is defined and measured globally and how qualitative studies have explored child poverty. Lastly we take a brief look at the lack of longitudinal studies around child poverty particularly in the South before concluding that both qualitative and quantitative methods need to be used as measures.

3.1 Why measure child poverty?

The last decade or two has seen the role of children and childhood being re-assessed, particularly in sociological terms. From being seen as proto adults, or individuals who are in the process of 'becoming' and whose true function will only be fulfilled when they reach adulthood, children are increasingly being seen as independent social actors in their own right. The 'new sociology' of childhood creates a quite different paradigm through which children may be studied and on which to base further studies. James and Prout (1990), put forward a new paradigm which is
centred upon the child as a social actor and participant in society in much the same way as other social groups have been viewed. Hitherto children had been viewed in biological and psychological terms as incomplete adults or what Qvortrup terms ‘human becomings’ (Qvortrup, 1987). Because children were basically inferior versions of adults they needed to be ‘socialised’ into the adult world and this was one of the main functions of childhood – to prepare an individual for adulthood and ‘an essential part of the process of becoming fully human’ (Berger & Berger, 1975, p6). A growing band of sociologists however began to challenge this view and suggest that children may be seen as human beings in their own right (Alanen, 1990).

These sociologists’ basic premise is that childhood is a social construction in much the same way that gender or old age is a social construction. The construction of childhood may therefore vary across cultures and societies and is not tied to the biological state of maturity of any specific individual. There is no universality of childhood and childhood is experienced differently in different parts of the world and in different cultures (James, Jenks & Prout, 2001). If this is the case childhood is a variable of social analysis much like gender and class and the social relationships children engage in can be studied much like any other group. In addition children can be seen as actors or agents and not merely as the passive recipients of structural processes (Hutchby & Moran-Ellis, 1998). They also will be engaged in creating their own social structures and processes.

There are various implications of this new paradigm that are relevant to studying the impact of poverty on children. Firstly, if childhood is not just about ‘becoming’ and about the kind of adult the child will grow up to be, then the impact poverty makes on an individual child or a group of children should be of concern for the here and now as much as for any future impacts. That poverty causes suffering in adults and children alike should be acknowledged and it should be less important to try and justify anti-poverty measures by predicting the potential outcome for a child at some unknown date in the future. Secondly, if children are presumed to have agency then how children define poverty, how they themselves think about it, should be measured and the impact that children feel poverty has on them should also be taken into account (Save the Children, 2001). Thirdly, if children are to be treated like any other social grouping then they should be subject to the same kind of analyses. In practice this
means taking the child as the unit of analysis (Saporiti, 1994). Saporiti goes on to say:

‘Construction of a social demography of childhood....requires placing children on the same footing as adults, on the one hand, and a good deal of theoretical and methodological imagination, on the other’ (Saporiti, 1994 p203).

Children’s relationship with poverty can be analysed therefore much as adults is and subjected to the same kind of cross cutting analysis with regard to gender, class, disability etc. In addition, in many parts of the world, this would also include income earning and other economically productive roles.

However, it is equally possible that poverty could impact on children, as a social group, in just the same way as with adults and so separate measurement would still not be necessary. To date, although there is some limited research as to whether child poverty (however defined) is quantitatively different from adult poverty (see Bradshaw, CPAG etc) yet little research has been undertaken as to whether there is a difference qualitatively between the two groups. We can however say certain things which may act as pointers and certainly give a reason for investigating child poverty in more depth. Firstly there is plenty of evidence that children are more vulnerable to poverty and that they are physically less robust than adults and therefore poverty can have a more serious affect on them both physically, mentally and possibly emotionally (Harper et al, 2003). Whereas adults can be malnourished for some months and probably recover, for children there can be long terms effects in terms of physical and cognitive development (James Commission, 2000).

Secondly there is some evidence that the length of time spent in poverty for children, especially in early life, could have a critical effect on later outcomes (Duncan and Brooks-Gunn, 1997; Gottschalk & Danziger, 2001; Yaqub, 2000). For instance, Duncan and Brooks-Gunn found that parental income in the first five years of life in the US is directly correlated with whether children complete school some ten to fifteen years later. As UNDP point out:
‘Children cannot reverse stunting. They cannot recover from preventable disabilities. Nor can they reclaim those 15 valuable years of growth and development in later life’ (UNDP, 2004 p3).

There is less evidence whether a similar period spent by an adult in poverty has the same critical effect say twenty years later, although ill-health in the elderly has sometimes been attributed to deprivation in earlier life.

Thirdly child poverty can act as a predictor for a country in that the lack of health or education in its young citizens will affect the economic and social health of the nation in future years (as in, say, the case of Uganda and the HIV/AIDS epidemic). For instance, the James Commission found that up to one billion children will be growing up by 2020 with impaired mental development because of malnutrition (James Commission, 2000). Fourthly child poverty carries with it, in most societies, a moral imperative to do something about it (Alcock, 1997). As far back as Rowntree attempts have been made, when considering adult poverty, to distinguish between those who are poor through no fault of their own and those who could be held individually responsible for their condition. There is a general consensus that children almost exclusively fall into the first category and so for the adults and particularly the policy makers of a country the plight of children is increasingly being used as a measure of the moral rectitude of those in authority. It is not clear at this point how this view of poverty relates to notions of children's agency but it is fairly well agreed that children are structurally disadvantaged with regard to adults (James, Jenks & Prout, 2001) and so any poverty they are experiencing is unlikely to be a result of their actions.

3.2 Ways of Measuring Child Poverty

Several methods have been used to try and measure child poverty, particularly in the North. Many use household data (either panel or cross-sectional) and re-analyse it making the child the unit of observation and analysis. This method has primarily been used in industrialised countries. Saporiti describes this as developing a sociography of childhood (Saporiti, 1994) and shows how by treating children as a social group quite different results can be obtained from household data. The difference in data that can be obtained from using the child or children as the unit of analysis is clearly
shown by one of his examples. Saporiti shows how just by altering the analysis from grouping families by number of children to grouping children by how many siblings they live with gives very different results. He found that whereas in his sample 49% of families had only one child yet only 30% of children lived without a sibling. Similarly 16.6% of families with children were found to be living below the poverty line in Israel in 1987 but 21.3% of children were found to be in poverty when they were used as the unit of analysis (Shamgar-Handelman, 1994). Doing this type of re-analysis shows how poverty can differentially affect children eg. The Vietnam Living Standards Survey 1993 showed how 50% of Vietnam’s population lived in poverty but 63% of them were under 15 years old (Brassard, 1999).

One of the weaknesses of this approach is that it assumes equal access to resources by children in a family and re-analysing household surveys may miss factors which are peculiar to children. It also tends to rely heavily on income figures per household and so says little about children's actual living conditions (and children usually have very limited direct access to income). Brooks-Gunn and Duncan found that there is a point when family income ceases to make a significant difference to children's well-being or outcome measures (Duncan & Brooks-Gunn, 1998). We will now turn to look in more detail at some of the different approaches and consider their strengths and weaknesses.

3.2.1 Income and Income Proxy Definitions

In terms of income poverty children and adults have been treated in broadly the same manner over the years. Basically a household's income has been taken and then divided between the members of that household, often using some form of equivalence scaling. Using this method, but also using the child as the unit of analysis, Bradshaw shows how child poverty rates, defined as children living in households at a percentage below the average income, have changed in the UK over time and how they compare to other European countries (Bradshaw, 2000; CPAG, 2005). By these measures children in the UK are some of the worst off in Europe but there is some evidence that, although child poverty was increasing over the last 20 years of the twentieth century it has now started to decrease (Bradshaw, 2001).

Income proxy methods have also been used to try and assess how much money is needed to raise a child in Britain and hence to assess how many families' incomes fall
short of this standard (Piachaud, 1979). This has been one of the main planks behind campaigning groups such as the Child Poverty Action Group. Set up in the late 1960s this group has campaigned against child poverty in Britain for the last 30 years. As well as lobbying it carries out much of its own research (Oppenheim, 1994; Oppenheim & Harker, 1996) and its basis for the measurement of poverty is usually strictly in monetary terms – understandably given its campaigning role.

Most commentators have been careful to stress that such measures indicate how many children are growing up in poor households rather than claiming the children are by definition poor. But a central problem remains when using income or income proxy means of measurement and that is whether children are viewed as economic subjects or commodities. In the post industrialised world children are nearly always seen as consumers and have been excluded from the formal economy (Wintersberger, 1994) although not always the informal economy in terms of their caring roles or domestic responsibilities. It could be argued that in highly monetised societies income measures and viewing the child as consumer accurately reflects children’s ability to access goods and services. However, the inbuilt assumption in most of these surveys is that all children have equal access to goods and services compared to other household members. In order to overcome some of these problems there have been attempts at other forms of measurement to at least try and reflect the more immediate impact of poverty on children and their experience of it.

### 3.2.2 Other measures used for child poverty

There are a few other approaches to measuring child poverty which have been tried over the past ten years. One of the main ways that non-income measures have defined poverty is to consider deprivation. A list of items that children normally have access to is drawn up and then the proportion of children lacking those items calculated as in the case of adults. Middleton et al were some of the first to specifically research children’s poverty using deprivation indicators. In this case parents from various income groups were asked to draw up a list of perceived necessities for children (Middleton et al, 1997). Using a similar technique, the 1999 Poverty and Social Exclusion survey included a section on necessities for children whereby parents were asked which items they felt were necessities for children in the UK. There were 30 items for the parents to choose from ranging from ‘three meals a day’ to ‘computer games’.
In analysing this data Gordon et al (2000a) found that at least 50% of parents endorsed all but three of the items as being necessities for children. However some items had a higher percentage of agreement by parents than others. In particular over 90% of parents felt that eating three meals a day with fruit and vegetables at least once a day were a necessity, as were new shoes, a warm coat, the opportunity to celebrate special occasions, owning books and having one's own bed and bedding. Three non necessities were having a computer, computer games and money for sweets.

Gordon et al set the cut off point at those children lacking two or more items. These children were deemed to be poor and comprised about 18% of the sample. The correlation between income and deprivation of necessities was not particularly high with 65% of the children who were income poor not being necessities deprived. This would seem to suggest that parents try and mitigate the affect of poverty on their children by ensuring that what little money they have is spent on the children. Bradshaw and Finch also found that measuring different dimensions produced different results in terms of who was poor. But they also found that those who were poor on all the different dimensions were the least like the non-poor and they therefore advocate using several measures of poverty in one study (Bradshaw & Finch, 2003)

The method of drawing up lists of necessities and then establishing how many children go without is a powerful tool for conveying something of the experience of poverty and, incidentally for campaigning purposes. However, in these studies it is parents who have been asked about their children's necessities rather than the children themselves. Possibly because of this the list tends to deal with belongings/things and does not deal with access to services or, for that matter, types of family. The list also mostly includes things that parents feel are 'good' for children but children might not agree, for instance adults judged that to have a small amount of money to spend on themselves weekly was a necessity but did not feel that this was a necessity for children.

A second non-income approach to measuring child poverty is to use the outcomes in order to assess what ought to be measured or, to put it another way, what aspects of
poverty in childhood affect the child when an adult. Although some work has been done on this in the UK (Bradshaw, 2001) much of the best data is from the US where the Panel Study of Income Dynamics provides a rich source of data on how family income affects outcomes for children. Duncan and Brooks-Gunn used four age groupings to look at the impact of poverty in children. These were the pre-natal infancy period; the early childhood years; the late childhood years and the adolescent years and used a whole variety of outcome measures ranging from psycho-social testing to school attainment and drop-out rates to the use of drugs and alcohol and early pregnancy. They found that 'family income is usually a stronger predictor of ability and achievement outcomes than are measures of parental schooling or family structure' (Duncan & Brooks-Gunn, 1997, p553)

A third approach uses primarily children's own experience of poverty. Although some basic figures may be given yet most of the data is qualitative in nature and is based on observations and/or interviews with children. This methodology has particularly been used in developing countries where 'hard' data might be scarce and will be discussed in more detail when looking at children and poverty measures in the South. In the UK, Tessa Ridge found that stigma was a particular concern for children and young people and the feeling of being different from other people (Ridge, 2002). Charitable groups such as Save the Children and the Children's Society have also held discussions with children around the issue of poverty and found that children could describe vividly what it was like not to have either as much money as their peers or to lack necessities (Willow, 2001; West, 1995)

Possibly because of the stigma attached to the word, in these discussions with children and young people, it was clear that 'poverty' was something that happened to other people. On the whole they saw homeless people or 'tramps' as the poor of their societies. Lack of money, lack of education, lack of emotional support were never classed as poverty although young people were very clear about the problems the lack of these caused. In answer to the question 'Are there poor people in the UK?' most therefore said 'only a few' and cited the homeless – although many of the young people felt that the homeless were often not poor either and simply chose to live that particular lifestyle. Many of the young people also felt that there were, for instance, jobs available but that people were not prepared to do them under the conditions they were offered. 'Poverty' was therefore a matter of choice but even though poverty was
largely seen in material terms, children also made links with the deficiencies in other areas of people's lives:

'People are poor because they're depressed, and then they're making themselves feel poor. And after walking around in rags and all that they're then neglected by people, being shouted abuse at, and it just brings people down and its making them poorer and poorer again. In themselves.' (Save the Children, 2001)

Such qualitative approaches give very important insights into the experience of being poor and how children and young people define poverty. In particular they find echoes in Sen's views of shame and the conditions that cause a human to feel shame (Sen, 1999). However they give little insight into the incidence or prevalence of poverty.

A fourth approach involves the specific collection of indicators which relate directly to children. The Department of Works and Pensions in the UK has a list of indicators of child poverty which they use but these are not combined into any particular index (DWP, 2005). Such indicators are often not income based and nearly always are drawn up by policy makers as to what they feel is important when considering child development rather than basing indicators on any sort of participatory or consensual approach as has been done with adults. It is worth looking at how often and in what form data about child poverty indicators are collected internationally as this method is used by most of the large multi-lateral agencies who are concerned with child poverty on a global scale.

3.3 Poverty Measurements Globally

3.3.1 Quantitative Measures

Currently, as we have seen in the previous chapter, only a few measurements of poverty are used internationally for comparison and these are mostly found in the UN Human Development Index or in UNICEF statistics. With regard to children, they almost exclusively cover health, in the form of mortality, immunisation status, low birth weight and malnutrition, access to safe water and sanitation and school enrolment or
achievement. For industrialised countries there are also figures for youth unemployment, young people involved in the justice system and teenage pregnancy.

Many countries collect data on children that is either not analysed or not released or does not come into the international arena. For instance, several developing countries have undertaken Living Standards Surveys funded by the World Bank or other forms of surveys which include children, for example in Uganda and South Africa (World Bank, 2005). What is collected, of course, depends on the definition of poverty being used. However, it seems that there is very little consistency between countries as to what is collected and what data is analysed and the format in which it is presented. Based on data collected by UNICEF, WHO and UNESCO, UNDP currently report on the following indicators globally for children:

- Life expectancy at birth
- Low birth weight
- Underweight children
- Calorie supply per capita
- Under five mortality
- Immunisation
- Access to health services
- Access to sanitation and safe water
- School enrolment (incl orphans)
- Female school enrolment
- Children who do not receive 5 years of schooling
- Child labour

In addition, the industrialised countries measure:

- Full-time students 5-19 years
- Youth unemployment
- Young prisoners
- Teenage pregnancy
- Single female parent homes

UNICEF defines poverty in terms of child rights. Its statement on child poverty reads:
‘Children living in poverty are deprived of their rights to survival, health and nutrition, education, participation and protection from harm, exploitation and discrimination’ (UNICEF, 2005 p 2).

UNICEF goes on to say that poverty is multifaceted and so requires a multifaceted approach to its measurement. In terms of indicators however they tend to collate much the same data as UNDP but with slightly more detail in terms of health status (such as more details on immunisation status) and have now started to consolidate certain indicators (under 5 mortality rate, the prevalence of underweight children, primary school enrolment and the likelihood of being involved in armed conflict or being affected by HIV/AIDS) into a Child Risk Measure (CRM) for each country. So, for example Angola’s CRM is 96 whereas the average for Europe is 6. In addition it also collects data on child labour and birth registration, figures on child exploitation and data about access to information such as radio, newspapers television and computers, where it is available. In terms of the wealthier OECD countries UNICEF uses a relative poverty line of 50% of median income. By this measure 15% of the children in the UK are living in poverty (UNICEF-IRC, 2005).

It can be seen therefore that the statistics gathered by many of the large unilateral agencies, although important indicators for child well-being, do not reflect the range of experiences that children undergo and certainly do not reflect many of the issues children talk about. Relying on these data also means that the North will always appear so immeasurably better off than the South that it becomes difficult to identify child poverty in the North. What these indicators also lack is any sense of differential within countries – a country with low scores can also be hiding ‘pockets’ of deprivation.

Because of these relatively narrow indicators and because they are not always collated in a way that allows meaningful comparison various other researchers and organisations have drawn up their own means of measuring child poverty and a few are mentioned here.

The Bristol Deprivation Indicators use seven of the indicators collected by UNICEF to form a Deprivation Index. These cover severe food deprivation (more than three standard deviations from the norm); severe water deprivation (dirty water or too far
away); severe deprivation of sanitation (no latrines); severe health deprivation (lack of immunisation and diarrhoea with no treatment); severe shelter deprivation (overcrowded or a mud floor); severe educational deprivation (no schooling for 7-18 year olds) and severe information deprivation (no access to radio etc.) The study found that the percentage of children suffering from severe deprivation — that is children suffering from one or more deprivations — was 93% in sub-saharan Africa and those in absolute poverty — that is suffering from 2 or more severe deprivations — were 78% in the same region (Gordon et al, 2003).

The Childhood Poverty Research Centre has also commissioned studies in the developing world to investigate child poverty. They have defined child poverty as children who are: growing up without an adequate livelihood; without opportunities for development (education, health, sanitation etc); without a family and community that supports them; without a voice (that is lack of political power amongst other things). As yet the data from these studies have not been released.

The Christian Children’s Fund sees poverty as comprising the severe lack of material goods and services, the exclusion of children from decision making and rights because of their age and the vulnerability of children when societies are unable to provide for their needs. CCF sees child poverty as the interrelationship of these three concepts and poverty measures should include all three (Minujin, 2005)

The Institute for Democracy in Southern Africa (IDASA) which is a national NGO but with cells in other SADC countries such as Lesotho has defined children being in poverty as those who: have insufficient income and income earning opportunities; lack of human development opportunities (such as education and lack of basic services); feelings of economic and physical insecurity (in particular as a result of ‘shocks’ such as death of family members or retrenchment) and; feelings of powerlessness (oppressed in the family unit or excluded from mainstream society) (Streak, 2000).

Several attempts have been made to measure child poverty in South Africa. Dieden and Gustafsson used two poverty lines – one based on the World Bank ‘dollar a day’ calculation and one based on 50% of median income (Dieden and Gustafsson, 2003). They found that abut 40% of all children under 14 years were poor but, just as with adults and households, the likelihood of being poor was affected by the size of the
household, the sex of the household head, the location of the child (rural/urban) and the presence of a wage earner in the family. Above all race was a determining factor, again one which is unlikely to be so pertinent in other southern African nations.

Noble et al, take a different approach and propose a model for measuring child poverty in South Africa which takes in to account the different facets of a child's experience (Noble et al, 2006). Their model includes eight domains of poverty each comprising an 'absolute core' of deprivation such as inadequate food, shelter, clothing etc (in the Material Deprivation domain for example) which are derived from internationally set standards and then a relative component which is linked to local conditions and set locally (for example the lack of a television may be considered poverty in some cultures and not in others). The two components of each domain would then contribute to the poverty index but could be separated out if necessary so that cross-national comparisons could be made. The advantage of this model is that it leaves room for children to be consulted on the issues that are important to them and for them to be able to include their interpretation of what constitutes poverty whilst keeping other internationally agreed measures as well.

From the above examples it can be seen that various attempts are being made to widen the definition of child poverty, globally, not only beyond purely money metrics but also beyond the provision of basic services. Inclusion of items such as powerlessness, vulnerability and participation often come from discussions with children but they are often very difficult to express as indicators. In addition, unless governments or aid agencies take all these concepts on board they rarely appear in national surveys. So, for instance, IDASA's concept of poverty or Noble's is yet to be fully operationalised in the national statistics. However there are many smaller surveys of specific areas of children's lives which can feed into a bigger picture on child poverty (eg Andersen, 2000 & 2001; Baigal et al, 2001; Satyanarayana et al (1986). These may focus on a specific aspect of poverty such as nutritional status of children in India (Krishnaswamy et al, 2002) or on the experience of a particular group of children for example street children in Tanzania (Mdoe, 1997).

Existing indicators therefore have two main problems. Firstly there is little consistency or comparability between countries, except for those produced by the UN and secondly the majority, and certainly those that are used internationally, do not often
reflect fully children's experience or main concerns. In fact indicators used by national Governments and by multi-lateral agencies tend to reflect their concerns. How they construct child poverty then becomes the determining factor for how it is measured.

### 3.3.2 Qualitative studies

As well as studies which measure indicators of child poverty there have been several qualitative studies which try and convey child poverty as it is experienced by those children. Children have also sometimes participated in Participatory Poverty Assessments or taken part in participatory type research and data is available from that. For instance the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper process involved several group discussions with children (Marcus & Wilkinson, 2002). This type of research has often been used around certain issues, for instance child labour and can give some basic numerical data but rarely in sufficient quantity to be statistically robust (eg Johnson et al, 1995). However their strength is in terms of capturing the holistic nature of poverty and in describing poverty as it is felt and experienced by children.

If we look at a selection of these qualitative studies we can see the kinds of things children talk about in connection with poverty. None of these studies were asking children about poverty per se but were talking to poor children about their lives but a huge spectrum of issues is raised by these children. The discussions with children were held in Zimbabwe (Chinyenze et al, 1999); Laos (Lao Youth Union, 1998); Vietnam (Save the Children(a), 1998); Honduras (Green, 1998); Rwanda (Sezikeye, 1999) and Nepal (Rajbhandary, 1998). One of the main themes that children discussed were their families and the sequence of events when deaths occurred, or the families could no longer support them or if there was some form of abuse within the family such as alcoholism. Lack of food and money also were a predominating theme as was the type of housing the children lived in and the type of neighbourhood. In fact children often had quite a lot to say about the stigma of living in certain types of neighbourhoods or in shanty towns. The critical role friends played in children's survival strategies, particularly for children working in the street, was also an important theme.

After the most immediate needs, children also discussed issues around health and education - education in terms of the struggle to get an education and health in terms
of their own poor health or a family member's poor health and the lack of availability of services. For many children work was a fact of life and they discussed the hardships they often had to contend with at work along with their pride at often being able to help the family out or even be the breadwinner for the family. Along with work went crime and exploitation. Many of these poor children had either engaged in crime as a means of survival or had been the victim of crime and many also had been sexually exploited either as part of their work or because they were in a vulnerable situation. However, throughout many of these discussions there are overarching themes. One is about exclusion and how these particular children often felt excluded from the 'mainstream'. This would suggest that, even in poor countries, the poorest children can still feel that somehow they do not fit the norm. Another theme is that of fear and the everyday anxiety poor children feel over the most commonplace of issues such as the next meal or the next wash. This is contrasted by the kinds of hope, often unrealistic, that poor children also feel that somehow things will come all right in the end and one day they will have good jobs and a full and free family life. It is only the qualitative studies that can give us this richness of detail and enable us to think about child poverty in its fullest sense. These studies also can act as a springboard for thinking about indicators and which indicators best reflect children's own experience.

### 3.4 Children and longitudinal data

As with adult data nearly all longitudinal data on children comes from panel studies in the North. For instance, the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth in Canada and the National Child Development Study in the UK have both shown the links between sustained poverty and other factors including cognitive ability (Bradshaw, 2001; McCulloch and Joshi, 1999). Bradbury et al, 2001 chart the dynamics of child poverty over time in the industrialised nations and again use the distinction between chronic (or persistent) poverty as experienced by children and transitory poverty. Chronic poverty is assumed to have greater long term impacts than temporary, transitory poverty.

In the South there are very few longitudinal studies to date. Out of 110 countries low on the UNDP Human Development Index only 12 contain any longitudinal data and most of those are for less than five years or contain only two waves of data (Baulch & Hoddinott, 2000). These limited studies from the developing world show how many
factors specific to children affect the outcomes as they grow into adulthood. Deprivations in the form of physical assets, lack of education, inadequate nutrition and health care, lack of society and kin groups and negative attitudes towards children all impact on the child later in life (Harper et al, 2003) and there are several studies showing how poverty in childhood can cause poor adults (Glewwe et al, 1999; Behrman et al, 2001).

An on-going study at the moment is exploring the lives of children in four countries – Ethiopia, Peru, Vietnam and India. This is a 15 year study with 12,000 children and their carers being followed up every three years. The project is funded by the UK Department for International Development in conjunction with various academic and aid agencies. The indicators in this study cover access to basic services, access to health care and facilities, child caring and rearing, child nutrition, literacy and numeracy, child work and social capital in communities around children (Young Lives, 2004). Only the first round of interviews have been completed so there is no longitudinal data available as yet but it should provide a much clearer insight into the nature of poverty over the early part of the life course than is available at present.

Less well researched is how transfers of disadvantage are transmitted inter-generationally and passed from parent to child or one generational cohort to another. Since Lewis in 1959 propounded his theories of a culture of poverty there has been a hot debate about whether it is something innate in the poor themselves that seemingly causes endless cycles of disadvantage or whether the coping mechanisms established by poor families are appropriate to their circumstances but do not encourage escape from poverty (Moore, 2001).

Of course the assumption here is that transfers tend to go from adult to child, and whilst this may be true in the industrialised world, anecdotal evidence from the developing world suggests the opposite is sometimes the case. We need to understand the nature of inter-generational relations (Alanen and Mayall, 2001) before we can understand transfers of this nature.

Summary

In the last couple of decades of the twentieth century child poverty came much more to the fore both in the UK and globally. This was partly because in the UK poverty
itself was seeing a resurgence of interest and partly because from 1980 to 1997 child poverty actually got worse in the UK. As children are being seen differently in the sociological world this also has implications for how child poverty is viewed. Much contemporary sociological theory now sees children as human beings with agency in their own right and therefore they should be studied as any other social group rather than either subsumed beneath the interests of adults or defined as passive recipients of adult culture and policies.

Approaches to child poverty have not always kept up with changes in sociological theory. Most of the differences studied between adult poverty and child poverty are to do with the long term impact of poverty in childhood, children's decreased resilience to poverty and the kind of moral imperative child poverty, in particular, carries with it. Fewer studies have looked at children' own experience of poverty or the steps they take to mitigate the worst of its effects.

Child poverty has been measured in a variety of ways. One way is to use income measures or income proxy measures but there are a variety of other ways including deprivation indices, outcome measures, indicators and qualitative studies. Globally, apart from income measures, basic indicators and small qualitative studies are the most common. There is very little longitudinal data on children from the South although more is being collected now.

Child poverty therefore has tended to be measured on a global scale quantitatively and using indicators prescribed by policymakers who are normally adults. These sometimes reflect the concerns of children in poverty and sometimes do not but reflect governments' and aid agencies own concerns. One of the main concerns of policymakers and their researchers is the future impact of poverty on children and the likely life paths of poor children. This constant 'looking to the future' has sometimes obscured the very immediate suffering and needs of children now and has not always given due weight to the ways that children try and mitigate their situations now.

In general, qualitative studies have tended to be small and uncoordinated in nature and have been subsidiary to larger quantitative collations of statistics. Yet these small qualitative studies have brought the experience of poor children to life and can form a basis for the development of indicators. Children's views also should be heard purely
because they have a right to be heard. Whilst poor people throughout the world have increasingly been making their voices heard (Narayan, 1999; CoPPP, 2000) yet children's voices have not been so loud. The Convention on the Rights of the Child makes participation a key 'right' in all matters affecting children and it is important for researchers of poverty to take that on board.

In the Introduction we also discussed the five contexts that children find themselves in and too often poverty studies do not take account of these contexts. This is particularly true of global measures of poverty which, by their very nature, do not introduce any kind of contextualisation. For this reason locally developed deprivation indices are more powerful tools for conveying the reality of children living in poverty. This thesis therefore, attempts to use qualitative data to make some judgements as to what aspects of poverty children feel most affects them. This is then used to inform the quantitative data analysis taking into account the temporal aspects where possible. The basis for the collection of the quantitative data, however, was the livelihoods framework, described in chapter 2, which encompassed data on physical assets, social contacts, the environment, income and expenditure and human capital. How, and if, these domains relate to how children describe poverty is explored and how children's poverty relates to its context is also considered with particular reference to Lesotho where the field work was undertaken. Whilst income is used as a primary variable when measuring poverty status the thesis will show how a more holistic approach to children's poverty, based on the notion of livelihood, can give quite different results.
Chapter 4 – Methodology

Introduction

In order to measure child poverty in Lesotho, the study was designed in two parts which eventually became three. The first part of the study re-visited households from a previous survey which had been conducted in 1993. Only households with children under 10 years of age in 1993 were selected so that the children would still be under 18 years by 2002. This should give a picture not only of what children were facing in 2002 but also how their situations had changed over time. Whilst following up on the 1993 households added an additional complication in terms of making the research into a longitudinal study, this was a unique opportunity to gain time series data and would give some indication of poverty dynamics over the nine year period.

The second part of the study was to hold group discussions with children around the subject of poverty to gain an insight into their understanding of the issue. This would enable children, albeit in a somewhat limited way, to ‘have a voice’ in the process and the results would give further insights into the quantitative process. Although there was an argument for conducting this qualitative research before the quantitative survey, in that it could inform the survey data collection, the funding did not allow for this delay and, in any case, the quantitative data was constrained by what had been collected in 1993.

The third part of the study was a small tracer study of those children who were no longer living in the 1993 household by 2002. These children had moved to other places either with or without relatives but it was felt that their mobility may be related to the poverty status of the original household.

The study was designed, therefore, to use both quantitative and qualitative methodologies and indirect and direct work with children. This chapter starts with a description of the methodology for the three parts of the study including an in-depth analysis of the sampling frame used in the 1993 survey as this forms the basis of the study which was conducted in 2002. The adjustments made to the 1993 sample are then described and there is some discussion of attrition rates and issues around conducting longitudinal studies.
The chapter then turns to a description of the qualitative data collection and a demonstration of how analysing quantitative data at an early stage can lead to further qualitative data being carried out in order to make sense of the information being revealed. The section on analysis then describes some of the techniques used in the data analysis. Details of the statistical analysis conducted on the quantitative data are, however, given with the results where appropriate in later chapters. The second half of the chapter gives an overview of some of the ways qualitative and quantitative data and methods have been linked. This is followed by a brief exploration of some of the issues which arise when researching children, particularly when undertaking qualitative research with children.

This chapter explains how the data collection was carried out and analysed and discusses some of the conceptual issues undergirding this research. The next chapter, chapter 5 reflects on the process of the research and discusses some of the particular concerns of collecting data of this nature in a developing country.

4.1 The 1993 and 2002 Studies

In 1993 Lesotho, in common with the rest of southern Africa, was in the grip of a two year long drought caused by the El Nino effect in the South Atlantic. As a result there was catastrophic failure of the crops, livestock starved and water was in very short supply. A conglomeration of donors including the EU, DfID and others funded a small local research company to undertake a rapid assessment of conditions throughout the country in order to effectively target food aid. This study was a national study and involved visiting two villages in every one of the 60 constituencies. The final number of households visited was 1719 and they were asked about members of the household and their occupations, ownership of fields and livestock, assets and durables such as agricultural equipment and toilets and stoves etc., access to clean water and children under 5 year were weighed and measured. The questionnaire was inevitably fairly brief because the results were needed quickly. I was involved in the field work for this study but was less involved in the data analysis owing to the fact that I contracted typhoid in the mountains.
In 2002, the Chronic Poverty Research Centre (CPRC) in Manchester, which is funded by the Department for International Development, gave me a limited grant to re-visit some of the households from the 1993 survey in Lesotho. Although a more detailed survey had been conducted on different households in 1999, it was decided to use the 1993 survey as this would give a longer length of time during which households could have changed. This was because the CPRC was primarily interested in chronic poverty rather than child poverty. In addition there were some problems locating the 1999 questionnaires which would have been essential in order to locate the exact households. As the funds were limited it was not possible to try and visit all 1719 households and so a sample was selected, the details of which are given below. The survey was set up in the January of 2002 whilst I was in Lesotho. The original 1993 questionnaires were found and these were used as basis for the 2002 questionnaire although a considerable number of extra questions were added as speed was not so essential this time round.

After piloting the questionnaire and training the 10 research assistants, two teams of five research assistants each went into the field. The survey began at the end of January whilst I was still in Lesotho and then carried on under the supervision of a Mosotho colleague until I returned in March 2002. During March and April the teams were de-briefed and the data entry was begun, as I had already created the templates in SPSS whilst in the UK. It was also at this time that I and a Mosotho colleague conducted the group discussions with children. Data entry and cleaning continued until the end of June but was primarily done in the UK. From the initial analysis of the data it was clear that many of the children who were under 10 years of age in 1993 were no longer in the household by 2002. I decided therefore to return to Lesotho in January and February of 2003 to try and find some of these children and conduct a small tracer study. Accompanying me on this study was one of the research assistants, an older man, who had a good understanding of the mountain regions of Lesotho and who would be well received in the villages we would be visiting.

4.1.1 The Quantitative survey

Sampling in the 1993 survey
The unit of analysis for all the poverty surveys was the household but information was also collected on individuals within those households. In order to minimise the
logistical problems in a country where many households live some 8 hours walk from
the nearest (dirt) road some form of cluster sampling was needed at household level.

The sampling frame followed a multi-stage cluster sampling schedule therefore as put
forward by de Vaus (p 67 de Vaus, 1996):

Stage A – selection of all 60 constituencies in Lesotho (first strata)
Stage B – systematic selection with a random start of 2 villages per constituency
(second strata). These formed the clusters.
Stage C – systematic selection with a random start of 25 household per village (third
strata).

Stage A required establishing the sampling frame and this meant knowing the
populations of the various constituencies in Lesotho. The problem of using census
data from developing countries is well documented (Bulmer, 1983) but it was the best
data available. Censuses have been held in Lesotho every ten years for the past 40
years and a census was therefore held in 1986. Any calculations based on a sampling
frame of the whole population would have to be based on the 1986 census therefore
but with adjustments. This divided Lesotho into 60 constituencies each with
theoretically similar population sizes of between 20,000 and 30,000 people and so
selection of all constituencies would mean the whole of the country was covered
including each ecological zone.

It was decided that each constituency should have an equal number of households
interviewed. This was working on the assumption that households, like the
population, were evenly distributed between constituencies, in other words there was
no difference in household size between the different ecological zones. This, along
with the assumptions about populations proved not to be strictly accurate but was the
best estimate in the circumstances. The first stratum was therefore the constituencies
and it was decided that 50 households should be interviewed from each as this was
the maximum funds allowed. According to de Vaus this would be the smallest
possible sub-group which would be statistically reliable but at this point there were no
plans to actually use individual constituencies as units of analysis. At a later date the
constituencies would be grouped into 15 ecological zones which would form one of
the analytical units (de Vaus, 1996).
Stage B required the formation of clusters because of the logistical problems that would be posed by a random sample of households in each constituency. We decided therefore to take two clusters in each constituency and the easiest way to do this was to randomly choose two villages and then take 10 households from each. The villages were chosen by taking a list of the villages in that constituency with their populations. A random number was then taken between 1 and 1000 and then two noughts added to the number. For example, if 173 were the random number we then counted through the population until we came to the 17,300th person and their village was selected. This was done twice to get the two villages. This did introduce some bias in that the larger villages were more likely to be selected than the smaller ones. Sapsford also points out that this kind of clustering can lead to an exaggeration of homogeneity because people from one village may all experience, for instance, similar problems (Sapsford, 1999). It was hoped that the fact that 120 villages or clusters were to be sampled for the whole population would counteract some of this effect.

Stage C involved the systematic selection of households from a random start. Once on the ground, the research assistants were told to divide the number of households in the village by 10 to find the sampling fraction they would need to use (Arber, 1998). So for instance in a village containing 50 houses they would select every fifth house and in one containing 100 they would choose every tenth house. They decided where to start in a village by standing outside the chief’s house and spinning a bottle on the ground. The first house to be interviewed would be where the bottle pointed. Where no-one from a household was present for the day the interviewers were present in the village the next house was interviewed. This in fact biased the sample towards the larger households where people were more likely to be present. Logistics meant it was not possible to go back later and follow up absent households.

Because of variations in constituency size the results were then weighted in order to give a nationally representative sample. In the urban areas a slightly different sampling method had to be used but still based on estimated population figures for that area. The result of this sampling strategy meant that 1719 households were interviewed representing two villages/urban areas from each of the 60 constituencies in Lesotho in 1993.
Sampling for 2002 survey

Funds did not permit an attempt to return to all the households interviewed in 1993 and it was calculated that only 500 households could be sought. Three new criteria were therefore set to focus on those households which would be traced. Because this study wanted to look at the lives of children in Lesotho in more depth it was decided to restrict the households sampled to those which had children under 10 years in 1993. This would mean that the children were still under 18 years in 2002, the legal age of majority in Lesotho. As previous surveys had shown rural households were more likely to suffer poverty than urban ones (Sechaba Consultants, 1994, 2000) and so it was also decided to restrict the 2002 survey to rural households.

Because it would have been logistically very difficult to take a random sample of rural households with children under 10 in 1993 and then try and trace them it was decided to stratify the sample in the following stages:

Stage A - The rural villages from the 1993 survey were selected and clustered into three zones – northern, central and southern.

Stage B – Households from these villages which had children under 10 years of age in 1993 were selected. There were 1317 households in the 1993 sample which were rural and contained children under 10 years.

Stage C – the villages were clustered, within the three zones, for logistical purposes. Villages which were a long way from other villages or which had less than four households which fitted the criteria (ie had children under 10 years in 1993) were dropped as being logistically too difficult to pursue for possibly a very small rate of return. This led to about 300 households being dropped from the sampling frame.

Stage D – There therefore remained a sampling frame of about 1000. In order to gain 500 interviews therefore every second household would need to be found. However this would also be logistically difficult as it would include all the villages. It was decided therefore to randomly select villages until the requisite number of households (500) was reached and to interview all the relevant households within the selected villages.
This type of purposive sampling automatically introduced bias towards the larger villages but made logistical sense. The sample was therefore purposive in terms of the selection of strata and clusters but random within these categories because it was based on a randomly selected sample from 1993 and the subsequent selection of villages was random (Stage D).

In the end 328 households were actually traced and interviewed. Households from 57 villages were interviewed representing 25 constituencies.

### 4.1.2 Development of the Survey Instrument and Process of the Research

The survey instrument was largely based on that used in 1993 but with many additions. It was important that the same questions were asked in the same way in 2002 in order to maintain consistency in the data but other data was also collected (Menard, 1991). The study in 1993 had been primarily aimed at collecting data on the effect of the major drought which was affecting the country in order for the Government to put in place drought relief strategies. It was not therefore a greatly detailed survey and largely concentrated on household structure, physical assets and income. It did however take anthropometric measurements of children under 5 years. The 2002 study covered all the same questions except it was not able to take anthropometric measurements. However, it also asked questions in addition on: gifts from and donations to other villagers; shocks which the household had sustained in the last 8 years; schooling history of children in the household; children's membership of groups; people's opinions on their current livelihoods and political involvement.

Once a draft instrument had been drawn up it was piloted in two villages very close to the capital Maseru which were not going to be used in the survey. Adjustments were then made to the questionnaire and it was cut considerably owing to the time it took to administer. The interview was conducted in Sesotho (the local language) and replies were recorded in Sesotho but the questionnaire was written in English.

In order to trace each household the original questionnaires from 1993 had to be located as these were the only place where the names of the respondents were kept. The 1993 questionnaire had been designed to be anonymous and the name of the
head of household was only included on the sheet for the sake of courtesy as just to take details from people without asking and recording their names would have been considered impolite in Lesotho. This meant that the names of most of the individuals within households were missing and they were identified only by a number. The only way to trace these individuals therefore was to ask questions such as: 'In 1993 there was a girl aged five who was the grandchild of the household head where is that child now?' This inevitably led to some confusion which had to be sorted out later.

Two teams of five enumerators each were then formed and trained over a period of 4 days in administration of the survey instrument. One team then went North, the other South and on completion of each area they then started on villages in the Central region. One of the members of each team was a senior enumerator who had wide experience of conducting surveys in Lesotho. They would check every team members completed questionnaires at the end of each day. In addition the teams were visited twice in the field by myself.

The completed questionnaires were then entered into SPSS manually. The data was then cleaned thoroughly and each individual in each questionnaire (some 3000) in all, was manually matched to their 1993 counterpart because of the problem of lack of names in 1993 data. By the end of cleaning (which took three months) each individual had been given a unique identifier for both 1993 and 2002 and those numbers had been entered into each of the six files which made up the data from the questionnaire.

4.1.3 Attrition Rates
In order to check whether there were differences between the larger 1993 sample and that found in 2002 a regression was run using a variety of variables which were known to correlate with socio-economic status in 1993. A dichotomous variable was created as to whether the household had been a respondent or not in 2002. This was then used as the dependent variable and a selection of others from the 1993 data acted as the independent variables. These included the total number of rooms owned; ownership of cattle, smaller livestock, chickens and fields; ownership of certain assets such as a stove and radio; the fraction of household members bringing income into the house and the number of household members. It was found that only with regard to two variables were the households traced by this study significantly different from
that of the larger sample (having controlled for location and age of children). As might be expected this study found and interviewed slightly larger households \( (p=0.014) \) than in the 1993 sample and for some reason they were slightly more likely to own more pigs. Interviewing larger households is almost certainly more likely because there is a greater chance of finding a member present in the house (and lack of resources meant repeat visits were difficult). There does not seem to be an obvious cause for the increased likelihood of interviewing families with pigs unless it represents a shift in type of agriculture undertaken which may mean family members stay closer to the homestead.

Out of the 500 households targeted only 328 households were interviewed. An additional 30 households were found but there was no-one in the household at the time to interview or there were only children present. The remaining 148 households had left the villages. The chief or headman was asked what had happened to the households who no longer appeared to be present in the village. These households had either disintegrated with the death of the household head or had emigrated to South Africa in search of work or some other form of livelihood.

4.1.4 Issues arising in the use of longitudinal data

Although this study is a longitudinal study it has had to contend with some of the issues faced by studies conducted in a developing country. The dearth of longitudinal data on the majority of the world’s population means that certain anomalies in the data may have to be overlooked in the interests of gaining any kind of longitudinal data at all. In particular Duncan (2000) suggests that four precautionary measures should be taken before embarking on a longitudinal survey at least two of which it was not possible to do in this case. Firstly he suggests the reference population should be clearly identified with specific attention paid to longitudinal aspects. As the 1993 survey was never intended to be a longitudinal survey this was not done. Secondly he suggests that precise operating rules for following the members over time should be established and again this was not done for reasons given above. Thirdly the interview method and questionnaire design should be efficacious which, with the exception possibly of expenditure data this was broadly the case and fourthly he suggests the panel should continue for sufficiently long a period. In this case the period was 9 years but as it was a two wave panel at this point there is a considerable amount of missing data from the intervening period.
Like other panel studies this study also has certain problems but has avoided others. Missing data from either 1993 or 2002 meant that some questions for certain households had to be dropped and unreliability of certain answers was apparent for some households where it was found that some children appeared to have changed sex or never to have existed at all. It was therefore difficult sometimes to disentangle 'apparent' from 'true' change (Hagenaars, 1990). This study also potentially suffered from the fallacy of cohort centrism, fallacy of historical period, problems of attributing effect to cause and the problems of independent variables changing over time (Ruspini, 2002). Given that data from only two waves were collected there was much that happened in the intervening period which people may well have recalled inaccurately or were never asked about. The reference group being studied are children all born between 1984 and 1993, a time of political turmoil in Lesotho and a time when Lesotho acted as haven for those who fell foul of apartheid South Africa. Between 1993 and 2002 these families would have seen the gradual democratisation of South Africa with the concomitant opportunities for the better educated but closely related Basotho and this may have contributed to the high emigration rates that were found. Whatever the causes, cohort centrism certainly will have played a part in the data and it is important the results from these surveys are set in their historical and cultural contexts.

However, an attrition rate of around 30% is not exceptional in the developing world. The Bolivian Pre-School Program Evaluation Household Survey had an attrition rate of 35% between 1995 and 1998 and similarly the Kenyan Ideational Change Survey had an attrition rate of 33% for men and 28% for women (Alderman et al, 2000). The nearest longitudinal study to Lesotho was conducted in Kwa-Zulu Natal in South Africa. This study had a lower attrition rate of 21% for households between 1993 and 1998. However South Africa cannot be considered typical in some respects given that the apartheid regime not only restricted people's movements (and South Africa was only just shedding apartheid policies at this point) but also required more extensive records to be kept of people's whereabouts (Alderman et al, 2000). Placed in this context and attrition rate for Lesotho of around 30% over a period of 9 years is not remarkable.
Perhaps most importantly Ruspini’s point about the nature of effects over time are likely to affect the results. Some causes give rise to linear effects and are relatively easy to measure but for others the effects can be cyclical or even more complex in shape. As later chapters will show poverty status rarely follows a linear pattern. Households can dip in and out of poverty on a regular basis or experience major changes in either direction very rapidly (Yaqub 2000). Assigning effect to cause can therefore be very difficult. In particular the effect of deaths in the household, whilst clearly important, is hard to calculate as it is not always clear the sequence of events that either preceded or succeeded the death.

4.2 The Group Discussions

In order to examine more fully the concept of poverty with children, seven group discussions were held with children aged 8 to 12 years and one with children aged from about 12 to 16 years. Each group contained 8 children and two adults – myself and one other - one to facilitate the discussion and one to take notes.

At first it was hoped to hold the groups with children in some of the villages where the survey was being conducted. However, three years ago the Government of Lesotho introduced free education for the first three years of primary schooling and most of the children were therefore in school. When we suggested holding groups after school their parents said that they had too much work to do around the home for such activities. This was likely to be the case and not just a question of parents being unwilling for their children to take part. Pradeep, (1997) has documented how introducing free or more accessible schooling in India led to an increase in the amount of activity a child was supposed to undertake as domestic chores got pushed into time after school rather than being undertaken by somebody else. We decided therefore to approach the school serving the particular village and ask to speak to children from the village concerned.

All the schools were very willing to accommodate holding the groups. Many of the teachers asked if they could sit in as a high proportion of teachers in Lesotho are unqualified and are often desperate for any new ideas or techniques to use with children. The teachers were asked not to participate as this might have caused the
children to feel embarrassed but we talked to the teachers after the session and went through the materials we used with them.

As schooling in Lesotho does not encourage individual expression and therefore children were unlikely to be used to discussing in groups especially with an adult present it was decided to use Participatory Poverty Appraisal techniques (Johnson et al, 1998) to start discussions and help the children relax. The children were first asked to draw a plan of their village and then played various games using cards, pictures or role play depending on the group (see Appendix 3). The aim was to gain a better picture of what children understand by the word poverty and how they measure it in their own villages.

The groups were all tape recorded and notes were taken at the time and the recordings were then transcribed and translated into English.

4.3 The Tracer Study

An initial analysis of the data from the quantitative survey showed that nearly a third of the children who were present in the households in 1993 were no longer present in 2002. As the study was aiming to look at the pathways of poor children's lives it was felt important to try and understand why these children were no longer at home and what they were doing and thinking now. This therefore would involve some form of tracer study. As funds were limited, and this part of the study had not been predicted, it was felt that probably only about 30 children could be traced (depending on how easy it was to find them) and interviewed.

The survey questionnaire had asked for some very basic information on members of the family who were no longer present (if the respondent knew). From this we knew if a child had died (about 10%), gone to live elsewhere in Lesotho or gone to South Africa. A list of all the 'missing' children was drawn up and it was decided to return to those villages where there were several missing children than villages where only perhaps one or two children were no longer present. The original 1993 home of the child was then visited and the householders asked where the child might be. If the householder knew, we then visited that place and then tried to trace the child from there. On average it took three visits to different places to find the children to
interview but some of the children were found relatively quickly and others took much more searching for. In all 30 households were visited which finally led to 19 children being interviewed. In these interviews children were asked to fill in a graph of a timeline from 1993 up until the present. The points on the graph not only marked major events in the child's life but also the high spots and low spots of the past nine years. It was then possible to discuss the graph with the child in more detail. These conversations were taped and the tapes then transcribed in to Sesotho and then translated into English.

Transcription of the tapes was done by a native Sesotho speaker but translation of the transcripts was done by myself in conjunction with a Mosotho teacher of English to ensure the accuracy of the translation.

4.4 Analysis

4.4.1 Analysing the Quantitative Data

The quantitative survey was analysed first using SPSS and then LEM, a programme for Latent Class Analysis. One of the first tasks was to establish a poverty line for measurements of income. It was recognised that there was likely to be considerable underreporting of income particularly as figures were asked for the whole of the previous year. Although this is a long time for people to remember, the intermittent nature of most Basotho's income means that a twelve month period is necessary. Assuming people were just as likely to under report income in 2002 as in 1993 this should not have had a major impact on comparative data.

As there was no official poverty line in 1993 it was decided, on looking at the 1993 data to fix the poverty line at the 6th decile or 4th quintile of per capita income in 1993. This was for several reasons. Firstly, previous reports on data from 1993 and 1999 had used quintiles to demarcate levels of poverty and those in the bottom two quintiles, or bottom four deciles were described as being poor, whilst those in the bottom most quintile were described as being destitute (Sechaba Consultants, 1994 & 2000). Secondly, many other studies including those in South Africa (Klasen, 2000) use income quintiles as a way of categorizing households and they also set their poverty line at the 6th decile from the top. Thirdly, the report on the 1993 data
(Sechaba Consultants, 1994) also used a poverty line based on budget standards from 1986. However, the fact that on average about 70% of the rural population were below this figure, and yet most of them were still surviving, suggests that the figure may have been too high not least because the rural population clearly survive by subsistence agriculture as well as monetary income. As it was not possible in this study to collect data to set a new budget standard, it was felt that assuming the bottom two quintiles to indicate poverty, which fall considerably below the Sechaba Consultants figure of M50 per household member per month, would be an acceptable compromise. Below the 4th quintile line households were assumed to be in poverty and above it not to be poor. The line would then be updated to 2002 using the rate of inflation over the intervening 9 year period as the multiple. Another possibility would have been to use income quintiles in both 1993 and 2002 but this would not have allowed us to compare incomes over time.

The poverty line in 2002 was therefore set at M24 per person per month. This is much lower than the M124 per person per month which was the official poverty line for that year. As is discussed later, using the official poverty line in 2002 (there was no official poverty line in 1993) would have meant that 85% of the sample from this survey would have been designated poor. As it is a figure of M124 per person per month means that 58% of the wider population in Lesotho are poor (May and Roberts, 2005). Although this is an important finding it does mean that it is hard to differentiate between the very poor, those who are just surviving and those who are relatively well-off. In order to do this May and Roberts make use of an 'ultra-poor' poverty line which is set at 50% of the poverty line. In 1994 approximately 39% of the population were 'ultra-poor' which roughly corresponds to the 40% of the population below the 6th decile.

However, one of the main problems in using a fixed poverty line over time rather than comparing quintiles is that of inflation. The Central Bank of Lesotho issues monthly figures for inflation but these are from a Consumer Price Index based in eight lowland towns and only weight food and non-alcoholic beverages at 36.3% of household expenditure. As Ambrose (2002) says ‘There is no ‘poor families’ CPI which should probably give a 60% weighting to food with a correspondingly much higher inflation rate. The inflation rate for bread and cereals between October 2001 and October 2002 was 42.2% and if maize meal were to be isolated within this component it would
have been higher still' (Ambrose, 2002).’ Because inflation on food has been so much higher than on other things, taking the 6th income decile in 1993 and updating it using official figures for inflation probably gives a very conservative view of the numbers of people in poverty. Those with income between the 4th and 6th decile were probably only marginally better off than those below.

In the analysis in chapter 6 income is usually stated as per person per year. Equivalence scales are not used. Equivalence scales assume that income is the main determinant of well-being and that all members of the household benefit equally from the combined income of that household (Gloucestershire County Council, 2006). In the industrialised world the modified OECD rates are normally used which give a weight of 1.0 to the first adult, of 0.5 to subsequent household members over the age of 14 years and 0.3 to children under 14. Equivalence scales tend to be based on either objective scales eg the relative expenditure by members of a household on food, or subjective eg what people consider an adequate income for households of a certain size, or a 'standard of living' approach which attempts to combine the two by focusing on income and consumption but recognising different kinds of households have different requirements to attain a certain standard of living (Lelli, 2005).

There is much debate about the appropriate equivalence scales to be used in developing countries (Masset, 2000) and no agreed scales. Klasen, in analysing data from the South African Labour and Demographic Research Unit (SALDRU) used the OECD scales and then developed another based on Lanjouw and Ravallion's work which assumed children under 18 had a weighting of 0.5 (Klasen, 2000). However he found that the OECD scales (unmodified) and those developed by Lanjouw and Ravallion assumed that there were greater economies of scale than were in fact the case. Equivalence scales based on 'nutrition' (appropos Engel's work) gave an exponent of 0.9 implying very few economies of scale. Klasen concludes by saying 'while several methods have been proposed which, in various ways, seek to identify equivalence scales through the impact of demographic characteristics on expenditure patterns of households, all of these methods are controversial or lead to unconvincing results' (Klasen, 2000 pp 37). Dieden and Gutafsson use an equivalence scale for children under the age of 14 years based on one developed by Bradbury and Jantti. This gives a weight of 0.7 for children in the household and was developed in order to compare child poverty across 25 industrialised nations. Whilst, therefore, using this
scale allows for comparison with industrialised nations in the West it does not necessarily reflect actual economies of scale (or not) in South African society itself. Potgeiter in 1993 calculated a Household Subsistence Level based on studies in urban areas of South Africa and found that 0.7 was a suitable weighting for additional members of households (Potgeiter, 1993). The problem with using this weight is that it is based on urban dwellers who do not engage in subsistence agriculture. In addition it was found that different locales often had very different prices implying that each area needed its own scale.

In calculating an 'official' poverty line for Lesotho May and Roberts do not attempt to use equivalence scales (May and Roberts, 2005). This was partly because the Household Budget Data which they used was not linked to household size and partly because much more work needs to be undertaken on what is a suitable equivalence scale for Lesotho. For instance, there is some evidence to suggest that children actually consume more than adults of the family budget (because of school costs etc) and that economies of scale do not have the same impact on the family budget as they do in the industrialised world. In addition there are problems with how to incorporate items of food, clothing or durables which are not purchased with money and may even be made at home. Due to these problems therefore and in line with the analysis of poverty from the studies in the 1990s each household member in this study carries equal weighting.

As with many countries income or money metrics alone do not give a full picture of a household’s either relative or absolute wealth ranking. In Lesotho livestock play a major part in the household’s ability to feed itself, to convert assets into cash and to play its part socially. In addition, the 1993 survey also gathered data on type of house and the number of rooms, type of fuel used and source of water supply, number and productivity of fields and certain physical assets such as the presence of a radio, stove, agricultural equipment etc. and these questions were replicated in 2002. Whilst some of these assets could be dealt with as they appeared in the data it was felt that items such as smaller durable assets (eg radios) and livestock would need to be brought together and scored in some way that reflected the relative holdings of these items amongst the different families.
Attempts were therefore made to draw up scales for each type of asset based on its value relative to other similar assets. The prices of livestock and durables were gathered from market towns and then compared with one another. Two scales, one for livestock and one for durables were then developed based on their relative cost with a chicken, in the livestock category and a radio in the durable category acting as a reference item. Each was then given a score depending on their relation to the reference item, so that eg a stove on average costs three times as much as a radio. The problems associated with using these kinds of indicators are discussed in the next chapter but the scoring was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep or Goat</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow or Ox</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse or Donkey</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stove</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing machine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural equipment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eg planter, plough etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater tank</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cart</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This method circumvented the need to know the specific inflation rate for each type of asset but it does assume things have retained their value relative to others in the same category. The number of rooms, fields and possession of a toilet were all left as either numerical or dummy variables for analysis, as can be seen in chapter 6.

4.4.2 Analysing the qualitative data

The qualitative data from the group discussions were analysed using a grounded analytic approach based on Strauss and Corbin's grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Using just the transcripts from the groups the responses were coded according to themes or concepts which arose in the discussion. The same themes were identified in the other discussions and new ones added. These could then be brought together to form categories. So, for instance the children discussed a variety of concepts such as 'the difficulty of keeping clean if poor', 'difficulty of affording medicines' if poor. These could then be brought together to form a category such as 'the problem of keeping healthy if poor'.
However, because only one discussion could be held with each group of children there was quite a lot of extra material gathered in these discussions which proved to be extraneous to the subject of this thesis. Other topics were discussed partly to help children relax and enjoy themselves before embarking on the much heavier subject of poverty. So, for instance, we asked a lot about children’s favourite games etc. and subjects at school. It was also partly to get a more ‘rounded’ picture of life for children in Lesotho today and so, for instance, we asked them to draw what they would like to be when they had finished school. This additional data was not used in the analysis of child poverty.

In terms of the tracer study, the kind of data obtained was of a more narrative type. Because only one interview was held with each child and many of these children had had quite difficult lives it was felt important not to probe too deeply into what might be distressing events in these children’s past. The data obtained was therefore fairly factual in nature and the children were not asked to elaborate on some of the more negative events in their lives because we were not able to offer them further support. I therefore analysed the life histories of these children as narratives which exemplify a particular life path rather than by taking common themes as in the group discussions.

Using Clausen’s (1998) model of life chart analysis but adding to it I looked at various events in the child’s life. These included: a) the satisfaction children gained from certain events in their lives (such as school, moving etc), b) the possible turning points for them including how and when they had left the original household and c) some of the influences that had been brought to bear on them (Clausen, 1998). I also included origins (in this case the originating household) and destinations (in this case where we had found the children). However some of this type of analysis was limited because of the children’s age, as the younger children were not always able to construct a full life history. Where this was the case those events which they could remember were included and their present circumstances discussed.

Before going on to consider the process of the study in more depth in the next chapter, we will first explore some of the issues that arise when attempting to combine quantitative and qualitative methodologies and when undertaking research with children.
4.5 Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods

In a workshop in 2002 at Cornell University which brought together academics from different disciplines around the theme of poverty appraisal five over-arching dimensions were brought to the debate on the relationship between qualitative and quantitative research. They are:

- Type of Information on Population: Non-numerical to Numerical
- Type of Population Coverage: Specific to General
- Type of Population Involvement: Active to Passive
- Type of Inference Methodology: Inductive to Deductive
- Type of Disciplinary Framework: Broad Social Sciences to Neo-Classical Economic

(Kanbur, 2002)

Participants suggested that most research could be placed on a continuum on one of these dimensions. This study covers all the above dimensions and uses different methodologies to explore them, but first it is useful to look at some of the more general issues around this topic.

4.5.1 Representation versus Representativeness

One of the crucial differences between quantitative data and qualitative data has often been the generalisable quality of it. Broadly speaking, statistical checks in quantitative data are used to ensure that the findings from it can be considered representative of the general population (with certain caveats) and qualitative data is considered as representing the particular group being studied but does not necessarily represent the broader population. However this divide has been called in to question by various writers.

If qualitative research is used to describe a wider population than the one studied then issues of reliability and validity come to the fore. Silverman (1994) advocates the combining of analytic induction methods (ie testing of a hypothesis) with grounded theorizing to test for emerging themes. As each case is tested against the hypothesis the theory is either confirmed or has to be reformulated to fit the current case. The process is iterative and
'Examination of cases, redefinition of the phenomenon, and reformulation of hypotheses is repeated until a universal relationship is shown' (Fielding 1988: p7-8)

Schermermaier and Schmitt (2001) in response to the question as to whether qualitative research is ever generalisable state that

'The response of most qualitative researchers has usually been to conduct research that uses 'multiple case studies', such as sampling a number of sites or to generalise to 'theoretical propositions' rather than to 'populations or universes' (Schmuttermaier and Schmitt 2001, 3.12).

Burgelman (1985) and Bryman (1995) also take this approach and see generalisation from qualitative data as being one which generates new insights into theory rather than populations. However most quantitative research is for the purpose of building generalisable theories or testing general hypotheses and so it could be argued that there is little difference in the outcomes of these two methods if this approach (ie using multiple case studies to build new theory) is taken. Schmuttermaier and Schmitt conclude that qualitative research is capable of generalisation and so can be used in the building of theory just as quantitative data is used. They say that:

'This is what a theory, or proposition, is supposed to do - draw inferences from the research and make statements about causality that are then generalised, or extrapolated to another group and context similar to the one already studied' (Schmuttermaier and Schmitt 2001, 3.16).

This is also what quantitative research is supposed to do. There is one other way in which qualitative research is 'made' generalisable. Caldwell (1985) shows how the strictly quantitative methods hitherto used by demographers do not always give reliable or valid results particularly when reporting on processes, causes and attitudes. He advocates that good qualitative work is done in the potential survey area in order to ensure that 'demographic behaviour can be investigated in its total framework' (Caldwell, 1985, p58). If hypotheses have already been formulated from what he calls 'micro' field work they will be tested through the survey and this 'micro'
field work also ensures critical issues are not omitted. However he goes on to suggest 'institutionalising' this form of qualitative or micro field work by embedding it in the survey areas. The villages chosen for the survey would therefore also be studied using qualitative methods. Caldwell does not go quite as far as to say this would mean that any results from these villages could be linked into the quantitative data and so be more representative although this is implied. But these ideas have recently been picked up by other researchers in the developing world such as Narayan who is experimenting with conducting participatory research in areas where surveys have been conducted in order to actively link the two, not by just comparing general results but by linking actual cases. In my study in Lesotho the qualitative data from interviews with children was linked with the quantitative data about their households of origin to provide a more detailed picture of the lives of these children. We cannot therefore tell how representative these children are although it does mean their statements are necessarily representative of their group.

4.5.2 Data versus Methodology

Several writers have made the distinction between qualitative or quantitative data and qualitative or quantitative methodologies. This has become particularly pertinent recently with the growth in the use of computer software for the analysis of qualitative data.

Perhaps in the field of sociology Bryman (1995) has been at the forefront of considering ways to combine qualitative and quantitative research. He identified eleven different ways in which the two methods were combined. These ranged from using the different methods as forms of triangulation, using one method to raise research questions which would be explored by the other, the different perspectives of the researcher giving rise to different use of methodology, and the different stages in the research process also giving rise to the use of different methodologies. However, Bryman distinguishes between method and data and uses a matrix to illustrate the weaknesses and strengths of both.
Bryman therefore does not see quantitative methods producing qualitative data and vice versa as being genuine combined research as neither use the strengths of the different types of methodologies to produce different types of data. Using quantitative methods to give qualitative data or vice versa should only be used therefore to help summarise or understand the data.

The distinction between methods and data has also been described by other writers (eg Hentschel, 1998). But they are not always as critical of combining the different methods as Bryman. The issue has become particularly pertinent when looking at the analysis of data from poverty studies particularly in the developing world. Poverty studies tend to cover a huge range of methodologies from large scale surveys (such as the World Bank Living Standard Surveys) to long term ethnographic studies of particular groups and encompassing participatory research techniques, in-depth interviewing, focus groups, participant observation, spatial analysis along the way. Whilst it is clear which tradition certain of these methods come from, others, particularly in terms of participatory approaches often encompass the two. The gathering of data from participatory research and its analysis is becoming a critical issue especially as it is now a preferred method for World Bank Poverty Assessment and therefore can attract huge amounts of funding.

Authors such as Hentschel (1998), therefore, have suggested other ways of looking at qualitative and quantitative links. Like Bryman, Hentschel makes a distinction between method and data. On a continuum, data can therefore be 'more quantitative'
or 'more qualitative'. Cutting across this however is method which is more or less contextual. By contextual Hentschel means methods which produce data and attempts ‘to understand human behaviour within the social, cultural, economic and political environment of a locality’ (Hentschel, 1998, p9). Each methodology will therefore fall within a particular quadrant depending on the degree of contextuality and the type of data it produces as this diagram shows:

**Figure 4.2 Hentschel’s (1998) Method/Data Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More contextual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Assessments</td>
<td>Qualitative Module of Core Welfare Indicator Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth interviews</td>
<td>Household/health surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epidemiological surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal village Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term locality has a specific geographic meaning here. Research methods can then be placed along two different continuums and there is not the need to have to fit the data into one particular ‘camp’ ie qualitative or quantitative but to place it on a continuum. Large scale surveys would therefore be placed in the less contextual and more quantitative quadrant for obvious reasons; longitudinal surveys would probably produce more quantitative data but be specific to a particular context; large scale qualitative studies may be less contextually specific but produce qualitative data and ethnographic studies and much of the data from participatory assessments would be
more contextual and more qualitative quadrant. However, quantitative data from these assessments could be placed in the more contextual quadrant.

Of course there are drawbacks with this approach. All quantitative data is to some extent contextual, just as qualitative data is, even if the context is countrywide rather than a few villages. In addition there is the question of the uniformity of the instrument used for studying the population in question. This leads us back to the question of generalisability and it appears here that Hentschel implies less contextual to mean more generalisable (Kanbur, 2002).

4.5.3 Different Ways of Combining Data

Different authors have categorized the way that different methodologies are sometimes put together. McKendrick (1999), a geographer, identifies eight different models which encompass the way different research methods are linked. His first three models describe situations where different methods are used but not necessarily in a planned or explicitly linked way. Different methods are used more for pragmatic or tactical reasons rather than because the research question actually demands it. The fourth and fifth models are where case studies taken from a larger overview are used or wider research is done in order to situate case studies within their wider context. The final three models are a variation on triangulation and are where different methods are brought to bear on the same research question. They also include instances where qualitative methods are used to clarify and expand quantitative.

Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998), based on research done by Greene et al (1989), give five examples of mixed method studies based on the reasons these studies are undertaken. These cover a) triangulation; b) complementarity ie exploring different aspects of the same research problem; c) initiation ie discovering paradoxes, contradictions or different perspectives; d) development ie using the different methods in sequence so that one leads to another to another etc. and e) expansion ie where different methods will add to the scope of the research.

Tashakkori and Teddlie go on to develop a taxonomy of eight different models which link qualitative and quantitative methods and data analysis. In their case they base the categories on whether the studies are confirmatory or exploratory in nature and
each category depends on whether the data is qualitative or quantitative and whether
the analysis is qualitative or quantitative (so for instance, Type I is 'Confirmatory
investigation, qualitative data, statistical analysis' (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998 p
139). Their final two categories are based on whether the study is of a Parallel Mixed
Model Design ie qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis happens in
all stages of the study or whether the study is a Sequential Mixed Model whereby
qualitative and quantitative data is collected and analysed but at different phases of
the study. The study of children in Lesotho, as will be seen, fits two of these models.
Because the quantitative data collection and analysis was conducted at the same time
as the group discussions the studies could be said to be parallel. However they were
linked at the analysis stage. The continuation of the study into a small tracer study
meant that the two methods were being used sequentially.

Ravallion (2002), an economist, picks up on this issue of how methods are mixed by
suggesting that most studies (in this case he was talking about poverty studies) are
either simultaneous or sequential in design. Sequential design is when, for instance,
open-ended questions are asked of a non-random sample prior to drawing up a
structured survey instrument. Although there is a need for coordination they present
few problems in terms of design. Simultaneous models are more problematic
because Ravallion sees the need for qualitative subjective questions and methods to
follow rigorous sampling methodology if the two are to be properly mixed. Ravallion
ends by saying:

'The main barriers to mixing QUAL and QUAN methods appear to lie in the
resistance of practitioners and reviewers to stepping outside the traditional
boundaries of practice. Economists have traditionally eschewed subjective
questions; oddly, while economists generally think that people are the best
judges of their own welfare, they resist asking people directly how they feel.
Psychologists have often obtained individual data on subjective welfare by
carefully designed questions in survey instruments or experimental settings
that are poorly designed for other purposes. And anthropologists and non-
quantitative sociologists have often turned their backs on any sort of 'survey'.
The challenge remains of how to best provide the information...drawing
pragmatically from existing tools and inventing new ones when needed.'
(Ravallion, 2002 p 41)
As we have seen, in this study of children in Lesotho both qualitative and quantitative methods were used. The longitudinal survey of households first interviewed in 1993 was quantitative in nature and was subjected to statistical analysis. But the results of parallel discussions held with children were used to direct the analysis of some of that quantitative data. The small tracer study that followed the initial analysis of the quantitative data was entirely qualitative in methodology and this data and was critical to understanding the nature of child poverty in Lesotho, but the children were drawn from the quantitative survey. Both methodologies and data were therefore important to a full understanding of the issues.

4.6 Research with Children

Although the focus of this study was children only parts of it involved direct face-to-face communication with them. The household survey was conducted with an adult in the household being the main respondent and data was gathered about the children from them. However, the group discussions and the interviews conducted as part of the tracer study were all with children directly and so it is worth considering some of the issues around research with children before going on to a more detailed description of the research in Lesotho.

Of course one of the main issues is whether research with children is in any way different from research with adults and this will depend on the ways that children are seen. If children are seen as being very different from adults then ethnography is probably the only appropriate method of researching their world (Hill, 1997). However if children are seen as being the same as adults yet with different competencies then it is possible to actively engage them in research but using different methods (James, et al, 2001). Punch argues that the development of different methods for use with children, whilst very useful, has sometimes obscured the exploration of other issues which are common to research with adults and children alike such as building rapport, validity and reliability etc (Punch, 2002). The reasons that some of these common research issues may have been given less attention is, Punch argues, because children are perceived by adults in one of three ways in the research arena. Either their position as competent actors is constrained by the limitations of adult society, in other words the power relations between adults and children are such that children cannot actively engage in research, or adults perceive children to be different and this
is the main constraint in adults understanding children, or children are in reality very different from adults and so adult methods and concerns will not apply to children.

Punch goes on to outline the main differences she sees between research with adults and children. The first difference is ‘not imposing the researcher’s own perceptions’ (Punch, 2002 p324). Although a researcher should never do this ‘the difference with research with children is that it is difficult for an adult researcher ever to totally understand the world from a child’s point of view’ (Punch, 2002 p325). This may be true but it could be argued that it is equally difficult for female researchers to understand a male point of view and so on and power issues also come into play when considering other kinds of differences between researcher and research subject. The second difference is one of validity and reliability because it is assumed that child respondents are more vulnerable than adult respondents to feeling that they must please the interviewer and they are more likely to fear adult’s reactions. This is undoubtedly true but it assumes that there are only two categories of age status – child and adult. In cultures where age is not such a powerful determining factor in terms of status other aspects may come into play. For instance the status of a 14 year old girl who is married with a child in Lesotho is very different from a 14 year old who is still living with her parents. Whilst age is a form of capital in Lesotho (Pole, Mizen and Bolton, 1999) it continues to be accrued through the life course so that in some respects the very elderly are as different from younger adults as adults are from children. Status, physical size, gender and ethnicity will all have an impact on the child’s desire to please or fear of reprisals. Morrow argues that some of these problems can be overcome by investing time to build up trust (Morrow, 1999) but this is not always possible under the constraints of a research project.

The third difference is clarity of language because children do not necessarily have the vocabulary of an adult. Indeed they may well have their own language as well. This is one of the advantages of a researcher working in their second language. Adults from the same culture may have pre-conceptions that adults from another culture may not share and the language used by a researcher working in their second language may well be simpler in form. Drawing has often also been used with young children, in particular, but care has to be taken if the interpretation is being done by an adult who may be reading into it more than the child intended (Thomas & O’Kane, 1998).
The fourth difference is one of research context and setting. Punch calls attention to this because children are often interviewed in adult centred or adult controlled settings such as schools. On the other hand children may not want adults to invade their spaces and so sensitivity is required as to the location of any research. The fifth difference is that of building rapport which, Punch argues, may be more difficult with children because of the researcher's own fears about being patronizing or not behaving appropriately. Morrow also stresses that researchers have to build rapport with both children and their adult gatekeepers (Morrow, 1999). However, rapport building is a feature of all social research and similar concerns are in evidence in, for instance, cross-cultural research or research between people with and without disabilities.

Finally analysis and using appropriate research methods are also said to differ between children and adults. Appropriate methods will be discussed later but there is a concern that analysis of data is usually done through the lens of the mind of the adult researcher. Again this is true for all research and it may be more a question of degree of interpretation rather than assuming adult researchers interpret children's responses very differently from, say, responses from other cultures.

4.6.1 Ethics
In one way research with children is often treated very differently from adults and that is with regard to ethics. The perceived increased vulnerability of children often means that ethics become an important issue when considering them as the subjects of research. In addition western societies tend to limit access to children unless fairly stringent ethical criteria have been met. This affects methods as well as other aspects of the research process. An increasing body of opinion supports the inclusion of children in all aspects of the research process in a participative manner (Thomas & O'Kane, 1998; Grover, 2004). Hence children have the right to be involved in the formation and planning of the research, the research itself and the analysis and dissemination. Whether this is possible, or even desirable in every situation, is not always the case but as well as being ethically sound the argument is that children's participation also encourages reliability and validity, a similar argument to that used in feminist research (Thomas & O'Kane, 1998).
However it is important to consider the ethical position at every phase of the research. For this purpose guidelines drawn up by Alderson were used (Alderson, 1995). They will be identified here in general terms and then applied to this particular study along with some further ethical issues in the next chapter. Alderson suggests that:

1. The purpose of the research should be for the benefit of a named group of children.
2. The human costs and hoped for benefits must be considered – especially if distress or embarrassment might be caused.
3. How will privacy and confidentiality be maintained? And who gives permission for extracts form interviews to be used.
4. Which children will be included and which excluded and why?
5. Does (and should) the funding come from agencies who do not actively harm children?
6. Have children and carers been involved in the planning and finalisation of the research.
7. Have the children and adults concerned been given enough information about the research such as the purpose, the methods, possible outcomes etc?
8. Have children actively consented to the research and are they aware they can withdraw at any stage?
9. Will the children be told the findings?
10. How might not only the children involved in the research, but also children in the wider society be affected by it? (Alderson, 1995)

One of the other major issues that also had to be considered was what action should be taken if we came across a child who was in deep distress through abuse or sheer poverty and for this a combination of Government protocols and food parcels was used but this is discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

Summary

There are a variety of ways of combining qualitative and quantitative data and this study exemplifies some of them. In particular specifying the difference between data and methodology is useful when collecting data on poverty status and Hentschel’s concept of less/more contextual methods versus qualitative/quantitative data. This study collected quantitative data from a household survey but the survey was more
contextualised than a random survey as it was based on a national survey in 1993 and was therefore longitudinal in nature. Some of the analysis of the quantitative data was also based on qualitative group discussions with children which had been held in parallel with the survey data collection.

Holding the group discussions with children and the interviews for the tracer study meant that the particular needs of children had to be borne in mind, in particular with regards to the ethics of working with children and the differences between researching children and adults. As we have seen the data from the group discussions was used to inform the quantitative data analysis. The qualitative tracer study grew out of the findings from the quantitative study and shows the need for an iterative and flexible approach in relatively under-researched situations.

The next chapter is more reflexive and reflective in style and describes in some detail some of the issues that arose from these particular studies and some of the ethical, logistical and linguistic problems conducting research in a developing country can entail.
Chapter 5 – Collecting Data in Developing Countries

Introduction
The previous chapter described the various methodologies used in the study and some of the concepts behind the research methods. In this chapter we will look at some of the issues involved in carrying out the field work in Lesotho and in analysing the data. Some of the problems are common to all surveys or interviews of these types but others were specifically as a result of undertaking a study in a poor country such as Lesotho.

Various writers over the last twenty years or so have tried to encapsulate some of the problems of conducting research in developing countries (Bulmer & Warwick, 1983, Peil, 1982, Bates et al, 1993). Normally two types of difference are identified. Firstly there are differences of magnitude. Procedures which are routinely undertaken in industrialised countries, such as sampling, can be undertaken in the same way in developing countries but the results are likely to be less reliable because most existing data sources tend to be less reliable. The problems of using western techniques in developing countries are therefore often magnified elsewhere. The second type of problem is where completely new problems are met with that are not present in research in industrialised countries. These are often to do with the mismatch between western ways of thinking and ways of viewing the world in other cultures. For instance, the communal nature of decision making in many developing countries does not fit easily with the way surveys of individuals, based on a western model, are often undertaken (Bulmer & Warwick, 1983). Participatory techniques were historically developed to overcome some of these problems (Chambers, 1993) but they are sometimes in danger of losing the sense of scale that more quantitative surveys can give, and they too have proved to be less suitable for gaining very personal information.

This section looks at some of the practical problems that this study met with and also some of the cultural issues that arose.
5.1 Ethics

Perhaps the most pressing consideration at the start of the study was that of ethics. Not only did this research require the usual ethical considerations but interviews were also going to be conducted with children and these, as we have seen in industrialised countries, nearly always require greater ethical considerations than when dealing only with adults (Alderson, 1995).

The first consideration was that Lesotho does not possess any ethical committees overseeing research. Although, out of courtesy, the Government of Lesotho Bureau of Statistics was informed that this study would be taking place there was no requirement to gain any form of consents at a national level and no requirement to justify the study or the contents of the questionnaire to any supervisory body. Nevertheless this did not mean that ethical considerations were not of paramount importance but it does show how easy it is for researchers to conduct research in developing countries without having to consider ethical issues. The quantitative survey would only be interviewing adults and so ethical issues specifically to do with children did not need to be considered in detail at this stage.

However, villages in Lesotho are 'managed' by a chief or headman. His (or occasionally her) consent is vital before any work can be undertaken in a village. On approaching a village therefore we would first meet with the chief and the elders of the village for an often long discussion about the purpose and logistics of the research. Only if the chief agreed that we could work in that village could we then go ahead with the interviews. In fact, because these villages had all been visited before for the 1993 survey none of the chiefs objected but they did like to know exactly what questions we were asking their villagers. The chief would normally then send one of his advisors with us to introduce us to the householder concerned and to let the householder know that we had the chief's permission to be there. On occasion the chief would not let us talk to a specific household. This was normally for a good reason such as there had recently been a death in the family or the family were struggling to work the fields and could not spare the time. This inevitably potentially skewed the results.

One result of this type of introduction means that informed consent takes on a different meaning in a different context. It has been repeatedly stressed that informed
consent is essential for the ethical conduct of research (Hornsby Smith, 1998). However there are many questions around what is meant by informed consent. In less individualistic cultures than are found in the west consent is not always seen as an individual’s prerogative. When the chief gave his consent to us surveying the village he was giving consent for the whole village. Although we asked each householder for consent their reply was always that if the chief had given permission the question was superfluous. Previous experience in conducting these kind of surveys in developing countries had also shown us that requiring written permissions were highly problematic. Firstly people were often hesitant about signing anything either because they had trouble with literacy or were concerned what they were committing themselves to and secondly people could not see the necessity for this if the chief had given written permission.

The method used in this survey was to ask the householder if they agreed in the presence of the chief’s advisor who would act as witness to the consent if necessary. Although technically therefore the householder could refuse they never did and it would have been a brave householder who went against the chief’s decision. In fact surveys in the West also often include an element of communal decision making and often it is assumed that if one adult householder gives consent, researchers are at liberty to gather information on other members of the household (eg. The General Household Survey). In Lesotho this communal type of decision making is often made at village level and people will be guided by the chief in these matters. However, this is not to say that all householders felt comfortable answering all the questions. The survey instrument tried to incorporate various questions which would act as internal checks on the accuracy of statements given. This was because experience had taught us that although refusal to answer to questions was rare, giving inaccurate answers was a way of dealing with unwelcome questions. Fortunately, the pilot showed that this survey did not contain many questions that were considered sensitive, but previous research on, for example contraception or sexual behaviour had 100% compliance and sometimes nearly 50% inaccurate answers given (Lesotho Highlands Development Authority, 1996).

Research with children contains particular ethical issues (Christensen and James, 2000; Blagbrough, 1998). In this study we would be interviewing children in groups and individually. For the groups of children initial permission was gained either from
their teachers (if they were in school) or from the chief of the village (in the case of children not in school). Parental permission was not always sought because either teachers or the chief would be considered a more senior source of permission than parents. Again the children were then asked if they were willing to talk to us but it was clear this was merely a formality and some of the younger children were so surprised at being asked their opinion about anything they found it hard to answer at all. All through the games and discussions during the group we repeatedly asked the children if they were happy to stay in the group and at the end asked them if there was anything they would rather we didn’t include when writing the research up.

For the individual interviews with children their parents or carers, if they were available, were contacted first and asked for their permission. In many cases the carer sat in on the interview. There was only one refusal and that was a school who refused to let us talk to the child despite the fact that the mother had agreed. Even when we suggested that the mother should send a letter giving permission the school refused and said that the mother would have to come in person – something which it was virtually impossible for the mother to do as she worked at a considerable distance from the school. When interviewing these children we followed a protocol which had been drawn up for an earlier study on AIDS orphans and had been approved by the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare. This protocol outlined a course of action which should be taken if it was found that the child was being abused, neglected, alone or in great distress. Although many of the children we interviewed had difficult lives, and in fact some were in child only households, it was not necessary to resort to the protocol in this study. Ideally this study would have had a reference group made up of those who were the object of the study. The wide geographical scope of the study and the shortage of time spent with any one group meant that this was not possible. However, the research assistants were all drawn from similar backgrounds to those being studied and we met together regularly both at the beginning and the end of the data collection and after the initial analysis had been completed.

This study was about poverty and about how people survive in the face of great adversity. The study in 1993 had not given any kind of reward or incentive to people who took part in the study partly because the study was commissioned to assess the need for drought relief in the form of food aid and there was therefore the promise of help to come. In this study it was considered unethical to talk to the destitute or near
destitute without giving some immediate relief. Packs of food were therefore made up comprising tins of fish, maize meal, cooking oil and matches and given to respondents at the start of the interview. Similarly packs of food were given to the families of the children who were being traced. For the children, the groups were given high energy biscuits (as recommended by WHO), juice, exercise books and pencils. The biscuits and juice were designed to help the children relax but also to help them concentrate as it was clear that many of the children were not getting enough to eat on a regular basis. The children interviewed individually were also given food, pens and exercise books. The decision to provide this type of relief made the study much more expensive and logistically more difficult as we had to carry the food with us often on our backs or on donkeys. We also found that on occasion we had to give the chief a pack (some villages were very poor including the chief) and other people who gave assistance such as helping us find the way.

The issue of the type of reward if any which these studies should offer has rarely been addressed in the literature and particularly not with regard to the developing world where people are often suffering severely. And yet people often give up a considerable amount of time to answer interviewers’ questions which may have little direct result for them. Bulmer cites a case of a survey in Kenya where villagers felt that all surveys did was take something away from the community (Bulmer & Warwick, 1983). This also leads to the question of who owns the data from these studies and for whose benefit the study is being conducted (Hulme, 2003).

In order to address some of these issues I held a seminar on the initial results of the survey for Government officials, other researchers and donor agencies on my final visit to Lesotho. The funding for part of this study came from the Department for International Development and this may be regarded as an ethical source but the use of this study to the children concerned was not so clear. In order to make sure that the data from this survey were not only of use for this thesis, the analysed results were released, on request, to CARE International who run rural development projects in Lesotho and to the International Labour Organisation who have established projects to promote informal schooling and better conditions for herd-boys. However, owing to financial and logistical constraints there was little or no feedback directly to the children concerned.
5.2 Logistics

Any study in the developing world normally requires quite complex logistics and this study was no exception. Four-wheel drive vehicles were needed to get to at least within walking distance of the villages and this meant that at least one of the enumerators per team had to be a driver (which is not common in Lesotho) and preferably someone on the team needed to know how to do basic repairs. As the country was experiencing famine the teams had to carry all their own food and also their bedding, clothing etc. Water also became a problem as often the clean sources of water in a village had dried up and we were faced with drinking river water or nothing.

Although surveys such as this would be ideal for use with CAPI this was not possible. Not only would the purchase of laptops have been prohibitively expensive but some of the field staff were clearly very nervous of using computers (most had never touched one before) and felt that villagers would be nervous of them also. How well computers would stand up to the extremes of climate in Lesotho and especially the dust was also not known. It was decided to use paper and pens with all the concomitant dangers of dropping the completed questionnaires in rivers, losing pages from them, using them accidentally to light fires and the errors that occur when data is entered manually.

For the group discussions it was often difficult to find a suitable and quiet place and more often than not the discussion was held under a tree outside the school. This meant that asking the children to draw could be difficult and also meant that other curious children often wanted to come and join in. When this happened, distraction methods were used either in terms of a football which we carried with us, or the girls were allowed to practise looking after my baby daughter.

5.3 Field Staff

Matching of interviewee and interviewer is very important in Lesotho. Young unmarried women get poor responses from older women with children and it is very difficult for men to interview women and vice versa. Language and accent are also
important and so staff such as university students rarely make good field interviewers. In addition the harsh conditions that the field workers often have to endure – walking in the mountains for many hours, sleeping in villages with whoever can give them a bed, having to eat whatever food is available – is not to the taste of many of the more educated Basotho. Murthy and Roy found a similar situation with Indian students not making good field interviewers in the Indian National Sample Survey (Murthy and Roy, 1983). Field staff were drawn from the ranks of the unemployed therefore. They had some basic schooling, mostly at primary level, and were willing to endure the privations of field work in Lesotho.

The field staff had to be carefully matched and trained and the training took much longer than with a more educated work force because the whole background of poverty and poverty issues in Lesotho needed to be explained. In addition they needed closer supervision in the field and this meant that supervisors had to be prepared to make the long and often arduous journey to the villages concerned.

The interviews with children were nearly all conducted by the author, who, of course did not match her interviewee in terms of age, ethnicity or first language. However, various techniques could be used to set the children at their ease such as games and singing etc. I was accompanied by a Mosotho colleague, sometimes male, sometimes female who often acted as intermediary with the chiefs and provided some protection on long journeys in the mountains. It was therefore important for my Basotho colleagues in the discussion groups or in the individual interviews to know how to talk to children and set them at their ease. In a culture where adults are always considered senior and superior to children this can be difficult to learn and it was necessary to hold several practise groups and interviews, and do a lot of role play before conducting the interviews for real. As the following extract shows even when the author was conducting the interview a ‘helpful’ colleague could easily put a child at a disadvantage:

British researcher: What do you like about your village?
Basotho colleague: Take your hand away from your mouth.
Child: I like my friends
Basotho colleague: Take your hand away from your mouth. The lady can't hear you.
British researcher: It's OK. It's OK. I can hear.
My colleague saw the child as being disrespectful to an adult but his well-meant interventions merely served to make the child more nervous.

5.4 Language

Iyengar states that in surveys 'measurement equivalence is, in part, a function of linguistic equivalence' (p173 Iyengar, 1983). To ensure validity across languages questions need to be translated into one language from the other in a way that maintains meaning which means the translation may not be a literal one. To ensure reliability Iyengar suggests that the indicators chosen must have internal consistency within every language used and can be subject to test-retest. In other words indicators that are correlated in one language need to be correlated in the other and testing and re-testing does not alter the effect of the translation (Iyengar, 1983).

These issues were apparent in this study with regard to language. Firstly everything had to be translated from English into Sesotho or the reverse. Secondly even when words were used in translation it was necessary to ensure people understood the same things by the same term. This could be due to certain specific words in English being used generically in Sesotho for instance ‘grandmother’ in English means the mother of a parent. In Sesotho it can mean the sister of a grandparent (ie a great-aunt) as well as the English meaning. Or because certain words have different connotations for instance the question on disability had to be explained to refer to people who were permanently unable to carry out daily tasks. This was because there is no specific word for disability in Sesotho and it is normally translated into that language as ‘sick’. The responses then could also be problematic as the reasons people gave for being disabled often did not fit with Western taxonomies of disease or disability. All disabilities to do with being possessed of spirits, suffering from witchcraft or being called to become a traditional healer but not responding to that call do not have accurate translations into English and the best that can be achieved is to describe the symptoms.

Even though Lesotho is a small country words can be highly localised and the more accessible and populated lowlands often use words different to those used by people
in the high mountains. These words often carry subtly different meanings also. For instance, in the mountains young women would say they had been an ‘ausi’ to a family – a word which literally translates as ‘sister’ but when used in conjunction with living with non-relatives suggests she offered domestic help. But in some circumstances in the urban areas the word used could be ‘maiti’ – a word derived from Afrikaans and meaning servant girl or maid.

5.5 Methodological rigour

As a result of some of the above issues an increasing criticism of research in the developing world is that it can lack methodological rigour (Campbell, 2002). Sometimes conclusions are drawn from either surveys involving very small numbers (Sender and Smith, 1990) or from only a few group discussions or interviews (Narayan and Nyamwaya, 1996). The difficulty of collecting data in many developing countries can also mean that conclusions drawn from data in one country are often transferred to another. An example of this is, for instance, when considering gender issues. In many developing countries boys are more likely to attend primary school than girls and this has often been used as a general rule on which to develop aid programmes. However this is not true for all places, and in Lesotho more girls are attending primary school than boys. For many years aid programmes were based on this fallacy and may be one of the contributing factors to the ‘crisis of masculinity’ in Lesotho whereby men in particular appear to find it hard to get jobs and take a full role in the economic support of the household because they are poorly educated (Boehm, 2003).

Along with poor research, both by western academics and agencies and by institutions within the countries themselves, there are often poor national statistics on which to base the research. In this study the 1993 sample had been based on the 1986 census with adjustments for year on year growth. However it was fairly widely recognised that the census figures were not totally reliable and that very few people knew what the effect of HIV/AIDS was having on the population at that time or the effect of out-migration given the democratisation of neighbouring South Africa. This survey, based as it is on the 1993 sample will therefore suffer from those errors. An example of the widely differing estimates which can be obtained depending on the source of data can be seen on the estimates for the prevalence of disability. This
study found approximately 10% of the population suffered from some kind of disability which is in line with international figures. Even controlling for age a national survey of the previous year in Lesotho found only a 4% prevalence rate (Government of Lesotho, 2001). Either the questions were asked in different ways to give different answers, or this 2002 survey is in no way nationally representative, or one of the surveys has made an error.

By going into considerable depth as to the sampling frame and the actual administration of the survey it is hoped to demonstrate where the results can be considered as reliable and where there may be errors caused by working in such difficult circumstances.

5.6 What is being measured?

A key issue which arises particularly with regard to developing countries is the issue of how to measure poverty and what exactly is being measured. Chapters 2 and 3 showed how thinking about poverty changed over the period of the last century. From a strictly income based approach such as Rowntree’s the study of poverty moved to looking at people’s access to resources, their ability to participate in the social and cultural life of their country and even the freedom’s they were able to enjoy (Sen, 1999). However, the European Union and the UK still tends to present findings on poverty largely based on income statistics and income levels are considered one of the best proxies for measuring poverty in the industrialised world’s heavily monetised economies.

In the developing world the problem of measuring poverty is more complex. As we have seen money metrics provide only a part of the answer. Access to land, livestock and resources such as water and sanitation can make the difference between a family surviving or not. In this study, as in previous poverty studies of Lesotho, there were several households with no cash income but they were surviving at least during the period of the study. For the purposes of this study the best indicators of poverty for Lesotho had to be decided upon. Some of the indicators incorporated matched those collected in 1993 but as well as income respondents were asked about ownership of livestock, fields, and major assets such as vehicles, carts, stoves, toilets, radios, houses/huts etc. They were also asked about access to fuel and water. It is generally
agreed that asking about income for longer ago than a month is problematic (Gunning et al, 2000). However in the case of Lesotho, where income can be very sporadic and seasonal, to only ask about the previous month would not have sufficed. As in 1993 respondents were asked about income for the previous year. The answers given are almost certainly an under estimate but at least they capture those people who perhaps only had one or two one off payments made to them in the course of a year.

Respondents were also asked about expenditure (which is normally considered more reliable) but this proved to be highly problematic. The 1993 data for expenditure used too long a time scale for accurate reporting (a year). In order not to repeat the same mistake the 2002 study used a more detailed shorter period (a week or month) but this meant comparisons were not possible between the two phases.

Assessing assets is crucial to an understanding of poverty in Lesotho but can be highly contentious. This can be in terms of choice of asset and also in terms of how to codify them. An example is land. Most studies in the developing world stress the importance of land ownership (Baulch and Hoddinott, 1999) but this study, as will be shown later, found that land was only of use if the household had the labour and inputs with which to work it. In terms of coding assets various methods have been tried. Some studies turn all assets into their cash value in order to form discrete scales (eg Gay & Hall, 2003). Others set nominal values on certain assets so that they can form discrete scales just by counting them. For instance bovines are often counted in terms of Tropical Livestock Units and given the value of one. Smaller stock may then be given a value depending on the relative amount of grazing land needed to support a single unit of eg. Goats, as compared to this initial value (Heady, 1975). In this study the relative value in terms of re-sale was used but this could not include land, which has no re-sale value in Lesotho, or houses or latrines for the same reason.

The conversion of assets to interval scales based on relative market values therefore was not too complex. Of greater complexity was measuring other aspects of poverty most of which had not been included in the 1993 study. In order to gather information on human capital, questions were asked with regard to highest level of schooling, occupation and whether the respondent was disabled or not. Access to natural resources was covered by questions about access to fuel and water and land and
access to physical capital by questions about access to clinics, schools and roads. In order to investigate social capital and social situation respondents were asked about family/household structure, the giving and receiving of gifts, particularly food and clothing, loans, membership of groups and their feelings on how safe they regarded the village was for their children. Householders were also asked about their political activities and their opinions on what kind of things helped or hindered them in their daily lives in order to consider Sen's concepts of development as freedom. Households were also asked what they had eaten the day before and whether they regularly went without certain necessities.

The question is, whether all these questions really can provide a measure for poverty. Whilst most studies in industrialised countries would use similar types of indicators, qualitative work in developing countries has shown that the poor also see other aspects of life as critical to their well-being (Narayan, 1999). This will be discussed in more depth later but what is pertinent at this point is that the selection of questions for the study was not only based on the 1993 questionnaire but also on a specific conceptual approach to the measurement of poverty which was broadly based on a livelihoods approach with some room for broader interpretations along the lines of Sen and others. The study could have been improved by specific targeted qualitative studies of particularly children and their conceptual frames of reference. Unfortunately the study had to be conducted before the end of the financial year and the quantitative study had to come before the group discussions.

### 5.7 Analysis

The 1993 study had been commissioned to rapidly assess the effect of the drought which was then affecting much of southern Africa. Certain questions were therefore not asked in 1993 which might have been useful to compare in future surveys. On the other hand, anthropometric measurements were taken in 1993 of all children under 5 years, but funding constraints meant that a similar exercise could not be undertaken in 2002 and so there are no panel data for this indicator.

For most of the data, the household was used as the basic unit of analysis although data on individuals within each household were collected and results are given on them where available. Although much work still remains to be done on intra-
household transfers, both inter-generationally and in terms of gender this was beyond the scope of this study. Unfortunately one question, which would have allowed us to know the source of gifts and remittances to households, was misunderstood by the data collectors who, on occasion, specified whom the recipient was rather than the donor. Some information can be gleaned from individual level data but not a lot.

Even in industrialised countries the definition of a household is presenting increasing problems particularly with children who may well belong to two households if the parents have each formed their own separately (Bradbury et al, 2001), In Lesotho the definition of a household could be very complex. For instance, for the households of miners the man may well be away from the household for 11 months a year. He will send possibly up to two thirds of his wages home but will keep a third for his own needs at the mines. Although the family will regard him as head of the household yet for the majority of the time he is not there and his income is split between two different places. Children may well spend half their time with grandparents or extended family and half with their parents. Young women who work in the textile factories may leave their babies with their mothers in the village and return every month to bring food and money and regard themselves as a member of the household but again are not actually there most of the time. In order to try and cope with some of this fluidity one of the questions asked was where the household member was normally resident and for how many months of the year. Decisions can then be made as to who to include and who not to in unclear cases.

5.8 Levels of measurement

A study of this nature also relies on several levels of data collection which poses problems for analysis. Although the sampling was done at household level information was gathered on individuals (particularly the children) within those households so that some data is at an individual level. Data were also gathered which really should be placed at village level, for example, access to clean water, access to schools and even perceived security.
5.9 The Group Sessions

Although the groups elicited some interesting responses, it took a long time for the children to become fully relaxed and comfortable in any of them. This was probably due to a variety of factors. Firstly when running groups it is not possible to take on a 'least-adult' role (Thorne, 1993) and even this type of approach to research with children has been questioned (Davis et al, 2000). The facilitator of the group was therefore clearly of a different generation and also culturally different and even a different colour. Mayall, (2000) describes how some of these drawbacks can be overcome by using mixed methodologies and by conducting the study over a sufficient period of time that the children become used to and familiar with the researcher.

Unfortunately this was also not an option for this study. It was decided therefore to be as 'up-front' about the issues as possible with the children so that they could be openly discussed. I started by telling the children about my own background and a bit about children in the UK. For many of the children they had never been close enough to a white person to touch their skin or hair (always of interest!) and the children were encouraged to have an informal discussion about differences before the start of the group and, if they wished, to touch me and ask me questions. In fact using touch, whether through actions such as joining together in a dance, made a critical difference to the ability of the children and a white researcher to be able to communicate with each other. However, as we have seen above, children were also wary of adult Basotho facilitators particularly as they were often being asked to relate to them in a way they would not normally relate to an adult and more time was needed to build up rapport.

These sessions were taped and, as many of the children had never used a tape recorder before, we normally started with a song or reciting poetry and then played it back so that the children could hear their voices. This caused great hilarity and was a great ice-breaker. However it meant many children wanted copies of the tapes so that they could play it to their parents and we had to refuse this request. We did not have the resources to make the requisite number of tapes and the postal system in Lesotho is not reliable enough to send tapes to people. In retrospect it would have been better to donate a cheap tape recorder and tapes to each school to make their own tapes of singing and poetry.
5.10 The Tracer Study

Although we tried to trace about 30 children this was not always possible. Some of the households had lost track of the child, this was particularly true in the cases where the child was a labourer (normally a shepherd) for the family and was not related. In other cases the child might have gone too far away to interview and in one case the school of the child, once traced, refused to let the child be interviewed. In many of the cases we not only had to visit the original 1993 home but then the succeeding places of abode for the child until we could find them. As most of the original villages were also very remote (and proved often to be one of the main reasons the children had left) the research was very time consuming. In particular three of the villages took two days to get to (a days travel on bad roads and then about 4 hours walking) just to find out where the children had gone.

Writings about tracking techniques rarely discuss the problems of this type of study in developing countries. Dempster-McClain and Moen (1998) used birth and death registration records, city directories, telephone directories, school records, employers, clubs and military records. None of these were of any use, or indeed existed in Lesotho. However, local respondents were often very knowledgeable and even where the child had lost touch with their original household they could often be traced by going to the next place they were known to have been and finding someone there who remembered them and suggested somewhere to look. Children were often also with some family member (even if the original family didn't know it) and it often paid off just to visit as many family members as possible.

Once the child had been found we conducted an interview asking them about their life since 1993. If the child agreed the interviews were taped and notes written up afterwards. As discussed in the previous chapter, we used tools from Life Course research (Clausen 1998) and children were asked to complete a life chart of all that had happened to them since leaving their homes and to talk about the effect these events had had on their lives. Although we tried to keep these interviews as light and factual as possible, for many of these children this interview contained distressing elements and serious ethical issues often arose as to whether to continue the interview at all. We also were concerned about follow-up for these children and decided that we must at least conduct part of the interview with a responsible adult.
present who would understand the child's distress. We could provide some immediate relief in the form of food and it is possible the data may prove useful to policy makers in the future. But these interviews have made me question the ethics of carrying out 'academic' research on the very poor and dispossessed at all unless linked to a suitably funded relief programme.

Summary

This chapter has looked at some of the methodology used in and the issues arising from researching in a developing country, namely Lesotho. Lesotho is a poor country with many of the problems facing other poor countries in Africa. This means that there are particular issues around the sampling of populations, the logistics and the most appropriate measurements to be used when trying to measure this poverty. In addition research this particularly vulnerable group – the very poor- raises ethical issues around the degree to which participants benefit from the study.

The 2002 survey encountered many of the problems which longitudinal surveys encounter but also suffered from the fact that tracing mechanisms are more difficult in developing countries. In addition research in developing countries carries particular issues when considering ethics, informed consent and the protection of children in the research process. The question of reward or incentive for participating households and individuals is also critical in countries where people may be very poor. Logistics and cross-cultural issues such as language and working with field staff from different backgrounds also need to be taken into consideration in a survey of this type. One of the problems sometimes facing research in a developing country is also that of making sure methodological rigor is maintained and that the survey is actually measuring what it set out to measure. As poverty is such a wide concept and economies in countries like Lesotho are not necessarily highly monetised problems of measuring assets and family functioning can arise. This becomes even more pertinent when considering child poverty where household income as a measure on its own may have little relevance.

The quantitative study was complemented by two qualitative studies – one involving group discussions with children and one tracing children who had left the family home.
since 1993. The group discussions were mostly held in schools and used various Participatory Poverty Assessment techniques to try and understand children's conceptualisation and experience of poverty. The tracer study interviewed 19 children individually by charting their life histories. These were often painful interviews and showed how some children had suffered unremitting hardships for most of their lives. They raised issues of the ethics of doing this kind of research without adequate support systems in place. The challenge of collecting data from these three different sources and in three different ways was not just that they required different types of analysis but was also how to combine them to present a coherent picture of poor children in Lesotho.
Chapter 6 – Economic Mobility of Households

Introduction

In order to understand the situation into which many children in rural Lesotho are born and grow, this chapter considers the characteristics of long-term or chronic poverty in Lesotho at the household level. As we have seen, all of the households surveyed included children under 10 years of age, so how the households fared economically between the years 1993 and 2002 had a direct impact on the children they contained. We have seen in previous chapters how deprivation indicators in the UK have some correlation with income (Gordon et al., 2000). However, in other contexts, it is well documented that income alone does not necessarily correlate with other measures of poverty (Gunning et al., 2000; Baulch & Masset, 2003) and the question then arises what are the ‘best’ measures of household poverty in a particular country. Monetary indicators are simple and allow for cross country comparisons whilst deprivation indicators give a much clearer idea of what it is people lack when they are in poverty and of the experience of being in poverty itself. In addition, in the South deprivation indicators also convey the kind of livelihood strategies that may be open to people.

In this chapter we will look at how closely the deprivation of physical assets, access to basic services such as water, sanitation and fuel and what might be termed the ‘human capital’ of a household are linked with income over time, using the two waves of the study longitudinally in Lesotho. We will then test whether these indicators of deprivation in 1993 predict the income poverty status of a household in 2002. Because in some ways Lesotho is relatively highly monetised, has relied on monetary income from migrant labour for over a hundred years and is resource poor, we are working on the assumption that lack of income and other forms of deprivation are closely linked. We would therefore expect deprivation suffered by the household to be able to predict income poverty at a later date and, although households in Lesotho may lack certain physical assets we are assuming that it is lack of money that is the

cause of any deprivation. Conversely, if we can locate those factors which prevent a family from suffering from income poverty, in the Lesotho context, the implications of this can be used to develop micro interventions for rural households that contain a child.

The analysis of economic poverty in this chapter is broadly based on theories of chronic poverty developed by Hulme et al. and discussed in chapter 2. They distinguish between five categories of poverty – the always poor; the usually poor; the churning poor (this group moves in and out of poverty on a regular basis); the occasionally poor and the never poor (Hulme et al., 2001). The churning poor and the occasionally poor make up a group of people who are transiently poor and those who are always or usually poor may be termed the chronically poor. In this chapter we are assuming that those who were in poverty (ie which I define as those in the lowest two income quintiles) in 1993 and who still are in poverty in 2002, even if there have been brief periods of increased wealth in-between, belong to the category of the chronically poor and other households have either moved up or down or stayed in the ranks of the never poor.

Before turning to the structure of the chapter a brief description should be given of what is meant by 'household'. The term household has many connotations and many definitions particularly in southern Africa. It can mean any member of a family, whether they live constantly in the house or not, but may exclude other people living in the same house; it can refer to members of the same family excluding those who have married and moved away but including those who work elsewhere but frequently return and help with the family’s financial situation; it can refer purely to people who live in the house, whether related or not, but exclude other members of the family for instance children away at boarding school (Barnett & Whiteside, 1999). It can also refer to all members of the immediate family, whether physically living in the house or not and any other people who live in the house as well (Agarwal, 1990).

In Lesotho the term ‘lelapa’ is normally used for household. This suggests anyone living in the actual house or rondavels owned by the household head whether related or not and also often includes members of the family who have not moved away into their own houses. Therefore members of the family who were working in the towns but returning often to their rural homes were often said to be members of the
household. Indeed, miners, even if they only returned for one month of the year were often the head of households and central to the households identity. Conversely children, even if of the household head, may not be considered a member of the 'lelapa' if they had transferred to another so that there may be some quite young members of the family who were not recorded in this survey because they had moved. For the purposes of this thesis then 'household' will be used to mean people who live together on one plot of land and share cooking facilities and members of the family who are working or studying but who still look to that house as their main place of residence. The income that comes from these people who are absent for part of the time but still are regarded as part of the household is therefore included when calculating per capita income but income from members of the family who are regarded as having left the household is ignored except for gifts which they may or may not make to the household.

In this chapter we will first look at some of the demographics of the sample and at how those demographic factors relate to income mobility in the period 1993 to 2002. In particular we will look at how the composition of the household and the occupations of its members relates to its economic status. In sections two and three we will compare economic mobility of those households with the physical assets they possess and the household’s access to sanitation, clean water and fuel. This will be in both years – 1993 and 2002. In section 4, the sources of a household’s income will be investigated with regard to what kinds of activities provide financial security or not. In section 5 we will take a brief look at those households with no income and also how people themselves rate the status of their household. Section 6 investigates the predictors of poverty in 2002 using data from 1993 and discusses whether it is possible to locate factors which influence a household’s economic status in the future. Throughout this chapter the 1993 data and the 2002 data refer to the same households at two different time points.

6.1 Demographics of the Sample

6.1.1 Household Composition

The study included in total, in both 1993 and 2002, some 2970 people living in 328 households. The study in 1993 included a total of 2314 people which had dropped to 2005 people in 2002. However, 965 people who were present in 1993 were no longer
living in those same 328 households (either because they had left or because they had died) in 2002 and 656 people had joined the households or had been born since 1993. There was therefore a high degree of mobility of people in and out of the households. The mean number of people per household does not therefore tell us a lot about the composition of the household unless it is broken down by age. The mean size of a household in 1993 was just over 7 and by 2002 it had dropped to 6. Similar national figures were 5.4 in 1994 (May and Roberts, 2005) and reflect the fact that this sample was exclusively rural and did not include the smaller urban households.

Table 6.1 Mean Number of Individuals per age group per household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1993 (N=2314)</th>
<th>2002 (N=2005)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-64 years</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65 years</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 shows that whilst the mean number of adults has stayed roughly the same per household between 1993 and 2002, the mean number of children has dropped. A drop in the number of children would be expected in line with the lifecycle of the household and the next chapter shows how children had also left the households for various other reasons. It should be noted that most of the households contained at least as many adults as children, which has implications for the proportion of people who find themselves in poverty when using household measures. In terms of the sex of the members of each household this was roughly split 50:50 in both 1993 and 2002.

6.1.2 Poverty Status and Changes in Income 1993 -2002

Before going on to look more closely at the poverty status of the households in relation to the demographic and to the household asset base, it is useful to look at the changes in income over the nine year period. The 1993 data had divided households into income quintiles (this is achieved by dividing the sample of households into five equal bands) and so gave measures of relative poverty. As discussed in chapter 5, for the purposes of this study the 1993 poverty line was set at the 6th decile ie households in the bottom two quintiles (or four deciles) were considered to have been below the poverty line and those in the upper three quintiles above the poverty line. There was no official poverty line in Lesotho in 1993 but the data from that year shows that those households in the lowest two quintiles were not only the poorest relatively
but could also be considered to be poor in absolute terms. The 6th decile line could then be updated using official estimates of inflation to give a comparable poverty line in 2002. The figures in Table 6.2 show how the cut off for quintiles have changed between 1993 and 2002. Figures given are in in maloti (the local currency) per person per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2</th>
<th>Cut off Values of Quintiles in 1993 and 2002 (income per capita per year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile 5</td>
<td>Under M49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile 4</td>
<td>M49 - M152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile 3</td>
<td>M153 - M342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile 2</td>
<td>M343 - M600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile 1</td>
<td>M601 - M3200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figures have two points of note. Firstly they show how little the lot of the very poor (those in quintile five) has changed over the 9 years between the two rounds of the surveys. Despite the fact that the cut off for quintile 5 in 2002 is higher than in 1993 this has not risen by the rate of inflation and so this quintile has got poorer in real terms. Secondly the figures for quintile 1 show the growing inequality in Basotho society as the rich have at least managed to keep up with inflation during this same period. This is echoed in the Gini coefficient for Lesotho which was estimated as being 0.6 in 2000 (Sechaba Consultants, 2000).
Figure 6.1 shows how the new cut offs for quintiles for the sample in 2002 have not kept pace with official estimates of inflation except in quintiles 2 and 1 (the highest quintiles). The position is exacerbated by the fact that the lowest quintile probably spends more on food than other quintiles and food has suffered an even greater rate of inflation since 1993 than other goods (e.g., between July 2001 and June 2002, inflation on food was 30% compared to 7% overall).

Although, as discussed in chapter 2, an official poverty line has now been set for Lesotho, according to the figures gained in this survey about 85% of the population is below the M124 per person per month official poverty line, which is higher than that from previous national surveys which found about 58% of people were below the poverty line in 1994/5 (May and Roberts, 2005) or 68% of the rural population in 1999 (Sechaba Consultants, 2000). However, it must be remembered that this is not a random sample and the fact that it is based on geographically static and rural households may make the figure for those who fall below the official poverty line higher than the national average. May and Roberts found that 72% of the rural population in 1994/5 were poor according to the official poverty line so a higher incidence of poverty in the rural areas would be expected. The results of this survey also echoed the findings of May and Roberts in terms of the type of households who were more likely to be poor. Households with older heads in 1993 in this survey were more likely to be poor (an average age of 53 years as opposed to 49 years for the not poor compared to May and Roberts 54 years and 46 years); households headed by women are more likely to be poor (53% of whom were poor in this survey compared to 62% found by May and Roberts) and poorer households were more likely to engage in subsistence agriculture as opposed to having a waged worker. However this survey found no difference in the poverty status in 1993 according to household size unlike May and Roberts who found that larger households tended to be poorer. This was probably because the sample was exclusively rural and rural households tend to be larger anyway.

However with such a high proportion of the population being poor according to the official poverty line it is difficult to differentiate them from the better off and there are some questions over how useful a poverty line based on consumption is in a partly monetised economy. For this reason, and in order to enable comparisons between 1993 and 2002, the 6th income decile in 1993 has been used as the poverty
line and then updated for inflation. This gave a figure of M285 per person per year or about M24 per person per month in 2002 in this study.

That people had less income can be seen by the fact that the numbers of people having anything in their bank accounts has also dropped. In 1993, 68% of the whole sample either had no bank account or nothing in it. This had risen to 82% in 2002 and even those who did have some savings only had a few hundred maloti.

Taking the 6th income decile in 1993 as a poverty line, and then updating it by inflation for 2002, we can track the movement of households as they stay above or below it or cross it. Those who were above the line in 1993 and still were in 2002, we are assuming are families who are managing to cope well and have termed them the 'never poor' (after Sen, 2003). Those who were above the poverty line in 1993 but in 2002 had dropped below it we call the 'descending poor', those who in 1993 were below the poverty line but are now above are the 'ascending poor' and those who were below the poverty line in 1993 and still are in 2002 are the 'chronically poor'. In this sample the movements in and out of poverty are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Grouping</th>
<th>Percent of Households</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Poor</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending Poor</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending Poor</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Poor</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>328</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1993 60% of these households were above the poverty line. By 2002 only 46% (i.e. the never poor and the ascending poor) were above this line. This shows that whilst the group of never poor is the largest single group in fact the majority of the sample as a whole has grown poorer.

Comparing household income by quintile gives a sense of how households fared in relation to each other. Table 6.4 shows households who moved two or more quintiles in the nine years between 1993 and 2002. As can be seen, 62% of households stayed within the same quintile or within one quintile of the 1993 base, 18% of households dropped by two or more quintiles but 20% rose by two or more quintiles.
In fact, about 2% of households rose from the very bottom quintile to the very top and 3% dropped from the top to the bottom. The two ways of measuring change in poverty status (either using a poverty line or using quintiles) therefore give very similar results with about 60% of households not changing and 40% either going up or down.

Table 6.4 Household Mobility between Income Quintiles 1993 -2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quintile in 1993</th>
<th>Dropped by 2 or more quintiles in 2002</th>
<th>Stayed in the same or within one quintile</th>
<th>Risen by 2 or more quintiles in 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quintile 1</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile 2</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile 3</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile 4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintile 5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table also shows us the high degree of economic mobility in Lesotho. 46% of those households who were in the bottom-most quintile (quintile 5) had managed to raise their income sufficiently to be in quintile 3 or above by 2002. Similarly 39% of the wealthiest group had dropped to quintile 3 or below by 2002. Although, therefore, the top most quintile is richer in real terms in 2002 it does not necessarily comprise the same households as in 1993.

The question for this survey was whether to use income quintiles as a measurement of poverty or to establish a fixed poverty line. The advantages of quintiles is that they show how households are faring in relation to each other but the advantage of a using a fixed poverty line is that we can assess how households are faring in absolute terms. As Lesotho is, by any standards, a poor country and so it can be more useful to know what proportion of the population are in ‘absolute’ poverty and what factors may or may not influence a household’s escape from or descent into that poverty rather than purely assessing its comparative status. It can be assumed that household’s who manage to lift themselves above the poverty line are at least managing to function fairly effectively whilst merely knowing the income quintile which such a household belongs to does not convey any sense of how well a household is managing. However, this is not to say that the relative place of households should be entirely ignored. Lesotho has a high Gini coefficient (about 0.6) which implies great inequality and using quintiles as a measure does give an idea as to how widely spread income are. For the purposes of this study a poverty line was established at
the 6th decile or the bottom two quintiles were considered poor – a line which echoes the findings of May and Roberts whose ‘ultra poor’ category were the bottom most 40% (May and Roberts, 2005) and a line which could be updated using figures for inflation so that a household’s ability to move, economically speaking, could be assessed.

6.1.3 Demographics and Economic Mobility

Using the categories of household mobility – chronically poor, ascending poor, descending poor and never poor - outlined above the relationship of this mobility to demographic factors can be assessed. Table 6.5 shows the relative proportions of the populations of these categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of People</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic poor</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending poor</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending poor</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never poor</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, the proportions of people within each category did not change significantly although the sample as a whole became smaller. However, the relative proportions of adults to children changed significantly between 1993 and 2002 as Table 6.6 shows:
### Table 6.6 Relative Proportion of age groups within each poverty category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-15</th>
<th>16-64</th>
<th>Over 65</th>
<th>Mean no. members per hhd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic poor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending poor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending poor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never poor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the households within the sample had 'aged' over the 9 year period in that there was an increase in the proportion of older people and a corresponding decrease in the very young, as would be expected. However, the proportion of 5 to 16 year olds had stayed roughly constant for the ascending and descending poor and dropped slightly for the never poor and chronically poor. In the next chapter we will be seeing how children in the chronically poor category, in particular, often had left the household by 2002 and we will be examining the hypothesis that this physical mobility of children is a survival strategy for poor households. This would not explain why there has been a decrease in the proportion of never poor six to fifteen year olds except that the lower proportions may be the reason those households are not poor, in other words there are less dependents in the household.

The never poor group have seen the greatest increase in the proportion of potentially economically active people (those aged 16-64) and have the lowest proportion of elderly people and this would support the hypothesis that this group have kept out of poverty by ensuring their households have a high number of potentially economically active people. The descending poor are the only group to have seen a decrease in the proportion of economically active people, probably due to death and this also may well be linked to their downward mobility. Unexpectedly, perhaps, the mean age of adults between 16 and 64 years is roughly the same for each group. If we compare the 2002 figures with national figures from the Lesotho Demographic Health Survey.
(Government of Lesotho, 2001) we find, as expected, there is a much lower proportion of under 5s (7% cf 11%) and roughly the same proportion of over 65 year olds (7% cf 6%) but this sample contained a higher proportion of 6 to 15 year olds (33% cf 26%). There does not seem an immediate reason for this except that children may have been moving into these households for schooling or because parents have died.

Turning to the sex of household members according to the poverty categories the sample was evenly split between the sexes and on an individual level there was little significant difference between the numbers and proportions of males and females in each group. However, there was a considerable difference when considering the sex of the households head. Table 6.7 shows the status of the household head in 1993. Because of Lesotho's migrant labour system, the wives of miners are usually known as the de facto head of household. However, the man is still the de jure head and his household is normally reasonably well off because he is earning money. Nationally in 1994 there were about 30% of households with de jure female heads, considerably above the levels in this survey. This was almost certainly because of the rural and more traditional nature of this sample and because miners (who leave behind de facto female heads) tend to come from the rural areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>Change of head (% within group)</th>
<th>De jure male head in 1993 (% within group)</th>
<th>De facto female head in 1993 (% within group)</th>
<th>De jure female head in 1993 (% within group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic poor</td>
<td>27 (27)</td>
<td>61 (32)</td>
<td>8 (33)</td>
<td>31 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending poor</td>
<td>32 (32)</td>
<td>33 (32)</td>
<td>42 (33)</td>
<td>25 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending poor</td>
<td>16 (16)</td>
<td>68 (33)</td>
<td>5 (33)</td>
<td>27 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never poor</td>
<td>21 (21)</td>
<td>34 (21)</td>
<td>54 (27)</td>
<td>12 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall %</td>
<td>25 (25)</td>
<td>45 (25)</td>
<td>32 (25)</td>
<td>23 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households</td>
<td>328 (328)</td>
<td>147 (45)</td>
<td>105 (32)</td>
<td>75 (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p=<0.01

NB The p value represents the significance of the Pearson's chi-square and relates to the differences in poverty outcomes of the first column – change of head.
As can be seen from Table 6.7 a change of head is associated with either remaining poor or descending into poverty. In addition these groups have a much higher proportion of female de jure heads of households than the never poor group which would suggest that a change of head or having a female head in 1993 was linked with being poor in 2002. 58% of this sample of de jure female headed households were poor in 1993 as compared to 62% nationally at this time (May and Roberst, 2005). The relatively high proportion of female headed households who rose out of poverty is the exception. As we shall see throughout this chapter the ascending poor group is entrepreneurial in nature and moving away from traditional Basotho occupations and it is quite possible that this small group of households, over a quarter of whom are headed by women and who have had more stability in terms of household head, are forging a new type of life in the rural areas.

The association between poverty status and proportion of economically active adults suggests that the dependency ratio could be important. In particular, it can be hypothesised that the adequate care of children depends on the proportion of economically active adults. The dependency ratio of households is defined as the total number of people per household under the age of 16 or over the age of 65 divided by the number of people aged 16 to 64. The mean ratios per household across poverty groups are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic poor</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending poor</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending poor</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never poor</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen there has, rather surprisingly, been a drop overall in the dependency ratio since 1993. However this is almost certainly because of the longitudinal, as opposed to the cross-sectional nature, of the data and because so many people are dying before reaching 65. More children have reached adulthood and the very elderly have died off since 1993 without the corresponding increase in births and adults reaching the age of 65. The chronic poor have seen an increase in the ratio and this may be a contributory factor for them remaining in poverty. Likewise the fact that the
never poor households have a lower dependency ratio indicates this may have helped them avoid dropping into poverty. In 1994 the national age dependency rate was 0.8%, considerably lower than this sample and is a gain a reflection of the more rural nature of the sample where households are bigger and there is more likely to be grandparents looking after grandchildren (May and Roberts, 2005).

It is also important to note that 7% of the households had no adult between the ages of 16 and 64 in 2002 as compared to 2.4% in 1993. These households have not been included in the above table (because the dependency ratio is infinite). If disability is included in calculating the dependency ratio there is a significant change. Unfortunately the 1993 survey did not ask if people were disabled or not so figures are only available for 2002. People were asked to define themselves as being disabled or not, the definition of disability being that it would encompass a long-term condition that affects their ability to carry out normal everyday tasks. The disabilities mentioned therefore ranged from mental illness, to loss of limbs, sight or hearing, to long term illness such as TB (although TB is treatable it is clear that people who defined themselves as disabled were being disabled by this condition; it is also possible that they suffered from TB related AIDS and found it easier to mention the TB rather than the AIDS). If disability in adults is included as making people more dependent on others the ratio rises to a mean of 1.9 overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>Number of households</th>
<th>Mean ratio</th>
<th>Percent hhds with all dependants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic poor</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending poor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending poor</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never poor</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last column on the right shows the percent of households in each category with all dependants and no non-dependants. For the reason given above they cannot be included for the purposes of calculating a dependency ratio. Although the ascending poor have a high dependency ratio they are also more likely to have non-dependants than the chronic poor or the descending poor. The descending poor have a lower dependency ratio probably because they have a higher death rate and higher proportion of households with no able bodied adult. In other words in these
households the adults have either died or there are no able bodied adults to care for the elderly, sick or the young.

### 6.1.4 Occupations

In both 1993 and 2002 respondents were asked the occupations of all members of the household. Although there were 20 categories of occupation in all these were collapsed into the categories shown in table 6.10. The occupation of adults had also changed over the years as this table shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Chronic Poor</th>
<th>Descending Poor</th>
<th>Ascending Poor</th>
<th>Never Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>16  35</td>
<td>6  31</td>
<td>19  15</td>
<td>9  17</td>
<td>11  24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>13  7</td>
<td>6  6</td>
<td>11  11</td>
<td>3  7</td>
<td>7  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework</td>
<td>40  33</td>
<td>37  35</td>
<td>33  28</td>
<td>34  27</td>
<td>35  30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waged work</td>
<td>9  8</td>
<td>31  7</td>
<td>12  11</td>
<td>33  21</td>
<td>21  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>3  4</td>
<td>11  7</td>
<td>5  16</td>
<td>9  14</td>
<td>9  13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>12  6</td>
<td>3  2</td>
<td>11  8</td>
<td>7  5</td>
<td>10  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>7  8</td>
<td>6  12</td>
<td>9  10</td>
<td>5  9</td>
<td>7  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adults</td>
<td>245  262</td>
<td>297  273</td>
<td>145  124</td>
<td>354  385</td>
<td>1041 1044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{p}=<0.05

The above table shows that whilst the chronically poor do not stay on at school and the descending poor have become less likely to stay in school there has been a dramatic rise in the percent of ascending poor and never poor staying on at school or going into secondary and tertiary education. People with money, or acquiring it, appear to be using it to educate their children further. The differences between people claiming they were inactive between the two years may be partly accounted for by women re-defining themselves as inactive rather than doing housework, as 'inactivity' has seen a rise and 'housework' a drop. Despite more of the chronically poor being reliant on farming as a source of income fewer claim they are doing it now and fewer say they are doing casual work. For the descending poor the table shows clearly the drop in waged work for adults and the corresponding rise in inactivity and shepherding.

As would be expected women predominate in certain categories and men in others. Household workers are almost exclusively women while farmers, miners and job seekers are men. The drop in paid employment has hit men particularly hard. In
1993 59% of adult men in the sample were involved in an income generating activity (excluding farming which does not generate an income in the majority of cases although it is often essential for survival) and this had dropped to 40% in 2002. Women's employment has remained more constant although even so only 13% of women were gainfully employed in 2002 as opposed to 19% in 1993. Unfortunately it is hard to make comparisons with national data as all the figures have been collected differently. However, in 2001 the Lesotho Demographic Health Survey found that there were 10.3% of adults in waged employment which is similar to the 12% found in this survey (Government of Lesotho, 2001)

6.1.5 Education

In terms of the educational standard achieved by adults in the household there has been little change over the nine years as one might expect. However the chronically poor are considerably less well educated with the average standard of education reached by adults over 16 being fours years of primary schooling as compared to the never poor who averaged 6 years of primary schooling in 1993.

However, there were significant differences between men and women in the sample. As we have seen in chapter 1, Lesotho has a long tradition of educating its girls more than its boys. For this the migrant labour system has often been blamed (Letuka, 1998) which did not require men to be educated and the fact that boys were often used for herding. Table 6.10 shows the difference between men and women between aged 16 years and over in terms of the highest schooling they achieved:

| Table 6.11 Highest schooling of adults 16 years and over by sex in 1993 & 2002 (in percent) |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Level of Schooling                           | Male 1993 | Male 2002 | Female 1993 | Female 2002 |
| No education                                  | 32        | 24         | 10           | 12           |
| 1-3 years of primary education                | 15        | 14         | 6            | 8            |
| 4-7 years of primary education                | 32        | 37         | 56           | 53           |
| Entered secondary                             | 21        | 25         | 28           | 27           |
| Number of adults                              | 528       | 594        | 612          | 591          |

*p=<0.01

As can be seen 47% of men in 1993 had three years or less education compared to only 16% of women in this sample. But by 2002, the men have made substantial gains in terms of education with only 38% of men having three years or less schooling. Women have not gained to the same extent and in fact there is a slight
increase in women with no education. Nationally, in 1993, 19% of adults had no schooling but by 1999 this had fallen to 16% which is comparable to this sample.

It has been well established that mothers' education is related to child health (UNICEF, 2003) and for this reason, as well as because the woman in a household is likely to be the best educated, we will use the highest level of schooling achieved by the most senior woman in the household for the purposes of analysis.

6.1.6 Migration

At least a third of the sample had left the households since 1993 and the question arises as to where these members had gone? Table 6.12 shows the percent leaving the households between 1993 and 2002 by economic group.

Table 6.12 Percent of people who left household between 1993 and 2002 and Reason for leaving by poverty category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for leaving household (in percent)</th>
<th>Chronic Poor</th>
<th>Descending Poor</th>
<th>Ascending Poor</th>
<th>Never Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went Away</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to find work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live with relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built new house</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Went away where (in percent)</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Lesotho</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen the upwardly mobile (ascending poor) have benefited from people moving out (in that there are less mouths to feed and the possibility of remittances) and the never poor have benefited from members leaving to look for work, particularly in South Africa where work is better paid than in Lesotho. Those households in poverty in 2002 have had nearly similar proportions of people leave but they clearly
have not been so successful at finding work or are not sending the money back to the original household.

That deaths play a major part in a household’s poverty status can be seen from the next table:

Table 6.13 Deaths in Households between 1993 and 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>Number of Under 65s in 1993</th>
<th>Percent of under 65s who died</th>
<th>Percent of all deaths of under 65s (N=133)</th>
<th>Percent of households with one or more deaths (any age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic poor</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending poor</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending poor</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never poor</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2214</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.13 shows the percent of people who died in the 9 year period. The first two columns deal only with those people who were under 65 in 1993 as these people may have been expected to have had a higher chance of survival than the very elderly. As can be seen the chronically poor rank high in the numbers of deaths they have experienced. However even higher are the descending poor. The second column gives the proportions of deaths of under 65s by economic group as a proportion of all deaths. And the third column gives the percent of households who had experienced the death of a member of any age. If two regression models are run, one for those poor in 1993 and one for those not poor in 1993, using number of deaths as the independent variable and whether poor or not in 2002 as the dependent variable it is found that whilst household deaths do not significantly change the fortunes of the ascending poor and the chronically poor they make it nearly twice as likely that a previously non-poor family will become poor. The cost of dealing with these deaths should also be taken into account. Funerals in Lesotho can be ruinously expensive and use up all a families savings. If there have been multiple deaths in a family, particularly of the members considered the most important (head of household, elderly male or son of an elderly head) the household may well find it hard to recover from the expense.
6.2 Income Poverty and Assets

Because income is only one measure of wealth, especially in a country like Lesotho, comparisons were made between income and assets in 1993 and 2002. This was done by comparing how many livestock points or durable/equipment points each household owned with their poverty status. The details of methodology for scoring livestock and durables is given in chapter 4: by giving each animal and each piece of equipment owned by a household a score it was possible to make some comparisons.

6.2.1 Livestock

11% of households in 1993 and 15% in 2002 owned no livestock at all. The national figures for 1993 and 1999 were 23% and 30% but this is because households in urban areas, which were not included in this sample were far less likely to have livestock (Sechaba Consultants, 2000). The following table shows the mean scores for livestock assets in 1993 and 2002:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>Change in Score 1993-2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Poor</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending Poor</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending Poor</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Poor</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>-57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several points should be noted from the above table. Firstly in 1993 the chronically poor did not have significantly lower livestock scores than the other groups in 1993 (except the ascending poor) although by 2002 they were lagging considerably further behind the never poor and those who had come out of poverty. So the question is why were they so unable to make a living from these animals which could potentially take them over the poverty threshold? Secondly the ascending poor had the largest numbers of livestock and this may be relevant when considering how they overcame poverty, although they have also shed the largest numbers of animals. Thirdly the richest group – the never poor have not altered their livestock holdings significantly over the last 9 years. Finally, the descending poor have lost some animals over the...
nine years but, along with the chronically poor, seem to have been unable to use their livestock to protect them from poverty.

In terms of which animals have increased or decreased, the chronically poor have kept their bovines, hens and pigs but have divested themselves of their small stock ie sheep and goats. This would be expected given the cultural and social importance of bovines and the difficulty of feeding and herding large numbers of sheep and goats. The ascending and descending poor have likewise both kept cattle and shed small stock, but the ascending poor have been investing in pigs (until recently an unusual stock to keep) – again suggesting that this group may comprise innovative farmers.

There is also evidence that people are not putting the same premium on the ownership of animals as before. Previous studies have shown how the ownership of livestock is not necessarily correlated with income (Sechaba Consultants, 1994). This study supports that view and also demonstrates how even increases in income do not necessarily translate into increases in livestock. For instance 60% of households who dropped two or more livestock quintiles remained in the same quintile in terms of income. Similarly 83% of households who rose two or more income quintiles remained in the same quintile in terms of livestock. There are many reasons why households no longer invest to the same extent in livestock as in the past. Increasing urbanisation is of course a factor but this study was based mainly in the rural areas and so would not greatly be affected by the loss of suitable grazing to housing. More likely is the steady loss of grazing to erosion and the increasing monetisation of Lesotho’s economy. The precarious nature of livestock investment must also be a factor as there is some evidence, as we shall see later that people are more likely to invest in physical assets than living assets. If the numbers of livestock had changed since 1993 households were asked why that was the case. The most common reason given was that the animal had died. However, animals being stolen was also a significant category. Equines and small stock such as sheep and goats were more likely to be stolen than bovines, and so the average number of cattle kept by households has remained roughly the same.

Whilst some of these figures may not be terribly interesting in themselves they do demonstrate the adaptability of Basotho to changing circumstances. Pigs are easier to keep in that they can be kept nearer the house so are less likely to be stolen and do
not need a herd-boy to care for them. They also are easy to feed on scraps and waste. With the development of the road network in Lesotho, equines are also not so essential for transport and they are relatively difficult to feed and cannot be used by the family as food. Sheep and goats also require grazing and herders to mind them. The same is true for cattle but in the case of cattle they are the traditional currency of the Basotho and it may take longer before families are willing to part with this form of wealth. In particular households had gained cattle through bride-price or payment for services rendered by their children (such as herding) but had also used cattle for funerals and in payment to others. Cattle therefore still play a fairly major role in the social networks and relationships in the village.

6.2.2 Changes in Physical Assets
A similar scale to the livestock scale was devised for physical assets so that comparisons with income could be made (this is also shown in more detail in chapter 4). Very few households either in 1993 or 2002 owned vehicles. Five households in 1993 and in 2002 owned tractors and 8 households in 1993 and 9 in 2002 owned other vehicles (mostly pick-up trucks). Again very few households owned televisions in either year.

So many households had so few possessions it was not possible to rank them into quintiles. Instead households were ranked as to whether they were above or below the median level of ownership of durables. In 1993, 21% of households had none of the assets surveyed and this had risen to 25% in 2002. Half of the households had an asset score of below 4 which meant that it was unlikely that they either had a ventilated improved pit latrine or a stove or agricultural equipment (planter or plough). In fact many households appeared to be worse off in terms of physical assets in 2002. In 1993, 66% of households did not have a plough and this had risen to 74% in 2002. Similarly in 1993, 84% of households had no planter but this had risen to 90% in 2002. The reasons given were that they had been sold, given away stolen or were broken. The numbers of carts had scarcely changed. In terms of stoves, 78% had no stove in 1993 whilst this had fallen to 70% in 2002. However, it is probable these were stoves which burnt traditional materials.

Perhaps the most striking finding was that the number of radios had dropped quite dramatically. In 1993, 33% of households did not have a radio. This had risen to 52%
in 2002. The main reason given was that they had broken and presumably not been repaired. Given the importance of the radio in Lesotho as the main means in which messages from Government can be communicated and as a means by which people can gain information this is a disturbing finding. Both the UN and UNICEF rate lack of information as a deprivation (Gordon et al, 2003) and the children of these households in Lesotho are unlikely to have any access to information outside their village at all.

One area which had seen substantial increases in ownership at a household level was with regard to the ownership of latrines. In 1993, 68% of households did not own a latrine but this had dropped to 50% in 2002 (although the increase in ventilated improved latrines as opposed to ordinary latrines was minimal, again showing that people, even if they could afford a latrine could not run to a much more effective and healthy but more expensive version). Both stoves and latrines are highly resistant to decay and difficult to break and this may also be the reason why they are the only two physical assets to have increased in number since 1993. The following table shows the relative distribution of latrines and radios.

Table 6.15 Ownership of Latrines and Radios in 1993 and 2002 (percent of households) by poverty category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>1993 households with latrines (N=328)</th>
<th>1993 households with radios (N=328)</th>
<th>2002 households with latrines (N=328)</th>
<th>2002 households with radios (N=328)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Poor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending Poor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Poor</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=<0.01

Although all groups have seen a drop in the proportion of households with radios, the data suggests that the ascending poor and the never poor have replaced radios with televisions wherever possible. It is the descending poor and the chronically poor who have increasingly lost any means of hearing news or messages from the outside world and hence are at risk of becoming increasingly marginalised. The increase in latrines and drop in the number of radios follows national trends. Nationally in 1993, 39% of households had a latrine (Sechaba Consultants, 1994) and this had risen to 46% in 2001 (Government of Lesotho, 2001). In terms of radios, 64% had a radio in 1993 but this only dropped marginally to 63% in 1999 (Sechaba Consultants, 2000)
and probably reflects the fact that the rural areas had actually become poorer as compared to their urban counterparts.

### 6.2.3 Fields and Houses

Fields and rooms can also be considered in some senses assets. Overall the average total number of rooms per household had stayed the same at 3 since 1993. However, the ascending poor and never poor had approximately 2 members per room whilst the other two groups had at least three making them overcrowded. In 1999 nationally, the households above the poverty line had an average of 1.7 members per room and the poor households averaged 2.9.

Field ownership stayed the same with an average of 1.6 but this masks differences between the economic groups. Although those in poverty in 2002 (the chronically poor and the descending poor) had not changed their holdings of land to any great extent the ascending poor had been divesting themselves of fields (the proportion with no fields rose from 6% to 15% between the two years) and it appears the never poor were acquiring them (the proportion without fields dropped from 32% to 20% in the same period). There is a very marked difference between the findings from this survey and national figures of some three years previously. Nationally, in 1993, 23% of households did not have fields (Sechaba Consultants, 2000) and in this survey the proportion was 20%. In 1999, some 41% of households in the whole of Lesotho did not own fields whilst in this survey only 16% of households did not have land. The difference in these figures is probably because households in the urban areas very rarely own fields. However, a vulnerability survey in 2003 found that 34% of rural households did not own land (Moeti et al, 2003), a figure much higher than in this survey. One of the reasons for this discrepancy may well be because of the longitudinal nature of this study. These households are old and well established and therefore have been acquiring land, whilst newcomers or households which have moved from very remote areas to less remote areas have probably found it harder to acquire or even keep land.

However, the percentage of households with fields who did not produce any harvest at all, in other words the fields were probably left fallow tells a different tale. For the chronically poor and the descending poor there has been an increase in the number of households with unproductive fields from about a quarter to a third in 2002. This
reflects the high cost of agricultural inputs in Lesotho and possibly the lack of labour in these households. A third of the never poor households did not plant in either 1992 or 2001 but the ascending poor have seen a dramatic rise in the proportion of households with productive fields so that only 15% of their fields were unproductive in 2002. It appears then that land has different meanings for some of these households. The never poor are acquiring land possibly as a safety net for the future but not actually using it extensively even though they could afford the inputs. As there is a high proportion of miners in this group it is possible also that they lack labour or the decision making power of the head of the household. The ascending poor however are in some cases divesting themselves of land but are using what they keep. Again this points to efficient farming by this group.

6.3 Fuel and Water

The use of 'modern' fuels (electricity, gas, coal and paraffin) had in fact significantly dropped between 1993 and 2002 from 61% of households using modern fuels in 1993 to only 43% in 2002. These are in line with national figures which were 65% in 1993 and 40% in 1999 (Sechaba Consultants, 2000). Again it is the chronically poor and those households descending into poverty who bore the brunt of the change as the only group who actually increased their use of modern fuels was the ascending poor as the following table shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>1993 (N=328)</th>
<th>2002 (N=328)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic poor</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending poor</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending poor</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never poor</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=<0.01

The reason for this drop is likely to be the relative rise in the price of oil-based fuels. Lesotho is not extensively electrified and most of the villages in the sample were not on the national grid nor had access to generators. Solar power is also expensive to install. Paraffin was the most commonly used fuel in 1993 but the price of this has risen above the rate of inflation for other goods and has therefore become too
expensive for many households. It appears therefore, that despite the difficulties of finding more traditional fuels such as dung, shrubs and wood many rural Basotho have decided to economise in this way. This is reflected in the time taken to collect fuel. The average time spent everyday in getting fuel was 100 minutes in 1993 and is now 132 minutes and whereas half the households in 1993 spent less than an hour collecting fuel now half the households spend over two hours. Children and women are the main collectors of fuel so an increase in the use of traditional fuels means an increase in work for them (Gill et al, 2003).

Households had increased their access to clean water in the period between 1993 and 2002. In 1993, 61% of households in this sample had access to either piped water, a borehole or a covered spring. This figure had risen to 81% in 2002. Nationally the figures were 64% in 1993 (Sechaba Consultants, 1994) and 73% in 2001 (Government of Lesotho, 2001). One of the reasons for the slightly higher figures in this sample was because the most remote villages were not interviewed for logistical reasons.

The provision of water in most Basotho villages is a communal undertaking and so should be defined as access to services rather than a household asset. Nevertheless the increase in latrines and the increased access to water reflect the priorities set by Government in the 1990s and show that some of its policies were working. However, even though the chronically poor have increased their access to clean water between 1993 and 2002 they have less access than the other groups. Only 65% of the chronically poor have access to clean water compared to 87% of the ascending poor, 83% of the descending poor and 90% of the never poor. One of the reasons for this is that a larger proportion of the chronically poor are found in the mountain areas as opposed to the lowlands/foothills. Despite Government efforts services in general are worse in the mountains and this is reflected in access to clean water. Again, it is girls in particular who collect water in Lesotho so any increase in access to clean water, especially if it is piped or a pump, not only improves the health of the family but also makes girls lives less arduous.

The picture then, in terms of assets is one where people have by and large hung on to what they had but have been unable to increase their assets substantially. In addition when an object has broken or an animal has died they are unable to repair or replace
them and have to make do without. This is living life at the margins and partially accounts for the high degree of mobility we see in the possession of assets.

6.4 Poverty and Sources of Income

It appears that there was a slight drop in people bringing income into the family between 1993 and 2002. For those people who were present in the household in both years 19% brought in income in 1993 and only 18% in 2002. However there had been considerable movement in and out of different occupations with 58% having changed occupation in this period. Some of this can be accounted for by people either retiring or young people finishing school and starting some form of work. A more worrying trend emerges when we look at those involved in gainful employment. 68% had not changed their employment status (ie gainful or not) between 1993 and 2002 but 22% had dropped out of the labour market in these years and only 10% had joined it. Given the fact that the age profile of the households has not changed radically this means that less people have jobs providing income. The very volatile nature of gainful employment can be seen by the fact that of the 526 people in waged work or income generating activity in 1993, only 248 or 53% were still present in 2002 and of these only 111 or 21% were still in work. Of the 245 people who had left the households 24% were dead (as most of these were waged workers much of this was not due to old age and is probably one of the impacts of AIDS), about 30% had got married and moved away and about 14% were away looking for work so presumably they also had lost their employment.

The following table shows the distribution of waged work across the four groups in 1993 and 2002:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>1993 (N=328)</th>
<th>2002 (N=328)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic poor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending poor</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending poor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never poor</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=<0.01
As would be expected the chronic poor have seen little change in the numbers of wage earners per household (although this figure does show that at least 14% of Basotho have wages that will not take their families above the poverty line). The ascending poor have gained wage workers and the descending poor have seen a dramatic drop in the number of wage earners per household. The never poor have also lost wage workers but have still managed to keep above the poverty line and 48% of them are in the top most quintile which as we have seen has outstripped inflation. This begs the question why do some households, when they lose their wage workers descend into poverty (the descending poor) and why do others manage to maintain their standard of living? Nationally in 1993, 60% of households had at least one wage earner and this had only dropped to 49% in 1999 (Sechaba Consultants, 2000). This reflects the difference between urban and rural households and the difference is almost certainly because of much higher waged employment in the urban centres.

From the data in Table 6.18 it would appear that gifts and family connections pay a large part in preventing a household without wage workers from becoming poor. Farming does not necessarily imply gainful employment. Although farming does at times supply an income, in the majority of households where farming was cited as an occupation no money was derived from this activity. In 1993, 5% of households earned income from farm produce and a further 9% from the sale of livestock. In 2002 this had changed to 12% deriving income from farm produce and 8% from livestock or livestock produce. This is not to say that most households are not involved in some form of farming but most of what is produced will be for home consumption. However it is an important source of income for the very poor as the following table shows:

Table 6.18 Sources of household income by poverty category (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>Chronic poor (N=85)</th>
<th>Descending poor (N=92)</th>
<th>Ascending poor (N=46)</th>
<th>Never poor (N=105)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>12 27</td>
<td>15 20</td>
<td>17 16</td>
<td>13 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts, pensions</td>
<td>38 52</td>
<td>24 52</td>
<td>46 37</td>
<td>13 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; other Wages</td>
<td>21 6</td>
<td>81 7</td>
<td>22 36</td>
<td>91 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual/Informal</td>
<td>43 56</td>
<td>28 43</td>
<td>33 53</td>
<td>27 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB Most households had more than one source of income which is why the columns add up to more than 100%.
Table 6.18 shows that although gifts and casual work are vital to the chronic poor, farming is also an important source of income even though farming in Lesotho is not usually considered that productive. It also shows how farming has become a more important source of income for the newly (descending) poor – and also shows the catastrophic effect of loss of wages on this group. The never poor have substituted the loss of wage income with pensions (usually from the mines), informal work and even farming. The most interesting group is the ascending poor. They appeared to have relied heavily on gifts in 1993 but presumably have been able to use these to climb out of poverty. Along with acquiring waged work they have also expanded their informal businesses so that, contrary to the prevailing trend are less reliant on gifts than previously.

Many of the gifts and pensions come from family members who are working in the mines or in the new textile factories in Lesotho. Mining and income from the South African mines has long been the mainstay of many Basotho households. The period from 1993 to 2002 saw many thousands of miners being retrenched as the gold price fell and South Africa began to change its policies on migrant labour. In 1993 there were 129 miners in the sample. By 2002, only 34 of them were still mining although 11 new people had managed to get jobs in the mines. The ex-miners were now either inactive (13.4%), farmers (19.5%) or job seekers (8.5%). Only one who had come home had found regular paid employment. 54 did not come home (or at least were not in the household in 2002) either because they had died (37%) had married and moved away (35%) or were away looking for work (28%).

6.5 Households who had no income

In 1993, 17 households representing 136 people had no income whatsoever. 50% of these people were under 13 and 62% under 18. In 2002, 20 households reported no income of which 40% were under 18 years. However these two groups were not the same. Only one household in this survey had had no income in 1993 and in 2002 and this was an 88 year old woman living alone on the edge of starvation and only kept alive by gifts from neighbouring villagers. The remaining 16 households from 1993 had all risen through the quintiles with only a third still being in the lowest ‘5’ (but now having at least some income) and one having risen to the topmost quintile.
The 2002 households with no income tended to be smaller than the average with about 4.4 members. These were households which had descended into penury between 1993 and 2002. They tended to have less children (a third had no children under 16 in the house) and less elderly (63% had no-one over 65). Although they also tended to be in the lower quintiles in terms of animals and other assets this was not uniformly so with two households having considerable holdings of livestock. 77% of the children of school age were also attending school financed either by relatives, the Government or scholarships (such as those provided by World Vision). With such small numbers however it is important not to draw generalised conclusions.

As there were considerably more households with no income in 1993 and this study only found those who had improved their status over the years it is clear that this survey did not find the really poor/destitute from 1993 and there is a high probability that these households have either moved, died off, disintegrated or been absorbed by other households.

6.6 Predictors of Income Poverty

From the analysis presented above it can be seen that some factors appear to be related to the economic status of the household more than others. However, in order to ascertain which factors might be the most powerful at predicting income poverty in 2002 a logistic regression was run using indicators from 1993 as the predictors. The dependent variable was whether the household was below or above the poverty line in 2002. The regression was estimated in three 'blocks'. The first set of predictors comprised those to do with the physical assets of the household and income status in 1993. This included ownership of livestock measured in livestock scores; ownership of durables measured in asset scores; the number of fields owned by the household; the number of waged workers in the household and if the household was below the poverty line in 1993.

The second block of predictors was based on factors affecting the composition of the household. The variables therefore also included the number of female adults in the household; whether the head of household was female; the highest level of schooling attained by the most senior female; and the numbers of members in each age group.
In the third block, further variables were entered which related to health of the household and major shocks. These therefore included whether the household had access to a toilet and clean water; whether the house was crowded or not; whether the head of household had changed between 1993 and 2002 and the number of deaths the household had experienced in that time.

In carrying out a logistic regression of this nature problems of endogeneity occur. However by using data from 1993 to predict outcomes in 2002 these problems should be minimised. There is also the risk of some co-linearity between the variables but again none of them are correlated at higher than the 0.5 level using Pearson's product moment and so this can be set aside. Because nearly all the predictors were from 1993 there should be little synchronicity. However, we do not know from the survey at what point in the intervening 9 years deaths occurred or head of households changed. The reason for putting these in as predictors is that other evidence suggests that death, in particular, tends to pre-empt other changes (Black, 2000). Unlike some other African countries, Lesotho in 2002 was not in the grip of any great famine or civil war which was likely to cause death in itself. Death was likely to have been due to disease, in particular AIDS. It was therefore likely to be a contributing factor to a household's poverty status rather than a result of it (although it is also well documented that people are more likely to succumb to their HIV positive status if they are poor, (UNICEF, 2005)).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates from 1993</th>
<th>Model 1 Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Model 2 Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Model 3 Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bovines</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowl</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equines</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep &amp; Goats</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durables</td>
<td>0.97*</td>
<td>0.98*</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage workers</td>
<td>0.65*</td>
<td>0.57*</td>
<td>0.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor in 1993</td>
<td>1.88*</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. female adults</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female head</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's schooling</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 0-5 years</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 6-15 years</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 16-65 years</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. over 65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not crowded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head changed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. deaths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square 41.57** 63.36** 87.42**  
-2 log likelihood 381.32 359.54 335.48  
Nagelkerk's 0.17 0.25 0.33  
R square

Significance levels of covariates predicting poverty in 2002 *<0.05 **<0.01

When just variables to do with physical assets, access to wages and poverty status are entered alone (Model 1) the most significant factors that predict future poverty status are the possession of durables, having a waged worker in the household and not being poor as might be expected. However ownership of animals and fields did not seem to have an impact on future poverty. In model 2 the pattern remains much the same except that poverty status in 1993 no longer acts as a predictor once the composition of the household is taken into account. Now durables are still important as is having a wage worker in the family. But also important is the most senior female having an education.
In Model 3 durables are no longer a significant factor in predicting future poverty along with ownership of livestock or fields. Nor does whether the head was female or not in 1993 have an impact and neither does access to clean water or a latrine. However, for every extra year of education the most senior female achieves the odds of a household being in poverty drop by about 19%. Women's education has long been linked to family health (UNICEF, 1999) but also it appears from this data that educated women are also more capable of finding ways for the household to earn an income. Similarly not being overcrowded improves the chances of not being in poverty by nearly 100%. In a country with the highest TB rates in the world this is not perhaps very surprising as, as well as the number of rooms indicating that the family had wealth at some point in their career, the less overcrowding there is the healthier the family will be. Finally the number of deaths a household has experienced between 1993 and 2002 has a dramatic impact on the likelihood of a household being in poverty in 2002. For every additional death the odds of a household becoming poor increase by 120%. Given the high AIDS rate in Lesotho, and TB related AIDS, this is a strong indication of the link between AIDS and poverty and shows what happens to households which have members suffering from AIDS.

The model tests of fit all point to accepting the final 3 block model as the most reliable. The drop in the -2 log likelihood and the progressive increase in Nagelkerke’s R squared suggest that with the addition of each block the model fit is improved. The chi-square test indicates that the improvement in fit is significant at every stage. Model 3 can explain 33% of the variance.

There are two main points of note from this regression. Firstly the factors which do predict household financial poverty tend to be those to do with the human capital of the household. The ability to earn wages and be well educated may have structural causes but it also requires fit adults of working age and adults who have had the chance to attend school. That deaths in the household have such a negative affect on the income of a household supports this view. Secondly, there are comparatively few predictors of statistical significance. This may be because nine years is too long a time period over which to measure the mobility of a household but it may also be because household economies in a country like Lesotho are much more vulnerable to shocks and major life events. Rather than households being seen as poor (sometimes very poor) but stable what these data show is the volatile nature of
household income. Little wonder then that, although livestock and land do not appear to enrich Basotho households, they may well be seen to protect a household against the worst effects of an erratic labour market.

6.7 People's perceptions of poverty

In the 2002 questionnaire, householders were asked whether they had ever experienced the lack of certain basic amenities. These covered whether they had ever felt unsafe in their own homes, whether they had ever gone without medical treatment, clean water, enough to eat or cooking fuel. They were also asked how they thought they compared to other households and whether the economy of the household had got better or worse in the last nine years. The ability to obtain medical treatment when needed, access to clean water and having enough to eat were all correlated with the poverty group of the household with those being downwardly mobile all experiencing deprivations in these areas more often. A third of the sample said that they often did not have enough to eat (and this question was asked in summer when garden crops should have been available) and nearly a third said that they often went without medical treatment because they could not afford it. However, the chronically poor and the descending poor were far less likely to have enough to eat (about half of them saying they often went hungry) than the ascending poor and the never poor. Similarly with medical treatment the chronically poor and the descending poor often went without.

Feeling unsafe in one's home (ie fearing crime) and having enough fuel were not correlated with income. This is probably because the safety of one's home is more a characteristic of the village than of the individual household and the data showed that positive answers to this question were grouped by location. In the North areas of deprivation tend to be characterised by high crime rates (DWP, 2003). That is not necessarily the case in Lesotho where the degree of urbanisation tends to be a more relevant factor (Sechaba Consultants, 2000). Given that the majority of people used traditional fuels it is also unsurprising that this was not related to income either. In terms of water it is less easy to see why the poor found it more difficult to obtain clean water when, again, this tends to be a village level characteristic.
How people compared themselves to their neighbours was correlated with their income group.

Table 6.20 People's Perceptions by Poverty Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Chronic Poor</th>
<th>Descending Poor</th>
<th>Ascending Poor</th>
<th>Never Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% who consider they are poorer than their neighbours</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who say the household is worse off in 2002 than in 1993</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

85% of the chronically poor and 74% of the descending poor saw themselves as worse off than their neighbours. However only ten households who had either risen out of poverty or who were never poor were prepared to say they were better off than others (most said they were average). In terms of comparisons over time 70% said that the economy of their household had got worse since 1993, 22% that it had stayed the same and only 8% that it had improved (and that by only a little). Both the chronic poor and the descending poor said that life in the household had got worse but the 'never poor' group were less accurate in this respect as 60% of them also agreed with this statement.

Summary and Conclusion

In order to understand the situation of children fully in Lesotho some account has to be taken of the households in which these children live. Owing to the monetised nature of Lesotho's economy, in this chapter it was assumed that indicators of deprivation would correlate with income as has been shown to be the case in the North (Atkinson et al, 2002). It was also hypothesised that indicators of deprivation would therefore be able to predict whether or not a household was in poverty or not at a later date, in this case 2002.

Many demographic factors were shown to correlate with household economic mobility. In particular, the dependency ratio, which measures the number of household members a fit adult in the household has to support, was shown to be higher for those in poverty in 2002, and out migration and death was shown to be greater amongst the
long term and newly poor. In addition the average educational achievement was lower in long term poor households and lack of waged work was also shown to be related to low income.

Ownership of assets was less clearly linked to financial status. The poor were nearly as likely to have fields as the not poor and in the case of those households rising out of poverty they were divesting themselves of land but using that which they kept more efficiently. The never poor households were acquiring land but not necessarily using it implying it was being used as some form of protection against future loss of income. Similarly with livestock there was no consistent pattern with the never poor keeping about the same numbers of animals over the nine year period but all other groups losing a few, including the newly not poor. For this reason livestock and fields are not good predictors of household income poverty in Lesotho.

The exception to the link between financial income and assets was seen in the ownership of radios where the poor were far less likely to have access to this form of communication. Previous studies have shown how people have less political voice in the more remote areas of Lesotho (Turner, 2001). In common with other remote rural areas the Basotho living in the mountains and foothills of Lesotho have 'limited scope for production, higher risks, greater vulnerability, lower political bargaining power' (Bird et al, 2002) perhaps partly because of lack of information.

In terms of access to clean water only the long term poor still lagged behind the other groups although even they had seen a considerable rise in access to piped water or at least covered springs and boreholes. A similar pattern was seen in access to latrines, where all groups had increased access but the not poor had a far greater rate of increase of access. In terms of fuel all groups except the newly poor were using less modern fuels but again the chronically poor had seen the greatest decrease in use.

Most households had more than one source of income but it appears that it is waged work which best protects people from poverty as it has been the catastrophic loss of jobs which seems to have tipped previously not poor households into poverty. This study shows the paramount importance of paid work as a means of pulling people out of poverty and how it is sought after by the majority of Basotho households. Paid work however is a double-edged sword. Whilst it definitely raises families out of
relative poverty, it is one of the least stable occupations for this group of Basotho and its loss can result in a rapid decline in the family's wealth. The study has thrown up various questions however. It is clear that the retrenchment of miners from South Africa has had a major impact on rural Basotho households but against this can be set the growth in employment in the textile industries in Lesotho. These jobs are nearly all filled by women and the pay is much lower than that of miners (Dyer, 2001). In addition there is no formal remittance system from these workers to families back in the rural areas such as there was for miners. It appears that the growth of employment in Lesotho is not benefiting rural households to the extent that work outside Lesotho has done in the past.

The logistic regression echoes the findings of the bivariate analyses. The asset base of a household did not predict it's future wealth and only factors associated with the 'human capital' of a household appeared to make the difference. In this case it was the education of its most senior woman, the inclusion of a wage worker in the household, lack of overcrowding and not experiencing many deaths. The conclusion must be that assets, in the Lesotho context, are not closely related to monetary wealth nor predict financial gain but do represent another form of poverty or wealth. In Lesotho a household can be relatively financially poor but well off for land and livestock or financially well off but deprived in terms of land and other assets often seen vital in terms of Basotho life.

That poverty status in 1993 does not predict poverty status in 2002 and that there are so few predictors of poverty demonstrates the precarious nature of earning a livelihood in Lesotho. Households are relatively economically mobile and find it hard to withstand shocks when the starting base is low. Conversely, the volatile nature of the labour market and changing market conditions mean that it is possible to climb out of poverty by a combination of waged work and efficient use of resources. In fact it is the ascending poor or newly not poor who showed that it is possible to escape poverty not just by getting a job but also by fully utilising land (even if some land has to be given up possibly to fund inputs for the remainder) and by using livestock to the full.

However, given the fact that monetary indicators and other indicators do not correlate well in Lesotho the question remains to be asked as to what indicators should be used to best express the relative wealth or poverty of its people. That income measures are
not the only measure of poverty has been well documented (Bradshaw, 2002) and also that different measures of poverty do not always correlate (Baulch & Masset, 2002). This is true in this study where very few people ranked lowest on all the measures of poverty – income, assets, and self ranking. One issue is that many assets are non-fungible (such as toilets) in rural areas or there is little re-sale value (such as land). Having assets is only of use if they can be realised therefore. It is possible that the worst off households in 1993, in terms of income poverty, asset poverty or malnutrition, have not survived into 2002 and that they were just too vulnerable without substantial external help (Jaspars and Shoham, 1999). In that sense chronic poverty has destroyed these families. This study in Lesotho therefore is a study of mostly long-term, persistently and often deeply poor people but who nevertheless have managed to develop livelihoods whereby they can survive.

In terms of the kind of households children will have been growing up in between 1993 and 2002 in Lesotho the overall picture is varied. Despite high economic growth during the 1990s very little of this appears to have filtered through to the rural areas and particularly the rural poor. People have seen a real fall in income at the same time as growing inequality. The chronically very poor have borne the brunt of this with their incomes only rising by about 20% between 1993 and 2002 whilst those at the other end of the scale have had incomes that have doubled in that period. Along with this has been a steady fall in the numbers of livestock held and in the return from fields with stocks of maize, the staple food, falling. Most people have not been acquiring assets either except for stoves although it is clear that the richer groups have been spending money on building. In particular ownership of agricultural implements has fallen and that of radios. On the other hand more children will have access to clean water and sanitation and that will have undoubtedly helped their health status.
Chapter 7 - Children and Poverty in Lesotho

Introduction

This chapter will look at the children in the households described in the previous chapter. Saporiti (1994) shows how by focussing on children as the unit of analysis a different perspective can be obtained on an issue. This can be in terms of measures of magnitude or in terms of particular issues. For instance, although the number of families with only one child may be on the increase that does not necessarily mean that more children are living without siblings (Saporiti, 1994). It depends whether the household or the child is used as the unit of analysis. Focussing on the child means that a more accurate picture can be given of their situation. In particular children often differ from adults in the scale and depth of the deprivation they suffer as was examined in chapter three.

In this chapter we are assuming that those factors which predicted a household's poverty status (as in the previous chapter) will be instrumental in predicting the poverty status of a child because the child is a member of the household. We are hypothesising that poverty, defined as lack of income, and measured in this way will not differentiate between children, adults and households. If that is the case, we will go on to develop other ways of measuring child poverty and use factors in addition to income to measure child deprivation. However in order to start focussing on children we have to first establish some of the demographic factors in 1993 and 2002.

Firstly therefore we shall look at numbers of children and whether or not they were living with their parents in both waves of the survey. This is because, as we shall show later, children put a high premium on living with at least one parent. We shall then look at the activities of the children in both waves of the survey. In particular we shall look at children's access to schooling and whether they are engaged in various forms of work such as herding and domestic work as this also affects their opportunities in life.

We shall then look at children's financial poverty status in 1993 and 2002 and in particular how far their living conditions in 1993 can be used to predict the poverty
status of children in 2002. The shortcomings of using only income as a measure of poverty will then be assessed and we will discuss how this may not be the best indicator when attempting to measure child poverty. Because of this, suggestions are made for an index incorporating indicators which children themselves have identified which typify poverty to them.

Finally this index is tested through the use of latent class analysis and factor analysis and the proportion of children in poverty using the index variables ascertained.

7.1 Demographics

In 1993 there were approximately 736 children aged under 10 years living in the 328 households selected of whom 48% were boys and 52% girls. In total there were 1284 children under 18 living in these households. Approximations have to be used because it became clear in 2002 that mistakes had occasionally been made over the ages of the children. This was not necessarily a methodological error but was, on occasion, an error made by the household respondent. Age is far less a determinant of lifecycle status than in the North and people often do not keep accurate records with regard to age (or the date of birth was given such as 'he was born at peach blossom time in the year the old Queen started her poultry farm' – a date which it took some research to translate into the Common Era).

However, by 2002 the numbers of children aged 9 or under in households was 369 of whom 51% were girls and 49% boys. In total there were 949 under 18s living in these households. The drop in under 9s would be expected within the lifecycle of the households as children age within the household and people complete their families.

7.1.1 Children without parents

In order to understand some of the analysis later in the chapter and the potential reasons that children were poor or left the household, it is important to consider the numbers of children living without a parent at this point in both waves of the survey. 19% of children under 18 and 15% of those who were under 10 did not live with their parents in 1993. This had risen to 28% of children under 18 years and 24% of those under 10 in 2002. Whether a child lived with their parents or not was not related to their sex. Table 7.1 shows the proportion of children under 18 in 2002 who were
present in the survey in both 1993 and 2002 and whether they were living with a parent at either time point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.1</th>
<th>Children aged under 18 years living with their parents in 1993 and 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Not living with parent 1993</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living with a parent in 2002</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with parent in 2002</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, 18% of the sample of children who were present in both years ceased to live with a parent after 1993. The two main reasons for parents leaving the household were death and the need to look for work elsewhere. Between 1993 and 2002, 12% of the 16 to 65 year olds were reported to have died and the figure is likely to have been higher than this as respondents did not always know what had happened to household members who had left sometime previously. The death toll in this age group is probably a consequence of the growing impact of AIDS and is likely to rise in the near future. The full impact of this disease was also not captured by this study as households where both parents have died, and where there were no relatives present to care for the children, would have disintegrated and probably accounted for some of the 166 households we failed to trace. Children were also sometimes just deserted and left in the family home.

Conversely 22% of the children not living with parents in 1993 saw the return of a parent by 2002. As miners were not counted as living away from home (although fathers could be absent in the gold mines of South Africa for up to 11 months of the year) the parents who returned were probably those who had lost jobs and had returned to the family home, or who had just decided to try and make a life for themselves back in the rural areas. Only 13% of children who were living in the households in both 1993 and 2002 were living without a parent in 1993. This is considerably lower than the figure for the sample overall and points towards the conclusion that the children who remained in the households (particularly those who were under 10 in 1993) enjoyed greater stability in their family lives than did the sample as a whole.
The above figures show the fluid nature of many Basotho households with children both losing parents (to death or migration) and children gaining and re-gaining parents. Most of the children were being looked after by other relatives, particularly grandparents and aunts and uncles. However, as we have seen, there were 15% of children under 10 in 1993 who did not live with a parent. This represents 112 children of whom only 56 were still present in the household in 2002. We do not know what happened to the other 56 and whether the absence of a parent meant that they were more likely to move. The issue of children leaving the household will be addressed in the next chapter but the composition of a household almost certainly is an influencing factor. 3.3% of the under 18’s present in the household in 1993 were said to have died, a considerably lower proportion than the adults. We will now consider how many of the children in this sample were living in income poverty.

7.2 Children and Poverty

As we saw in the previous chapter, although there are various ways of measuring poverty, income measures are one of the most commonly used. Using an income definition, as in the previous chapter, we can take the 6th income decile in 1993 as a poverty line and then increase it by the rate of inflation in order to establish a poverty line for 2002. The proportion of children living below or above this line can then be ascertained. In 1993, 39% of children lived in poverty (almost exactly corresponding with the household measure) and 61% were above the poverty line. By 2002, 53% of children lived in poverty and 47% were above the poverty line. The figures are almost exactly the same for adults which is surprising given that in the industrialised world children normally represent one of the poorest groups (Sgritta, 1984). There also did not appear to be any significant differences in poverty status between the sexes either amongst children or adults. Table 7.2 shows the relative distribution of children and adults in both 1993 and 2002.

Table 7.2 Poverty status of children in 1993 and 2002 (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not poor 2002</th>
<th>Poor 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not poor</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not poor</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although there is no significant difference between adults and children who are not poor in 2002, in terms of whether they were poor or not in 1993, there is a difference between children and adults for those who were poor in 2002. 50% of adults who were poor in 2002 were not poor in 1993. But 54% of children who were poor in 2002 were not poor in 1993. In terms of just those children who were present in the households in both 1993 and 2002 they had seen their poverty rates fall slightly with 49% of them being below the poverty line in 2002. Table 7.2 also shows that the number of people whose income went down in real terms between 1993 and 2002 is greater than those whose income went up. If we use the classifications of Chronic Poor, Ascending Poor, Descending Poor and Never Poor which were used in the last chapter the pattern for all 1421 people who were present in both years is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Poor</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending Poor</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending Poor</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Poor</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern is similar to that of households but there are less ascending poor – presumably because ascending poor households are smaller – and slightly more never poor. There were no significant differences between adults and children in this pattern. As can be seen in Table 7.2 there has been substantial movement in poverty status since 1993. Some children have moved up and gone from being poor to not poor and others have moved down from being not poor to poor. Although it appears that there has been a high degree of stability therefore this is not necessarily the case.

### 7.3 Children’s Activities

The effect of a household’s economic status is reflected in the kind of activities that children are engaged in. Although many respondents claimed their children were ‘inactive’ this did not mean that the children did not engage in household tasks such as fetching water, gathering fuel, minding animals, cooking, washing etc. What it did mean was that they were not perceived to be doing anything as a full-time occupation. If these household tasks were perceived as being a full-time occupation the child was designated as a household worker.
Table 7.3 shows the activities of children aged 5 to 16 over the two waves. As can be seen there has been a dramatic rise in the numbers of children in school in all categories but the chronically poor still lag behind and have less children in school than the other groups. Very few children do any form of regular paid work in Lesotho with the exception of shepherding. Shepherds in Lesotho are either boys or men who spend their time herding either the family’s cattle or flocks or someone else’s herds and who may be paid in money, in kind (eg a sheep) or not paid at all. They are one of the reasons why boys and men in Lesotho are, very unusually, less well educated than the girls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=<0.01

Girls not in school, therefore, tend to do housework whilst boys are shepherds. As there are less poor children in school there is a corresponding rise in children involved in other activities although, apart from herding which is often done for the family anyway, few children living at home were involved in paid work. The relatively high rate for boys doing herding in the ‘never poor’ group is probably because it is this group who employ the shepherd and so they appear as members of the never poor households.

However there has been far more change in the number and percent of children at school almost certainly as a result of the Government’s policy on free education. Table 7.4 shows the proportion of families with none of their children aged 5 to 15 years in school and those with all their children of this age in school. Even the descending poor have managed to increase the numbers of their children going to school. It should be remembered that whilst the official age of the start of school is 5 years many children do not attend until 7 or 8 years old due to the physical difficulties.
of accessing school in the rural areas. Hence not even the never poor have all their children in school at any one time as the younger ones may well not have started.

Table 7.4 Percentage of households with no children and all their children aged 5 – 15 years in school by poverty category (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>Number of households</th>
<th>None in school 1993</th>
<th>None in school 2002</th>
<th>All in school 1993</th>
<th>All in school 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Poor</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending Poor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending Poor</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Poor</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=<0.01

7.4 Predictors of Poverty for Children

It can be seen therefore that more poor children than not poor are out of school and engaged in other activities. That several factors can be used to predict household poverty has been established in the previous chapter. The question is whether these same factors will predict child poverty at any one time and how would these factors compare to adult poverty. In order to compare the predictors of income poverty for adults, children and households a logistic regression was therefore run to ascertain the predictors of poverty status for children in 2002. It was hypothesised that the predictors of household poverty would also predict child poverty at any one time, unless the distribution of children amongst the poor households was very different from adults. So, whether there was a wage worker in the household, the level of mother's schooling, the level of crowding in a house and the number of deaths a household had experienced would all be predictors not only of household income poverty but also of child and adult poverty. As well as these factors, the asset base of the household was also included in case these became significant predictors at an individual level and also factors relating to the composition of the household. Health factors might also be important for children as might the age and sex of the child. The regression was run on all those children who were in the 328 households in the survey in 2002.
As we saw in the previous chapter, in carrying out a logistic regression of this nature problems of endogeneity and co-linearity can occur. However by using almost exclusively data from 1993 to predict outcomes in 2002 some of these problems should be minimised and again none of the correlations between independent variables were above the 0.5 level.

Model 1 shows that the ownership of durables (in this case mostly farm equipment such as planters and cultivators), the ownership of fields and cattle and the presence of wage workers in the household along with whether or not the household was poor in 1993 all have an impact in child poverty. Cattle, owning durables and the presence of a wage worker are all negatively correlated with being poor in 2002 as might be expected as they either bring income into the household or enable a household to earn income. Being poor in 1993 and, perhaps less expectedly, owning fields are positively correlated with being poor in 2002. The household being poor in 1993 approximately doubles the odds of children being poor in 2002. Ownership of fields may seem at first inexplicable. But the previous chapter showed how many of the chronically poor do have fields. It is lack of income that prevents them from using these fields productively however and that may be the explanation here. However, for adults neither cattle nor fields have an impact on predicting future poverty or wealth. Their pattern is more similar to that of households' as a whole whereby only durables and wage workers would have a positive impact at stopping the household becoming poor by 2002.
### Logistic Regression of Predictors of Children in Economic Poverty in 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 OR</th>
<th>Model 2 OR</th>
<th>Model 3 OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses/donkeys</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowl</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/goats</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durables</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own fields</td>
<td>1.21**</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage worker in hhd</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In poverty 1993</td>
<td>2.05**</td>
<td>2.25**</td>
<td>1.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. female adults</td>
<td>1.39*</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in hhd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years mother's school</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female head</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 0-5 years</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 6-15 years</td>
<td>1.12*</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.16-64 years</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. over 65</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.63*</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not crowded</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to clean water</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns Latrine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers who died 1993 - 2002</td>
<td>2.23**</td>
<td>2.21**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| X²                  | 114.99**   | 90.79**    | 190.50**   | 142.64**   | 271.15**   | 188.00**   |
| -2 log likelihood   | 1101.84    | 698.54     | 1026.33    | 646.70     | 944.45     | 601.34     |
| Nagelkerk's R squared | 0.16       | 0.20       | 0.26       | 0.29       | 0.35       | 0.38       |

In Model 2, the ownership of cattle and durables and dwelling in a household with a wage worker all continue to improve the odds for children of not being poor in 2002. Again, the ownership of fields in 1993 increases the odds of being poor in 2002 as does the ownership of chickens and the household being poor in 1993. Ownership of fowl may be significant because they were more likely to be held by poor people in 1993 than because they actually contribute to impoverishment. This is where it is hard to interpret because issues of endogeneity may be coming into play and it is not clear whether poor people are likely to have chickens or owning chickens means one
is more likely to be poor. The same may also be true for land although it does not explain why this would affect children differentially to adults. It may be that the kind of households which had the majority of children in 1993 were those which were poorer and had land which they could not use to generate income.

However, the composition of the household is also important for predicting child poverty. For each additional female adult in the house the chances of being poor increase by 40% and for each additional child aged between 6 years and 15 years the odds are increased by 12%. Conversely, for each additional person over 65 years in the household the odds of a child being in poverty in 2002 drop by over 100% and for each additional year of schooling the most senior female has the child’s odds of being poor drop by 22%. Whilst the feminisation of poverty has been discussed earlier and the link between mother’s (or in this case most senior female’s) schooling and poverty is well established it is less clear why an additional over 65 would make such a difference to the odds of a child being poor.

In Model 3 the ownership of cattle, durables and the presence of wage worker in the household in 1993 remain significant, increasing the odds of a child not being poor in 2002. Owning fowl and fields increases the odds of being poor in 2002 probably more because they are associated with poverty rather than because they cause poverty per se. The poverty status of the household in 1993 no longer is a significant factor in predicting poverty in 2002. Mother’s schooling and the presence of an elderly person in the household still have a strong effect on the prevention of poverty as does not being crowded in 1993. However, for each additional death in the household in the intervening years between 1993 and 2002 the odds of a child of that household becoming poor increase by 120%. For adults the pattern is very similar except that the ownership of fields is not significant but owning durables decreases the odds of being poor which makes sense intuitively.

The model tests of fit all point to accepting the final 3 block model as the most reliable. The drop in the -2 log likelihood and the progressive increase in Nagelkerke’s R squared suggest that with the addition of each block the model fit is improved and the chi-square test shows that this is significant. Model 3 can explain 35% of the variance for children and 38% for adults.
Model 3 suggests that ownership by the household of certain assets and the composition of the household in 1993 may be critical in predicting poverty for children in 2002. Cattle – the traditional form of wealth – help prevent a child from becoming income poor later as does owning farm equipment. The presence of fowl and fields at an earlier date may be a sign that this household is income poor, rather than a causal factor. We have seen that the ascending poor (in the previous chapter) were divesting themselves of land as one means of climbing out of poverty and that those who held on to their land were often the chronically poor. The presence of a wage worker in the family reduces the prospect of a child being poor by 66% and an extra years schooling for the mother by 19%. Apart from the fields and fowl all these factors would seem intuitively correct and support findings from elsewhere.

That child poverty should be related to overcrowding is also not surprising and again echoes the factors predicting poverty status of the household as a whole. Overcrowding causes ill-health and also indicates that the family in 1993 did not have enough money to build more rooms. There is probably therefore some relation between this factor and the number of deaths. The much higher odds of being in poverty for each additional death show the catastrophic impact on children of deaths in the family. Perhaps the most surprising result is the impact having an over 65 year old in the family has on child (and adult poverty) in 2002. By 2002 this elderly person may not even have still been in the household and may have died. However, it is possible that what it does indicate is a stable household. These households, that is one's with over 65s, are not new households with young parents just starting out. They probably had various assets built up over the years and, more importantly, an extensive knowledge and kin base. There is no formal pension system in Lesotho but these elderly people might well have had children elsewhere who sent them money and they may also have been experienced farmers, or able to supply farm labour when their children were working away. In addition many older women brew traditional beer or have herbalist skills which also bring in income. Most over 65s would also be unlikely to be HIV positive and therefore able to look after grandchildren whilst the younger members of the household earn income. Given that poverty for the elderly is becoming an increasing concern (Barrientos, 2003) the evidence here appears to be to the contrary and the elderly have a vital role to play in keeping children out of poverty.
Adults followed a very similar pattern to children, although in their case the ownership of cattle in 1993 appeared to have less impact and the ownership of durables more, which is more in line with the predictors for household poverty.

However, the above regressions for adults and children have looked at predictors for any child being in poverty in 2002. This included children who had not been born in 1993 (ie children under 10) and took no account as to whether children had left the household between 1993 and 2002 or joined it. This was possible because only household indicators were used from 1993 and the age and the sex of the child was taken from the 2002 data. If we look at the numbers of children who were present between 1993 and 2002 we find that there are far fewer of them. There were 736 children under 10 in the households in 1993. As these children were under 10 years they might be expected to still be in the household in 2002 as they would still legally be minors in 2002. In fact only 529 were still attached to the original households. 207 of them were no longer in the 328 households of our study – that is nearly a third of the sample. Similarly, 420 children have joined the households since 1993. The majority of these children were born since the last survey and so are under 9 years old. But 105 are aged between 10 and 17 years and so must have moved into the households from elsewhere. In the next chapter we will be looking at the children who have left the households or who have joined from another household but we will now look at those children who were under 10 years in 1993 and were still in the household in 2002. These children I have named the ‘stayers’ as opposed to the ‘leavers’ or ‘incomers’.

When the logistic regression is run again on just the ‘stayers’ there is very little difference between the predictors of poverty for the ‘stayers’ and for all the children in 2002. The exception is the impact of cattle, ownership of which, as for the adults, did not have any significant impact on the child’s status later. Again the presence of a wage worker in the household in 1993, more years of mother’s schooling, not being crowded and the presence of an over 65 year old all mitigate the likelihood of becoming poor whilst the number of deaths and the presence of fowl all predict an increase in the odds of these children being poor in 2002.

The presence of a wage earner, mother’s schooling, the level of crowding and the number of deaths all have an impact on poverty levels at household, adult and child...
levels. Adult and child poverty is also influenced by the presence of an over 65 year old in the household and possibly by the presence of fowl in 1993. In addition adult poverty is influenced by ownership of durables and children's by the ownership of cattle (for all children present in 2002). It would appear therefore, that whilst the pattern of predictors is broadly the same for all three groups there are some differences and children’s financial poverty in particular is more sensitive to factors affecting the household in 1993 than the poverty of the household as a whole.

These factors therefore do tell us something about children’s income poverty but do not differentiate substantially between the three groups household, adult and child. But, as we have seen in chapter 3, we might expect that there should be more differences between child and adult poverty either in terms of the factors predicting that poverty or in terms of the experience of that poverty. This might be true particularly in terms of family composition and health factors. In addition these household level predictors do not capture the full range of deprivation children may suffer.

7.5 A Child Poverty Index

We have seen in chapters two and three how measures of income poverty have many drawbacks when considering poverty in the developing world and when considering child poverty. Firstly, and this applies to any country in the world, measurements of income do not directly address the question of child poverty. This is because these measurements tend to be based on the amount of income coming into a household which is then allocated to each individual either, as in this survey, by just dividing the total income by the number of household members or, as is usually the case in industrialised countries, by using equivalence scales which allocate the income differentially according to age. However children do not necessarily have direct access to that money. As children do not have direct access to income (although they may well earn some of it) and probably have little control over how it is spent, other measures need to be considered when investigating child poverty. The regressions above show that there is little difference between child and adult poverty when using solely income measures whereas we might have expected more difference based on research in the North.
Secondly, as we have seen in chapter 6, income is only part of the livelihood strategy of most Basotho households. Not only is monetary wealth often converted into more traditional forms of wealth for instance cattle (and when inflation is high this makes some sense) but produce from the land, animal produce, bartering, payment in kind etc. all have an important role to play in the creation of Basotho livelihoods. The previous chapter has shown the multiplicity of livelihood strategies undertaken by the Basotho and it is clear that very few households could survive on just the income they receive. However, the question then arises of what are the critical indicators of poverty and what factors should be taken into account when describing somebody as poor?

In addition it is clear that there is considerable mobility of poor children. If a third of the under 10s have moved out of the household by the time they are followed up it is necessary to understand their situations more fully and to investigate their circumstances which may have led to their leaving the household. In recent years it has been recognised that the greatest experts on poverty are the poor themselves (Chambers, 1993; Narayan, 1999). So great has been the influence of the advocates of participatory approaches to the measurement of poverty that the World Bank now requires all countries seeking loans to have conducted research using participatory methods to inform their Poverty Reduction Strategy Programmes. It seemed appropriate therefore to ask children themselves how they defined poor people and what factors a poor child might be expected to exhibit.

In this study 8 group discussions were held with children to discuss with them different aspects of poverty. Six of the groups were held in primary schools and involved children aged between 8 and 12 years. The other two groups were held with children under the age of 14 but not in school. As poverty is a sensitive and sometimes stigmatising subject in Lesotho and as many of the children were unused to expressing their opinions in groups (or even as individuals) a variety of discussion starters were used including picture cards, getting children to draw pictures and story telling.

These discussions were then analysed using grounded theory and various major themes emerged around the subject of poverty. From these themes it should be possible to develop an index of well-being much like that for adults. The indicators for poverty fell into roughly four categories – those to do with material objects, those
around health issues, those to do with future opportunities and those to do with the
kind of care children received in the village.

Material well-being - Most of the children showed a great preoccupation with the
material consequences of being poor. When shown pictures of differently sized and
dressed people they immediately identified those with ragged clothes and those who
were thin as being poor. When asked to draw a picture of their village and then asked
which households were rich and which poor they explained that the smaller houses
made up of traditionally built rondavels with few cattle and livestock were the poor
ones. The rich households had modern style housing with many rooms and many
cattle and productive fields. This became apparent even when the facilitator was
asking a question of clarification:

F: What do you call people who rear animals (expecting the answer balisana or
herder)
C: Rich people!
F. (laughing) Rich in what?
C: Rich in animals!

Rich people were described as having many animals for food, produce and as a
means of transport and of having many durables (which would have to have been
bought with money). To be rich therefore implies access to money but also access to
other types of wealth such as animals and productive fields.

Because, as the previous chapter showed, ownership of fields is, if anything
negatively correlated with income and also cultivation of fields requires inputs bought
with money it was decided not to include fields in the index. However, as the children
identified animals as a source of wealth as well as money, two indicators were used to
measure the material wealth of a child’s household – a score for the number of cattle,
equines, small stock and fowl and the cash income of a household.

Health - The children often mentioned poor people as being unhealthy people. As
well as being too thin and always hungry, the poor were said to be dirty partly
because they did not have access to clean water and partly because they could not
afford soap. When shown a picture of someone sick in bed several groups identified
her as poor because she could not afford medical care to make her well and similarly
a picture of a disabled person was associated with being poor either because they
were unlikely to get a job with a disability or because their job (in this case most of the
children meant mining) had caused the disability and thus loss of work. Tuberculosis
is one of the main fatal diseases in Lesotho and most children were familiar with it and
the disability it can lead to. Unfortunately the 1993 data did not ask about disability
and so other indicators have had to be used. The indicators used to measure health,
therefore, are the number of people in the household divided by the number of rooms
(i.e. a measure of crowding and related to respiratory diseases) and whether a
household had access to a clean source of water (which relates to diarrhoeal
diseases and diseases of malnutrition).

Opportunities - The children in the groups were asked about what their hopes for the
future were and what they would like to be when they grew up. Nearly all of them
wanted to be paid employees, a very few said they would like to run their own
business and only one child said they would like to make a career out of farming.
Although most households do engage in some form of farming the children's
responses reflect the fact that Lesotho has an increasingly monetised economy and
that they do not see farming as a way of providing themselves with an income. Nearly
all the children said that a formal education would be critical in helping them gain paid
work and a way that they would be recognised as full citizens of Lesotho. During the
discussions it also became clear that several children's aspirations were linked with
the employment of their relatives. Relatives who worked could help children find work
and knew what kind of skills would be needed in their place of employment. Employment was not just to do with earning an income but also with maintaining
mental health and lack of stress:

F: (whilst discussing a picture of an unemployed man) Why do you think this
unemployed father is poor?
C: He doesn't have a job because he didn't attend school.
F: And what else?
C: He is worrying.
C. Because he doesn't know what to do.
In this category therefore the indicators used will be ones that provide children with options in life, namely whether, if aged between 6 and 15 years they are in school or if aged between 16 and 18 years, they have gone beyond Standard 3 of primary school, and whether there is a wage earner in the family.

**Care** - That children who are not cared for properly are poor is a strong theme running through the group discussions. Poverty was not just seen as being a lack of material things or even lack of opportunity but also a lack of care and even a lack of identity. Orphans in particular were singled out as being poor whatever their material circumstances:

F: Here is an orphan at the orphan school. He is carrying a radio so why do you say he is poor?
C: Because he doesn’t have parents.
F: And why does that mean he is poor?
C: Because he doesn’t know his mother, because he doesn’t have parents.

The members of the groups clearly saw it as the parent’s responsibility above all others to feed and clothe their children. Not being poor therefore means being cared for by parents and the village community, by those people being fit and able to feed clothe and literally ‘take care’ (*hlokomela*) of children and by there being people in the household who love and give emotional support to children. This study, along with many others, shows the fluid nature of many African households and the fact that children are often brought up by relatives. Yet in the discussions, children made it clear that, whilst placing a high premium on other family members especially grandparents, biological parents are the prime source of love and care. It should only be necessity therefore which forces children to look to people other than parents to fulfil their needs. Living with grandparents may have been emotionally supportive but children felt that their ability to meet all the children’s needs was more limited than if the younger parents were present.

In this category therefore the following indicators were chosen: whether a child lives with a biological parent or not and whether there are active members aged between 16 and 55 in the household. 55 years was used as the cut-off date for several reasons. Firstly because, if the child was below 10 years in 1993, this was the oldest
someone of parental age could be expected to be. Secondly because children themselves saw old age as a double edged sword. Although grandparents often offered love and care yet they were also susceptible to ill health and possibly death. It was unusual for many over 55s to be in paid employment. Thirdly because the sample size for over 65s was too small when considering only the 'stayers'.

The table below shows the indicators used and what they imply.

### Table 7.6 Child Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material wealth</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of Animals</td>
<td>Quintile 4 or 5</td>
<td>Quintiles 1,2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Below poverty line</td>
<td>Above poverty line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage earner in household</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school 6-15yrs or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std 4 &amp; above if 16-18yrs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding</td>
<td>&gt; 3 people per room</td>
<td>3 or less people per room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to clean water</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Care</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active members 16-55 in hhd</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with a parent</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to achieve a single measure of animal wealth, animals were given a score according to their relative values (see chapter 4). Each household was then placed in a quintile depending on how they scored on each of these measures.

Correlations were run on these variables for all children in 1993 and 2002. Although there were strong correlations between many of them, only one was above the 0.5 level – the correlation in 1993 between lack of wage workers in the family and whether the household is below the poverty line and this had actually dropped by 2002 to 0.425. This means that although there are strong associations between these variables they each also stand independently and represent an individual measure. Although it is possible that more relevant indicators could be found the analysis had to be restricted to variables which were available in both the 1993 and 2002 data sets.

If an index is therefore drawn up children can be given a total score depending on their score on each of the different indicators. However, there is still the question as
to whether all these indicators, based on what is known about Basotho society and what the children themselves discussed actually measure something called 'poverty'. Do all these variables represent an underlying condition, and if they do can children be placed either on a scale or in a category representing their 'poverty status'?

The answer to this problem may be to see how the variables grouped and whether they clustered together to form a pattern. To do this either factor analysis can be used or latent class analysis (LCA). Latent Class Analysis is usually used when there are set of interrelated categorical variables but which may not be causally related and are manifestations of some underlying unobserved condition (McCutcheon, 2001). It is sometimes seen as the equivalent of factor analysis for categorical data, and measures the probability of an individual belonging to a group which exhibits similar measures on the indicators of the underlying latent variable.

'LCA is used to measure the true scores on underlying, not directly observed, categorical variables by means of a set of observed categorical variables that function as the indicators of these underlying, latent variables. The indicators are not perfect measures of the latent variables, but they are subjected to 'random', non-systematic errors that lead to probabilistic relationships between the latent variables and the indicators' (Hagenaars, 2001; p234)

Latent class analysis establishes if there are clusterings of any of the children according to their scores on the indicators and then ascertains the probability of a child being in that particular group. Some of the variables used in the index are dichotomous (based on a categorical measure) and some are continuous. The question therefore is whether factor analysis should be used or latent class analysis. Although traditionally seen as dealing with two different types of data it is possible to use either method. As Muthen (2003) says when discussing whether to use factor analysis or LCA:

'This should not be seen as a problem, but merely as two ways of looking at the same reality. The factor analysis informs about underlying dimensions and how they are measured by the items, while the latent profile analysis sorts individuals into clusters of individuals who are homogenous with
respect to the item responses. The two analyses are not competing but are complementary'. (Muthen, 2003 p 371)

As this analysis is concerned with clusters of individuals latent class analysis was used primarily but was confirmed using factor analysis. One of the issues in latent class analysis when using two waves of data is whether the manifest variables are measuring the same thing in both waves. Owing to the nature of this data, that is the manifest variables are not measuring opinions which may be affected by external events but are using objective data, this is less likely to be a problem. If material wealth, access to opportunities, access to a healthy lifestyle and being cared for are all manifestations of some underlying variable or factor this is not likely to change greatly over time unless the overall wealth of a country changes substantially.

Probabilities for each child being in a particular group were calculated in both 1993 and 2002. The first model was developed using all children under 18 in 1993 and all children under 18 in 2002. In other words the data was treated as cross-sectional in nature rather than longitudinal. In the second model just the 529 children who were present in the household in both years were included. If the index is indeed a reflection of poverty status one would expect there to be some sort of continuum between those children who are high scorers in every category and those who were low in every category.

Table 7.7 shows the results for 1993 and 2002 for a three class latent class model.
Each column in Table 7.7 represents the probabilities of the members of each class or group X1, X2 or X3 obtaining that score within the category concerned. So, for instance, the children allocated to group X2 have a 42% chance of scoring 2 in the Health category. That is they have both access to clean water and are not living in crowded conditions. Similarly the children represented by the group X1 have a 15% chance of scoring 1 in the Care category which means they are living with an adult between 16 and 55 years of age but who is not their parent. The numbers in bold show the highest probability scores in each category for each class or group. By comparing these probabilities we can draw up a profile for each latent class.

A chi-square statistic of 80.25 with 54 degrees of freedom indicates a reasonably good model fit with p=<0.005. However, because chi-square is very sensitive to the number of parameters in a model (McCutcheon, 2001) it is more common to test the fit of a LCA model by assessing the Akaike Information Criteria and the Baysian

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Probabilities in 1993 (N=1284)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Probabilities in 2002 (N=925)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>X1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in each group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit statistics</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X²</td>
<td>80.25</td>
<td>82.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>-306.80</td>
<td>-279.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>-28.29</td>
<td>-19.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Criteria. These two measures take into account the total number of parameters required to estimate the model (AIC) and the total number of parameters and the sample size (BIC). Models with lower AICs and BICs are therefore preferred to those with higher values (McCutcheon and Mills, 1998). In the case of the model in Table 7.7, a two class model (ie just X1 and X2) gave positive AICs and BICs and so was rejected. When a four class model was specified the AIC and the BIC were lower than for the three class model. However, there were problems with interpretation. Not only were two of the categories very similar in terms of the distribution of probabilities but X4, the fourth class, only comprised about 2% of the total sample. It was decided therefore to adopt the three class model as the most parsimonious model with a low BIC and AIC.

The model above suggests that there were three groups of children in Lesotho in 1993 and 2002. GroupX1 represents those children who have a higher probability of scoring fairly low in every category except ‘care’. So, for instance, they have a 63% chance of being below the poverty line and being quintile 4 or 5 in terms of ownership of livestock. They have few animal assets and low income, their opportunities in life are few given that they are probably not in school and do not have a wage worker in the family, they probably live in an overcrowded home and their access to clean water is limited. However in 1993 they had an 84% probability of being cared for by at least one of their own parents who were below 55 years old. 20% of children were in this group. Group X2 are the more fortunate children who have relatively high material wealth, relatively high opportunities and access to a healthy lifestyle and also are cared for by their parents. 69% of children were in this group.

However the picture in Group X3 is not quite so straightforward. These are children who are placed mid way between the other two groups in terms of material wealth, opportunity and health. They are likely to score 1 in the material wealth category and 1 in the health category although they also have few opportunities. It is in the ‘care’ category that the difference really lies. Unlike the other two groups these children only have a 49% chance of living with their parents and a 17% chance of not living with anyone aged between 16 and 55 years which may well be why their opportunities in life are so low.
By 2002 the proportion of children in the wealthier group had dropped to around 44% and the differences between the two groups were becoming more stark. Correspondingly the poorer group has expanded with 28% of the children now in the X1 group. The proportion of children in X3 has also grown dramatically with 27% of the children now in this group. This means that 27% of children now have only a 50% probability of living with a parent or with someone of working age. The rise in this group is possibly linked to the rise in deaths from HIV/AIDS and may be a factor behind the greater mobility of children which will be discussed in the next chapter.

These results suggest that at least three of the categories were measuring an underlying variable or factor which can be called poverty. Given that one group measures 'high' on most of the indicators and another 'low' one could hypothesise that these were the opposite ends on a continuum. Even the fact that there was a third group, if all the variables were placed midway between the other two groups, this would not contradict this hypothesis. However, the fact that the third group has much lower probabilities for 'Care' suggests that there are a group of children who are distinct from the other two by virtue of the fact that they are not receiving care from a parent-like figure. The question is whether 'care' really is vital to the measurement of poverty or whether one would acknowledge the fact that children find themselves in this situation but it is not connected to 'poverty' per se.

There are several reasons for keeping 'care' as part of a measurement of poverty, however. Firstly, the children themselves felt that lack of parental care was a marker of whether children could be considered poor or not. Secondly, the measurement of 'care' flags up an important area of children's lives about which there has been relatively little research done in connection with child poverty. The measures used in this study may be too crude to have captured the full impact of the lack of care for children but studies in the industrialised world have shown how lack of emotional care has a direct impact on outcomes for children (Rutter, 1972; Duncan & Brooks-Gunn, 1997). Thirdly, it is quite possible, and indeed probable, that many children lacking care have not been included in this analysis of poverty because they have had to leave home and are living elsewhere. The lack of parental care has led to other forms of impoverishment. The following chapter looks at some of the children who have left the homes they inhabited in 1993, and what some of the reasons were for this, but a lot more research needs to be done in this area.
In order to test the hypothesis that there may be some sort of underlying continuum a factor analysis was carried out on the same data. If only one factor was obtained then these variables would all make up a continuum, on which each child could be placed. Table 7.8 shows the loadings on the components using Principal Components Analysis and rotating the model using Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 7.8 Rotated Factor Analysis of Child Poverty Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1993 (N=1284)</th>
<th>2002 (N=925)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material wealth</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>1.632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If an Eigenvalue of 1 is taken as a cut off point for the consideration of factors then two factors are obtained from this analysis of the data. The first factor, in both years, has relatively high loadings on all the variables. The second factor has low loadings on most variables except 'care', again suggesting that 'care' does not fit neatly into a continuous scale for measuring poverty. However, the fact that factor 2 has an eigenvalue just over one means that it is a matter of judgement whether to include this factor or not. If this factor is not included then the results suggest that the variables used in this index do indeed represent a continuum.

7.6 Stayers

A different pattern emerges if we look at the results of analysing the data using latent class analysis on only children who were present in the households in both 1993 and 2002. These children were under 10 years in 1993 and by 2002 they would still have been under 18 and still living in the household. Table 7.9 shows the result - a two class model for the 529 children with the wave or time (ie 1993 or 2002) being part of the model and using the 2002 score for each child.
Table 7.9  Latent Class Analysis of Child Poverty Indicators in 2002 for Children in Households in 1993 and 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N=523)</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in each group in 1993</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in each group in 2002</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fit statistics

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>152.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>-721.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>-97.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again the two class model was chosen as the preferred option because it was the most parsimonious whilst maintaining a negative BIC and AIC and a significant chi-square value.

The two groups are harder to interpret than those for the whole sample. X1 represents children who are relatively poor in terms of material wealth and health but who have limited opportunity (probably are attending school) and a high probability in terms of living with a parent or someone of working age. X2 represents children who have the probability of being materially wealthier and have better health but their opportunities are fairly evenly spread (possibly because they represent the older children who may have left school) and their chances of living with a parent or someone of working age is about equal to that of Group X1. The children and young people in these groups have seen major changes in the proportion of them in each group. In 1993, 66% of these children were in the poorer group and 34% in the richer.
By 2002, 41% were in the poorer group and 59% in the wealthier although, as noted before both groups had high care figures.

Why have so many children in this sample – that is those children who were in the households in both years- improved their poverty status? Although there does not appear to be much data from the developing world on lifecycles of poverty it is well documented in the industrialised world that families with young children tend to be poorer (Gordon and Townsend, 2000; Bradbury at al, 2001). It is possible a similar phenomenon is seen in Lesotho, although the logistic regression earlier in the chapter did not indicate this. However it should be remembered that all the children included in the regression were less than 10 years old in 1993 and so probably belonged to young families. Secondly, and possibly more plausibly, it is likely that the poorer children are no longer in the sample. It is possible that those children who have remained at home are those who can be adequately cared for by their parents or relatives because they have the means to support them and the fact that children in 2002 in the poorer group in this sample still have an 80% chance of living with a parent supports this view. Those children from families who could not guarantee them a certain level of support have maybe been sent to other relatives or have left home in search of a better life and therefore are no longer in the sample. The large number of children who were no longer in the household (nearly a third of the 1993 sample) would support this hypothesis.

Summary and Conclusion

There were some 1284 under 18 year olds in the survey households in 1993. By 2002 this had dropped to 949. Of these 949, 523 had been in the household since 1993 and so were present in both waves of the survey. Analysis of the proportions of children and adults below and above the poverty line showed that there was little difference between them. However, children who were not poor in 1993 were more likely than adults to have become poor by 2002. A considerable number of children did not live with their parents in 1993 and this had risen to 28% by 2002. Children's activities were related to their income status with poor children being less likely to attend school and to be more likely to engage in work such as herding and housework.
The predictors of child poverty were very similar to that of adult poverty. Treating the data cross-sectionally we find that the presence of a wage worker in the household; increased year's of the most senior female's schooling; the presence of an over 65 year old and not being crowded all act against the chance of a person becoming poor. On the other hand increasing numbers of deaths in the household and the ownership of fowl are all related with an increased chance of the person becoming poor. With regard to children the ownership of fields also is related to an increased chance of being poor later possibly because farming is an extremely non-lucrative profession in Lesotho and the fields have not been traded for something more lucrative. However, this is a clear indication where being income poor does not necessarily correlate with being poor on other measures, such as ownership of land. Cattle also reduced the odds of a child becoming poor presumably because they are fairly fungible. When using the data longitudinally the results for predicting child poverty are very similar to the cross-sectional analysis.

This analysis therefore shows some of the limitations of only using income as a measure of poverty, particularly for children. Because adult and child poverty, when measured using income measures only, are so similar other measures that differentiate children have to be found if one is to look more closely at the phenomenon of child poverty. However, in some senses, it seems that income poverty merges the distinctions between adults and children. Children are increasingly likely to undertake jobs that would otherwise have been done by adults (such as herding and housework) and are less likely to do activities normally associated with childhood such as go to school. To be income poor therefore means a blurring of the differences in roles and responsibilities between adults and children.

However children have limited access to money and in a developing country context many households have multiple livelihood strategies (Scoones, 1998; Ellis, 2000) and many of these are not based on financial transactions. In order to try and use a broader definition of poverty, therefore, and one which captures more of children's experience of being poor, children's own descriptions were used to try and draw up an index of indicators of poverty. Such an index was inevitably restricted to data that was available in both 1993 and 2002. The index was divided into four main categories – material wealth which comprised cash income and animal assets; opportunity, comprising attendance at school and whether there was a wage worker in the family;
health, comprising the extent of crowding in the house and access to clean water; and
care, comprising whether a child lived with their a biological parent or not and whether
there was anyone of working age in the household. It was recognised that these
categories may not be ideal but there were restrictions as to what items were
available in the data set.

Latent class analysis was used to assign children to different groups based on the
indicators in the index. The first three categories appeared to form a continuum of
wealthy to poor and this was confirmed by looking at a factor analysis of the same
indicators from the index. However the exception was the category 'care' which did
not appear to fit into the continuum and so, although correlated with the other
indicators, possibly represented a different factor or latent variable. However, children
put a high premium on living with their parents and research in the industrialised world
suggests that there is a link between good emotional care and the full development of
the child. It may be more useful, therefore, to see the indicators as a constellation of
elements which can be brought together in different ways to form groups that children
can be assigned to, rather than as a straight continuum from rich to poor. The
assigned groups were related to the income status of a household with children
assigned to the 'rich' group tending to be in households with incomes above the
poverty line and children assigned to the 'poor' group in households below the poverty
line.

When only children who had been present in both 1993 and 2002 were analysed
using a similar methodology a very different pattern emerged. Although broadly split
into two groups – wealthier and poorer there were no differences in the probability of
these children being cared for. This suggests that this particular group of children all
received relatively high care regardless of their status on the other indicators. This, in
turn, may suggest that this particular group were more likely to still be at home
because they are receiving adequate care. The wealthier group has also increased in
size again implying that children stay in the household because they are having all
their needs met.
Chapter 8 - Life Paths of Poor Children

Introduction

The previous chapter showed the likely outcomes for children who were under ten in 1993 and who were still in the same households in 2002. The very fact that they were still found in those original households suggested that these children had lived fairly settled lives. However, the 2002 survey also showed that nearly a third of the children who were present in 1993 had left that 1993 household by 2002. These children were still under 18 years old – one of the legal ages of majority in Lesotho – in 2002 and so there is the question as to what has happened to these children. Migration, as a strategy for coping with poverty, has long been established (Boyle et al, 1998, Waldorf, 1996) but there is a possibility that other factors also come into play when looking at children’s migration, such as the HIV/AIDS status of family members (Ansell & van Blerk, 2004), or whether the child was actually living with their biological parents in 1993. That adults often migrate to seek work or a better land is well documented; what is less well documented is what happens to the children in these circumstances and also whether children decide to migrate for themselves. For instance, ‘street children’ are clearly a form of migrant (Baker & Panter-Brick, 2000) but it is less clear what happens to children who leave their homes but who do not live life independently in the urban areas.

There is also a question as to whether, in fact, the children in this study have migrated out of the household completely or whether the pattern of a child’s life in Lesotho allows for some fluidity of movement between different households depending on the current circumstances of the family. The absence of a substantial number of children from the original households began to emerge as fieldwork for the 2002 survey was completed and quickly became apparent when the data were being prepared for analysis. As a result an attempt was made in 2003 to trace some of the children who were no longer present in the 2002 household sample. The questionnaire administered to the households in 2002 had asked where members who had left the household might have gone. At that point it was not anticipated that so many children would have left and so the replies were only recorded in general terms. This small
tracer study therefore involved going back to these original households for more information and then trying to trace the children who had left.

Only 27 children were found in the tracer study although some 207 had left their 1993 households. Those children who were found were asked to chart their lives since 1993 and explain where possible why they had left the 1993 household and what they were doing now. It was only possible to undertake one interview per child, so the data is not exhaustive but the accounts the children gave do give some indication of the pattern of lives experienced by children who do not remain in one place. However, as well as children moving out of the households, children had also moved in and the question then arises as to whether these children were in any respects different from children of a similar age who had remained in the households all along.

This chapter then sets out to explore the link between the physical mobility of children and poverty. As there is limited quantitative data available the conclusions are indicative and raise further questions that larger studies may be able to address more comprehensively. Nevertheless, the 19 interviews held with children who have moved household in Lesotho provide an insight into what some of the issues are for these children and what future surveys could explore more fully.

This chapter therefore begins by looking at the numbers of children who have moved – either out or in - and the poverty status of the household that they left or joined. Section 1 covers the children who have joined the households since 1993 and looks at the roles they play within the households. Section 2 explores the factors which predict the likelihood of a child leaving the household and section 3 looks at the kind of households these children have left and the reasons they gave for leaving. In section 4 the destinations of the children who have left are considered and in section 5 we look at the role of schooling in these children’s lives. Finally in section 6 we assess the condition of the households of origin in 2002 to assess whether the children improved their positions in life by moving or not.

In order to simplify descriptions of the various children and their movements, those children who have left the households will be known in this chapter as ‘leavers’; those who have come into the households as ‘incomers’; and those who were present in the household in both 1993 and 2002 as ‘stayers’.
8.1 Children moving in (the incomers)

420 children had joined the 328 households in the survey since 1993. The majority (315) of these children are under 9 years old and so were born since the last survey. There is a high likelihood they were born into their present households. But 105 are aged between 10 and 17 years and so must have moved into the households from elsewhere. They may well be family members but like those who left have moved household for a reason. Table 8.1 shows what these incomers, who were not born into the household were doing in 2002.

Table 8.1 Activities in 2002 of children aged 10-17 years (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>% of all</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>% of all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household worker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=&lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, the incomer boys are more likely not to be in school and are more likely to be herding than the children who have stayed in the households between 1993 and 2002. Boys, therefore, were being brought into the household to help with the herding and for schooling (although to much lesser extent than the girls). Girls were being brought in to do domestic tasks and to attend school. None apparently came in ostensibly for waged work, but it is common practice in Lesotho to provide girls brought in for domestic work with clothes and food and to provide boys who come to herd with, for instance, a sheep for his family and with food. Some of this labour would therefore undoubtedly be paid for even if it was 'in kind'.

It is also unlikely that many of these children (either incomers or stayers) were inactive. Nearly all children in Lesotho, particularly of this age would help with household chores and the term 'inactive' is more likely to imply that they are not fully employed than that they do nothing all day.
However, apart from boys herding and therefore having less access to schooling, the incoming children did not differ greatly from those already in the households. The girls in particular were being taken in to help with their schooling. Some of these children had therefore moved in to help with the household and others to benefit by the association (the two are not necessarily mutually exclusive). This is borne out by the fact that it is the wealthier households or the households who were wealthy in the past who are taking these children in as Table 8.2 shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty status as assessed in 2002</th>
<th>% incomers (N=105)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic poor</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descending poor</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascending poor</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never poor</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen the never poor and descending poor (who may well have taken these children before they lost their incomes) house a far greater proportion of the incoming children than the chronic and ascending poor both of whom started from a very low base in 1993. However, all the households took in some children whether poor or not.

### 8.2 Factors predicting children leaving the household

As has been seen, a total of 328 households had been interviewed in 1993 and 2002. In 1993 there were 736 children under 10 years in this sample. 529 (71%) of these children were still in the original household in 2002 which meant that 207 (29%) had left for various reasons. In other words nearly a third of the children under 10 from 1993 had disappeared from the survey by 2002 even though the household had been traced. The question was therefore what had happened to these children and why had they left the original households? The householders in the household survey were asked why they thought certain members of the household had left. Some did not know why, others possibly did not want to say but most gave some kind of reason. At this point in 2002 it was not anticipated that such a high proportion of the children would not be there, otherwise detailed information would have been sought. As it was the answers given are shown in Table 8.3:
Table 8.3 Reasons given for children leaving the household after 1993 (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>% who left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gone to look for work</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran away/was expelled</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone to stay with relatives</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went with parents to new house</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone elsewhere in Lesotho</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen some of these categories are more explanatory than others. In particular, ‘gone elsewhere in Lesotho’ does not give any idea whether this was alone, with other relatives or with parents. They may also include some ‘don't knows’ who did not like to admit to not knowing. A nine percent death rate is high, and the death rate was possibly even higher if children died sometime after leaving the household and the original household did not know about it. However it is not very different from the child mortality rate (about 84/1000) for all Lesotho. One reason why the death rate may have been slightly higher was because these were rural children who did not have access to the same sort of health facilities as urban children enjoyed.

By far the largest category of children who had left is that of children who had left to find work. As the survey did not ask exactly when these children had left the household it is likely that these children left during their teenage years. However by 2002 they would have still been under 18 years and so are still minors. It was very difficult to trace any of these children as, although the household of origin occasionally said they had gone to stay with relatives, when these relatives were later traced they said that either the children had never arrived at the relatives house or that they had moved on again. From what some households told the enumerators some of the young people had gone looking for work in South Africa and had not returned.

As a group there were no significant differences between sexes in terms of why the children left. The exception was ‘marriage’, as of those who left to get married, 80% were girls and 20% boys. This is most likely because girls tend to leave the parental
home on marriage whilst boys bring their new wives back to their parent's home. Boys also tend to get married at an older age. In terms of age, again there was no statistically significant differences between the under 5s in 1993 and the over 5s in 1993. The exception was children who had died, 80% of whom were over 5 in 1993. Traditionally the bulk of deaths in childhood have been amongst the under 5s and, again, this may be a sign of the AIDS epidemic whereby HIV positive children are dying when they are over five years but are not reaching adulthood.

However, before considering what the children who were traced have to say, it is worthwhile looking at whether there were factors within the household itself that made it more likely that any of the children would leave the households in the sample. Table 8.4 shows the percentage of children leaving by poverty status. As was seen in the previous two chapters the poverty status was calculated by comparing the income status of the household in 1993 and in 2002, by which time all the 207 children had left. It could be hypothesised that children are more likely to leave households which are struggling to support them – in other words households which are moving downwards, as in the 'descending poor' category, or which are permanently poor, as in the 'chronic poor' category, rather than in households which are moving upwards, as in the 'ascending poor' category, or who have not particularly struggled in the intervening nine years, as in the 'never poor' category.

Table 8.4 Whereabouts in 2002 of children under 10 years present in households in 1993 by poverty category (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Category</th>
<th>Chronic poor</th>
<th>Descending poor</th>
<th>Ascending poor</th>
<th>Never poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present in 2002</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present in 2002</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen a higher percentage of children left the chronically poor households between 1993 and 2002. The percentage of children leaving ascending or descending households was about the same but the highest percentage of children who stayed put were those in the households who were not poor in 1993 nor in 2002. Although this table shows a link between poverty status and the proportion of children staying in the household it does not give any indication of causality. A regression
was therefore run of factors pertaining to the household in 1993 that could possibly have had an influence on whether children stayed or not. The first block of possible causes included factors pertaining to the child such as the sex of the child; whether they were attending school in 1993; whether they were the child of the head of the household; whether the child lived with at least one of their parents and whether they were under 5 in 1993 or not. The second block of possible causes included factors pertaining to the household such as the number of household members; the poverty status of the household in 1993; the level of crowding in the household; whether the household had access to a latrine; whether the household had access to clean water; the number of wage earners in a household and the number of deaths experienced by the household between 1993 and 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of child</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending school or not?</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child of household head</td>
<td>6.04**</td>
<td>5.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child under 5</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with parent</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hhd members</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor in 1993</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not crowded</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns Latrine</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Clean water</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wage earners</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of deaths</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 \] 104.00** 134.40**
\[ -2 \text{ log likelihood} \] 751.30 720.87
\[ \text{Nagelkerk's } R^2 \] 0.19 0.25

Significance levels for whether a child remains in the household
**=<0.01
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The significant increase in the chi-square test and the increase in the explanatory power of the model as shown by Nagelkerk’s R squared suggests that Model 2 is more powerful in explaining why children remain in households.

Model 2 shows that out of all the factors selected as possibly having a bearing on children’s mobility only the poverty status of the household, the number of wage workers in the household, whether the child was a child of the head of the household and the number of deaths experienced by that household were significant. Children were six times less likely to move if they were the child of the household head probably because they would not be moving with their parents to newly built houses. Newly wed sons tend to live with their parents in Lesotho until such time that they are able to build their own houses and have had their first child. They then tend to move out, and if the parents later need their care the parents would come and live with them in the new house. Where the child is the child of the household head it is likely that the son of the household had already moved out and set up his own household before 1993.

If the household was poor in 1993 the odds of children staying in the household were 120% less than those children from not poor households. This shows a clear link between the poverty of a household and the necessity for children to move out. Whether this is with their parents or not cannot be ascertained from this data but these are likely to be the children who left to live with other relatives or to find work.

Conversely, the number of wage workers in a household is also positively associated with moving out with the odds of children moving out increasing by 96% for each additional wage earner in the household. This, again, is probably to do with the lifecycle of the original household. Where the son of a house manages to have a job he is able to build his own house and move out more quickly. Again the children are probably still living with their parents.

Deaths in the household are negatively correlated with staying and each additional death in the household means that the child is 28% less likely to stay. We have seen how deaths are related to household poverty and so this may be one of the mechanisms by which children leave home following a death. It may also be that the deaths represent the break up of the family which would be another reason for
children leaving. Certainly deaths from AIDS have been a major factor in children migrating in Southern Africa (Young & Ansell, 2003).

The model in Table 8.5 therefore possibly represents two types of children - those whose parents find work and who then move out with their parents and those whose parents are poor or where death has broken up the family and who move out without their parents.

8.3 Children who have moved out

In order to gain some perspective as to what might have happened to the children who were no longer staying in the original households, twenty seven of these children were traced to the households they were currently living in and interviews sought. From this, 19 interviews were obtained. One child refused to be interviewed on the advice of her school, five had died (this is in addition to those children who had been recorded as having died in the survey) and two were unavailable at the time of research. During the interviews children were asked to chart their histories since 1993 and to mark out on a graph the highs and lows of the intervening 9 years.

If we now turn to what the 19 traced children who were no longer living in the original 1993 households have to say they throw some light on the often complex set of circumstances that lead to a child, either with their parents and siblings, or alone leaving the household. Like any tracer study it is biased in favour of those children who could be traced and it is likely that only those children who in 2003 were leading a reasonably settled existence were in fact interviewed.

8.3.1 Households of Origin

In 1993 the 19 children interviewed lived in 12 fairly typical rural Basotho households. By 2003 they were members of 14 quite different households. However, whilst none of the households in 1993 were very rich, eight of them were above the poverty line and were classed as non-poor. The remaining four were households in which all the members were below the poverty line. Six of these households included the

---

1 Where names are used these are not the real names of the children concerned.
children’s parents and grandparents whilst the other six only included parents and not grandparents. In five of the households there were other non-related members living alongside the families often as students or as shepherds. The average household size for these original households was 8.6 but they varied from 4 to 17 people. Nine of these twelve households owned fields although the yields in 1993, probably because of the drought in that year, had been very poor, and many of the households had had a very low harvest. About 60% of the households owned cattle or chickens but only 50% owned sheep or goats and only two households owned pigs. These households were therefore rural and most had land but they were clearly not farming in any major way.

The sources of income were therefore from waged work or service provision and, as we have seen, this is a very volatile situation in Lesotho. In particular five of the households relied on mining remittances for their source of income and a further three received regular gifts from miners as part of their income. The remaining four households relied on waged non-mining work for their income or scraped a living by casual work and piece jobs or by selling surplus crops and brewing. During the mid nineties, as we have seen, many thousands of miners were retrenched in Lesotho and those engaged in mining in 1993 would probably have known that their jobs were not secure and they could be laid off at any time. In addition the Government of Lesotho entered a period of extended Structural Adjustment and waged work, whether for the Government or in the private sector was also often hard hit. Although a regular income, either from mining or other waged work, is usually seen as desirable and certainly acts to lift families out of poverty the precarious nature of this type of work means that households in rural Lesotho in the early to mid nineties were probably only too aware that their relative prosperity could be short-lived.

In these households in 1993 there were 114 people of varying ages from 0 to 74 years. By 2002, 49% of the members of these households had left. They had left for a variety of reasons as we shall see but seven of them were not in the household any longer because they had died. It might be expected that these would be mostly elderly people but in fact the ages in 1993 of those who subsequently died were all below 34 and it is likely that these deaths were some of the first in Lesotho to be attributable to AIDS. Four males had died and three females. At least half of the households therefore had experienced deaths in the family and this is only amongst
those who were present in the households in 1993 and about whom the household had some knowledge. Other people may have joined the households since and subsequently died about whom we have no data.

Most of the children in their interviews gave the reasons they had moved from the original household. Some could not remember why themselves and gave the answer that their parents had given them. Others clearly gave their interpretation of events which did not always coincide with what the original household had told us. This perhaps is not important but what did seem to be important to the children was their own understanding of the moves they had made in life.

8.3.2 Reasons for moving

There was a wide variety of reasons given by the children as to why they had moved. In all 12 of the children had moved with their parents although that did not necessarily mean that they were living with their parents in 2002. This included two families where three of the children had been interviewed and so 6 of these 12 children were actually only from two families. Six of the children had moved away from their biological parents and in one case the boy had moved out but had returned to the original household by the time he was interviewed.

Those who had moved with their parents often gave overcrowding as the reason why they had moved. As more children had been born to their parents so the one or two rondavels which they had inhabited often with their grandparents became too crowded and the parents had decided to look for their own accommodation or to build it themselves. Three of the 1993 households gave overcrowding as the reason why the children and their parents had moved out. The pressure of too many mouths to feed in one household comes through in the children's accounts:

1. 'During your stay at Ha Ramatlalla were you staying in your sister's house or somebody else's house?'
2. 'We were staying at my grandparent's house.'
3. 'Tell me about your life there.'
4. 'Life was not easy because there were a lot of us and our needs were not well met.'
‘Now that you have moved to your own house where you live with your parents, how are things? Are they any different?’

‘Yes they are, they are much better.’ (Girl 4414)

Large households nearly always comprised three generations and often other non-related members as well. For instance household 5008 comprised two elderly women with four of their children and 11 grandchildren. Household 5014 comprised a couple aged 60 and 59, four of their children, two grandchildren and a family of three who did not seem to be closely related (but almost certainly had some form of blood relationship with the owners of the house).

However large families per se were not the main reason for moving out. Where one of the parents had a job moving out was seen as a positive move as the nuclear family tried to establish itself in a different location. For instance in the case of household 2807 the family were desperately poor in 1993 but subsequently the father managed to gain work in the mines and the nuclear family of just parents and children were able to establish themselves separately from the grandparents and life improved radically for the children:

‘Do you still get enough food, clothes and the like?’

‘My needs are being met quite well now because my father is working whereas last time (we spoke) life was very difficult because he was not working.’ (Boy 2807)

However when resources were overstretched some re-configuring of the household was also necessary. In four instances where the family had relied on remittances from miners who were part of the household (and often the father of the child interviewed) the miner had subsequently been retrenched and the family began to slide into poverty. In three of the cases the child in question had been sent to another household in order to relieve pressure on the household and in the other case the mother had moved out to look for work. The loss of work often meant therefore the splitting of the existing household and an attempt to minimise the impact on the children by using other networks. For instance in household 3104 the 10 year old girl was sent to live with her older sister in order to ease the pressure on the family. Unfortunately in this case the sister was barely more able to cope than the parents:
I. 'How was life before?'

C. 'Life was very good because my father was still working.'

I. 'When did your father lose his job?'

C. 'He lost his job in 1997 and in 1998 we started having problems. Ever since then I haven’t been able to attend school regularly. Sometimes I was sent home because I couldn’t pay the school fees but when my sister went to talk to the Principal I was called back to school. We still have problems even now.'

(Girl, 3104)

In five of the households at least one of the parents had died and this could signal a general change in the household arrangements. Either the surviving spouse took the children and went to look for work, or increased poverty meant that the child had to be sent out to another family.

C. 'I stay here because my aunt wanted to help my mother after my father passed away. My mother was not able to take care of us..... The saddest thing that happened in my life was my father’s death. After his death everything changed. Our lives became very difficult.’ (Boy 4923)

The death of the parent could also mark a loosening of ties in the traditional Basotho family structure and particularly daughters-in-law looked to have more independence. Deaths did not automatically mean that the household would become poor, have to move or the children would be sent away, but there does appear to be a relatively high proportion of deaths, and especially deaths of people under 65 to suggest a link with child mobility. In most of the cases the death in the family seems to have started a chain of events which culminate in the child moving. For instance for household 5008:

I. ‘Now when did you leave here to go to Matholeng?’

C. ‘We left in 1994’

I. ‘And your father died in 1994?’

C. ‘Yes’

I. ‘So was that when your problems started?’
C. ‘Yes and they became worse in 1999 when my mother became sick’. (Girl 5008)

In two of the households the parents had moved out with their family in the hope of starting a household of their own but the only way they could do this was for one of the parents to work in South Africa. However, these parents could well have been working illegally in South Africa and there is nothing to suggest that they were part of the formal process that is part of the recruitment and employment of miners from Lesotho to South Africa. Having parents so far away can lead to particular problems for the children, especially if one subsequently dies as will be discussed later.

In two cases the children who had left the household were girls who had eloped and got married in both cases because they were pregnant. Both of them had left poor households.

The reasons why children had left the household which they had inhabited were therefore very complex and did not necessarily follow any specific pattern. Overcrowding placed a strain on often limited resources and this could lead to the whole of a nuclear family leaving the 1993 household and establishing a household elsewhere. A desire to establish their own households and be independent was also a factor behind some of these young families moving out. In these cases however the children nearly always left with the parents as opposed to be sent to relatives on their own. Overcrowding could therefore be seen as being a negative impetus for change as it contributed to a scarcity of resources or a positive impetus as it encouraged people who had the means to establish their own households.

Retrenchment was evidently a key factor in the family’s circumstances changing and in this case it was either more likely that the children would be sent to live with wealthier relatives or that the family would move in an attempt to find alternative employment. Subsequent to this initial move a family may then have to take further ‘mitigating’ action and children may then be sent away to relatives or the parents may take work in another country leaving the children behind.

Deaths in the family did not necessarily lead to the break up of the 1993 household unit but they often affected the income of the household and therefore its ability to
manage. Again the child may have moved out of the original household before the
death occurred and the effect of the death could either be to weaken ties with the
original household or, in places, to strengthen it as the surviving spouse looked for
support.

Finally marriage, particularly for girls was one way in which they left the households. However in both the cases in this small study the consequences had been fairly
disastrous and had certainly not led to an alleviation from poverty or want.

8.3.3 Children’s Attitudes to Leaving

Before moving on to look at the situations children found themselves in by 2002 it is
worth first considering how the children discussed the fact of their leaving the original
1993 households. Most of the reasons given above did not come directly from the
children themselves. They were pieced together from other subjects discussed in the
interviews or from discussions with carers and relatives. Carers and relatives were
not interviewed formally but notes were taken of the various discussions held with
them. In order to trace some of the children it was sometimes necessary to visit three
or four places as the children had moved on and brief discussions were held in each
place just in order to find where the child was currently. The children themselves
gave a variety of reasons for leaving some of which agreed with the adults’
interpretations and some of which did not and this sometimes depended on the
reason for leaving.

When children had been moved out without their parents they sometimes seemed
reluctant to disclose the reason and this only emerged from interviewing the carers.
For instance this was a fairly typical exchange in an interview:

I. ‘Why did you leave Rantasana?’
C. ‘I don’t know. I was told to leave and come here’ (Girl 3104)

Or children presented a version which proved not to be the full story as was shown
later in the interview:

I. ‘Why did you leave Temaneng to come and live here?’
C. 'My mother was working in town and she couldn't take me to school. So I had to come and stay with my aunt.' (Girl 2823)

In this case the father had been working in the mines in 1993 but was retrenched in 1998 and the child was sent to live with her mother's cousin (whom she called her aunt). Later, after the interview with the child, a conversation was held with the cousin:

I. 'Tell me, Mother, why exactly did M. come to live here with you?'
A. 'Her parents were very poor. They couldn't send her to school and they didn't even have anything to eat. The parents did not have jobs or, if they did they were only piece jobs. Another thing was that they always were quarrelling in front of the children and that wasn't good for the children. So her mother ended up going to town.'
I. 'I see. So she left her husband.'
A. 'Yes she left him,'
I. 'What about the other children?'
A. 'She sent them to her mother and I took M. to send her to school'.

(Carer 2823)

In other interviews it is clear the child is unwilling to discuss the matter. The following extract is from an interview with a girl who was living in very poor conditions just with her mother. She had been fairly relaxed at the beginning of the interview and had discussed her friends at school and her favourite subjects and games with ease. However the interview continued:

I. 'Where did you stay before you came here?'
C. 'I stayed with my grandmother'
I. 'How old were you when you left her?'
C. 'I don't know'

..................

I. 'Could you tell me about an incident in your life that made you sad?'
C. 'I have never been sad in my life'
I. 'Tell me, little sister, where is your father now?'
C. 'He is not here. He died'
I. 'Oh I'm sorry. I didn't know that. When did he die?'
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C. 'I don’t know. My mother didn’t tell me’. (Girl 5014)

An extract from my field notes shows how the interview had become much more difficult for the child:

'The girl seemed very young and had something like a bad sore on her left ear. She seemed willing to talk at first but I think she found questions she had to think about quite difficult. She was quite animated when talking about school but turned her head away and became much quieter when I moved on to questions about her family and both of us began to feel uncomfortable.' (extract from field notes).

This interview shows how even a seemingly straightforward question such as when a child left a place could have potentially painful overtones for children. Of course the child may really have known very little about her family life but it is unlikely and it was clear actually in the interview that the child was finding the questions difficult. In this case it was likely, from discussions held with other adults who knew the family, that the father had in fact abandoned his wife and child and the child had been told he was dead (or told to say he was dead).

On occasion the children could give a coherent account as to why they left the original household, but for the majority they were either too young to understand at the time, their parents had not explained the reasons to them fully or they were unwilling to discuss potentially painful subjects with a stranger. All three reasons are likely to be valid and a high proportion probably did have little idea as to why they had moved. However they were often able to compare their lives before the move with their current life and that often gave clues as to why they felt they had moved.

Most of the children, but not all, felt life had improved for them materially since moving. They often commented on the added facilities such as running water and electricity that they had access to. In addition the move had often enabled them to eat better, have a variety of clothes and sometimes increased access to transport. This was a typical comment:

I. 'Comparing life at Ha Makhalanyane and life here, which is better?'
C. 'Life here is better than at Ha Makhalanyane.'
I. ‘What are some of the things that you can tell me that show the difference?’

C. ‘There, we were not able to get clothes and the food that we liked’. (Girl 2913)

The improvement in life was nearly always framed in terms of an improvement in the material conditions of life and all of the children fully appreciated the importance of that. In particular having enough to eat and some variety of diet was nearly always mentioned. Increased access to schooling was also seen as a major improvement in life as compared to the household of origin. However, the children were also very aware that their parents were still struggling. This was particularly true of the children who had been sent out from the family or who fluctuated between the households of origin and the destination households. Although recognising that they were better off than their parents most children still felt some responsibility towards their parents and wanted to improve their chances in life to ensure not only a better life for themselves but for the rest of the family too. In fact when the children asked what they would like to be when they were older nearly all gave very altruistic answers as will be seen later.

A few of the children had seen little or no improvement in their lives and these tended to sound very depressed in the interviews. One girl who had moved in with her sister felt that life was still difficult for her and schooling in particular was a problem. This was her response to a question asking if life was better with her parents or her sister:

C. ‘Life is OK but we still have problems. Sometimes my sister is not able to pay for my school fees.’ (Girl 3104)

However, most children felt they had seen an improvement in their circumstances and even if they did not say exactly why they had left their previous home the implication that it was to improve the material aspects of their existence was there.

8.4 Households of Destination

Children had rarely had a straightforward journey from the household they were in in 1993 to that which they lived in 2002. The households that they ended up in were as
varied as the reasons that they had for leaving and it is difficult to discern definite patterns. However, whether the child was sent to another home or whether he/she moved with their parents, this was always a positive action in order to either better the family's circumstances or to try and prevent a worsening of the situation in the original household.

Before going on to look in detail at the kind of households in which these children were living in 2003, we shall first look at the kind of moves they made in diagrammatic form in order to understand the possible different categories of move.

Children who were living with their parents in 1993 and have subsequently moved out of the household without their parents we shall call Leaver Is and if they left to get married they are Leaver IIs. Children who originally lived without their parents (maybe with other relatives in 1993) and who then move to join them or children who lived with their parents but then moved out with them to a new place will be called Leaver Ills. Children who originally lived with their parents and who subsequently moved in to child only households are Leaver IVs. The remaining two categories are for children who in 2003 either lived in two households simultaneously or who oscillated between their parents' household and another. These households are sufficiently far apart that children cannot be in both of them on a daily basis but perhaps they go every weekend or every school holiday to one or another. These groups will be called Fluid Leavers I & II. The categories are not exhaustive and even in this small sample there were many nuances to them but they provide some kind of framework in which to explore the life paths of these children.
Figure 8.1 Origins and Destinations of Children
Leaver Is

Four of the children interviewed were living with relatives having been sent there by their parents and now lived without their parents. In every case this was because the family were too poor to provide for them and sending the child to live with a relative was one way of having less mouths to feed. In two of the cases the children were living with their aunt and in two they were living with older sisters who were either married or had a job. Although these children had moved due to poverty they did not necessarily improve their lot substantially.

One case was where a girl had gone to live with her married sister in a neighbouring village. This 14 year old girl still struggled to attend school as her sister could not always find the money for fees and she was not receiving medical treatment even though she clearly needed it (she was suffering from fits). In another case an 18 year old boy was living with his aunt who earned a very small salary as a domestic worker. However as the aunt had two disabled children of her own there was only just enough food for everyone and the boy helped make ends meet by working hard in his aunt’s garden (gardening in Lesotho is not a leisure activity and involves the development of the plot immediately round the house for vegetables – it can be crucial for the maintenance of a nutritious diet for the family). Although all the young people appreciated why they had moved in with relatives and were appreciative of their better fortune these two clearly regretted the necessity and would have preferred to stay with their parents towards whom they felt a sense of responsibility. However this was not the case for Manepo (see Box 1) who was probably too young when she was sent to live with her mother’s cousin in order to feel much loyalty to home.
Box 1 Manepo - Girl 2823

When Manepo was born in 1990 her family were relatively wealthy as her father was a miner. However he was retrenched from the mines in 1997 and the family which then comprised the parents and six children then found it increasingly hard to make ends meet. The parents began to argue a lot and this culminated in the mother taking the children with her to the capital Maseru in an attempt to find work. Manepo’s father had become very depressed but then went and trained as a Lethuela – a type of traditional healer. His depression lifted but his way of life now meant that he took little responsibility for his family. Manepo’s mother was unable to find work and so sent Manepo to her cousin (who Manepo calls her aunt) to be cared for. The cousin is a childless wife of a miner and so was very willing to take care of Manepo. Meanwhile the mother returned to her original village where she lives in extreme poverty and resents the partial abandonment of her husband.

Manepo is being brought up a good Catholic by the cousin and has seen the effect the lethuela training has had on her father and her family. She therefore had little time for her father:

I. ‘Now tell me, little sister, when you first came here how was life here as compared to Temaneng (her home)?’

M. ‘Life here is better than in Temaneng.’

I. ‘What is it that you didn’t like in Temaneng?’

M. ‘I didn’t like my father.’

I. ‘You didn’t like your father? Why?’

M. ‘Because he was a lethuela and he gave my mother a hard time’.

Manepo rarely goes home and sees her future with the cousin. She hopes to become a nun and not get married when she is older.

Similarly a ten year old girl who was now living with her half sister was very happy to remain where she was and appreciated her good fortune:

I. ‘Is life better in Maseru than in the village or not?’

C. ‘Life is better in Maseru than in the village because there are things that we have in Maseru that we do not have in the village. In Maseru we have running water, electricity and many other things that we do not have in the village.’

I. ‘Do you think the life you live now is the same as the life your parents lived when they were children?’

C. ‘No, I don’t think they had the chance to live the way I live now because they did not have the things I have now. They are still struggling even now. They still don’t have money to buy food and clothes or even send us to school’. (Girl 2909)

These children all had a strong attachment to at least one of their birth parents (two of them had lost their fathers) and a strong sense of identity but all understood why they had been sent to live with other relatives and were grateful for the improvement in the material standard of living. It might be expected that some of these children would
feel out of place in their new homes or may have felt that they were treated differently from the children of the new household they were joining. Although all these children clearly had to contribute to the good of the household and had chores to do there was little evidence from their interviews that this was the case. Firstly they were all living with fairly close relatives whom they probably knew before they were sent to them. Secondly, apart from the girl who was living with her sister because her father had been retrenched from the mines, there were few other children in the household of a similar age. For the boy living with his aunt there were only two younger disabled girls who needed access to the same household resources, Manepo (Box 1) was the only child in the household and the girl living with her half sister in Maseru was again the only child in the household as the sister was unmarried. Taking in and looking after a poorer, younger relative is therefore not just an altruistic act but can also have benefits for the adopter. In two of the cases the women were obtaining a child which would give them status in Basotho society and someone to help with the housework. The aunt gained an able-bodied male who could do some of the heavy work in the garden. Even the child staying with her sister was older than the sister’s children and could take a greater role in the running of the household. Children’s mobility in this context was a mutually beneficial act for sender, child and receiver alike.

**Leaver IIs**

Two girls had left home in order to be married. In this case they both became pregnant whilst still at school and ‘had’ to get married. In the first case the girl had married a miner – one of the wealthiest forms of employment for rural Basotho men and one with great prestige. However, she had seen less and less of her husband until she had finally gone to South Africa to find him and found that he had a second family near the mines. On her return to Lesotho she lived with her child and her parents-in-law because her husband was no longer sending money home and her house had no fields. Her own parents would not take her back (if a girl returns to her parents it often means they have to repay the bride-price which can make parents very unwilling to take their daughters back). For her, she was finding the situation intolerable as instead of the independence she had hoped for by getting married she was now dependent on the parents of her estranged husband. The other case was again a situation where a girl had become pregnant and then married as a result (see Box 2).
Box 2  Mapaseka – Girl 4921

Mapaseka is 18 years old. She was the daughter of a miner who was retrenched in 1996. Before her father was retrenched she had been living with her aunt in a small town some distance away. However on her father’s return home Mapaseka was called home to help the family. Owing to her father’s good income and subsequent compensation from the mines Mapaseka had a good education and finished her primary schooling in 1998. She then returned to her aunt’s house where she attended secondary school. This was a relief to her as her parents had both developed alcoholism by this time and money was now very scarce.

Towards the end of her school career, at the age of 16 years, Mapaseka became pregnant and married the father of her child. However as he has been unable to get a job she has been forced to return to her parents home. He meanwhile is in one of the industrial areas of Lesotho looking for work and Mapaseka rarely sees him. Mapaseka’s current home life is very difficult:

1. ‘When you look at the life your parent’s lead do you think you will lead a better or worse life?’
M. ‘I think I could lead a better life, especially if I can find a job’.
1. ‘What is it that would be different?’
M. ‘My parents wasted money on buying beer and drinking’.
1. ‘Do they both drink?’
M. ‘Yes both of them. It is very painful and they are violent.’

Mapaseka would like to train to be a nurse but feels that she neither has money for the training nor that her husband would not agree to her going alone for training. Meanwhile her aunt has taken Mapaseka’s child, ostensibly for weaning, but it appears she will care for him until Mapaseka’s situation improves.

1. ‘Tell me, are you happy?’
M. ‘No, I am not happy. I have a lot of problems and life is very difficult’.

These two cases show how marriage, which perhaps was initially seen as a way of escape and of gaining status, has been fairly disastrous for both girls. Whilst they had hopes for an independent life and a family of their own they are now in an even more restricted situation than before their marriages. In neither case has the husband provided support for them and their children are being brought up in relative poverty once more. In the case of Mapaseka (Box 2) she is fairly well educated and probably would have had a chance of going for nursing training if her husband would have permitted this and she had long term support for her child. In the case of the girl married to the miner she has a young child, is landless and poorly educated so her chances of climbing out of poverty without her husband’s support are slim.

Leaver Ills

These children had not been living with their parents in 1993 but by 2002 were living with at least one of them. Two children lived with just their mothers and the family unit was clearly struggling. The two children (both girls) expressed confusion and unhappiness in the interview. One girl was attending school under the Government’s free primary education scheme. She left a household of some 17 people which included her grandparents and various cousins in 1999 to come and live with her
mother, and initially her father, some distance away. It was not clear from the child what had happened to her father although it appeared he had abandoned the family or had died and the family were in consequence very poor. The child said she was very lonely and much preferred to live back with her grandparents. The other girl who lived with just her mother again presented a fairly depressed front (see Box 3). These children had both moved in the hopes of a better life and one which gave their parents more independence. In both cases the fathers had disappeared either through death or abandonment leaving the households very poor.

---

**Box 3 Mamokola – Girl 5014**

Mamokola is 16 years old and lives with her six brothers and sisters and her mother. In 1993 Mamokola lived with her great aunt and great uncle and her parents’ cousins but she left there back in 1994. She did not know why the family moved out although she did say the household was very crowded. Mamokola seemed unwilling to say what had happened to her father. In 1993 he had been a miner and Mamokola at first claimed that he was now a shepherd but later in the interview she said that he was dead.

Mamokola is only in Standard 2 of Primary School. Only she and one other sibling are in school under the Government’s free education scheme. Her mother does piece jobs in order to feed the family such as gathering firewood for people. Mamokola had bad sores around her ears but she had not been able to get medical treatment due to lack of money. During the interview although very willing to talk about school and her favourite games she was very unwilling to hazard an opinion on anything more personal and frequently only gave the most brief of answers when asked about her family. She did say however that she enjoyed returning to visit her great aunt’s family as they gave her bread to eat and something to drink. When she grows up she wants to collect firewood like her mother or possibly become a housewife but could not see her way to aspiring to anything more remunerative and needing more skill.

---

However, two other children were living a relatively happy and stable lifestyle with their parents. These two sisters aged 10 and 12 years had moved to the capital Maseru and their parents had found work in shops. These were perhaps the most fortunate of the children in the study. In the interviews they were happy, looking forward to the future and materially fairly well off. The success of these children moving back to be with their parents, therefore, seems to be partly due to the factors precipitating that move. Where the children have had to leave relatives’ homes to live with parents because the relatives can no longer cope, the outlook for the child may not be very satisfactory. But where the children are moving back to be with parents because they have gained work, the prospects for the children seem much brighter.
Leaver IVs

Two of the children interviewed lived in households where there was no adult present on a day to day basis. In the first family there were four children. In 1993 the family lived with the grandparents and various other relatives. As the father was a miner, and therefore able to build a house, they moved into their own house near the border of South Africa and Lesotho in 1997. After this time the mother gained work as a domestic worker in South Africa and so the children were left alone in the household. So despite the family being relatively well off the children see very little of their parents and the oldest 16 year old girl who was interviewed is responsible for the day to day welfare of her siblings. The second household comprised three siblings, the eldest of whom was 15 years old (see Box 4). As can be seen this child also had the day to day care of her younger siblings. In the case of these households parents had the choice of remaining at home but possibly not being able to support their families or of going elsewhere to find work. In the case of the two parents who were working in South Africa it would have been virtually impossible for them to take the children with them. Miners are not allowed to take their families to South Africa and it is unlikely a domestic worker would be allowed her family to stay as there are strict rules about non-South African citizens bringing in dependants into the country.

Box 4 Thakane - Girl 4414
Thakane is 15 years old and the eldest of three siblings. In 1993 she lived with her grandparents and parents in a village. Her father then gained work building roads and he moved the family to a village nearer the roads camps. In 1994 Thakane's mother fell ill and died leaving the children with just their father. Since then the father's work has moved further up into the mountains on work for the new dam and he has had to leave the children alone if he is to keep his work. Thakane does not know why the children have not been returned to their grandmother to live but possibly because it would be difficult for Thakane to access a secondary school from there (she is already at secondary school). Thakane does not see staying alone as much of a problem:
I. 'Who do you stay with, I mean who takes care of you when (your father) is away?'
T. 'Noone, we stay here by ourselves'.
I. 'Are you not scared?'
T. 'No we are not.'
Later in the interview Thakane shows she is proud of her household management skills:
I. 'Now can you tell me about things you like doing?'
T. 'I like doing household chores'
I. 'What is it that you know how to do?'
T. 'I know how to cook mealie meal and vegetables'.
I. 'Really!'
T. 'Yes and I know how to take care of my siblings'.
Thakane is unable to till her fields due to her family commitments and schooling and says she does not even want to keep animals because there is a high rate of stocktheft in the village. She hopes in time to become a policewoman to deal with that particular problem.
Fluid Leavers

Six children lived a life whereby they fluctuated between the household of origin and the one to which they had moved. Most of the children interviewed maintained some kind of contact with the household in which they lived in 1993 but these six children clearly depended on the household of origin for considerable support and spent some time there. The six children came from two families. In the first case the family had moved out of the household of origin because the father had a job in the neighbouring town and wished to be nearer to work. In addition he was able to build a new house and gain some independence by the move. However his wages are not sufficient to ensure that his children are always adequately cared for (see Box 5).

Box 5  Hlompheng - Boy 5001

Hlompheng is the oldest of three brothers and is 15 years old. In 1993 he lived with his grandparents, cousins and parents in a village in the mountains. In 1996 his father, who was a watchman in a roads camp, built a house in the main town in the valley and the immediate family moved there. Although the new house provides independence, the low wages Hlompheng's father receives means that the family are always struggling to care for the boys and they frequently send them back to their original home for a few days in order to be fed (the distance between the two households was too far for the boys to go every day or even every week so Hlompheng was speaking about holidays).

1. `How is life down here compared to when you are staying up there (with your grandparents)?'
H. `Life here is a bit difficult. There is nothing to eat here'
1. `I realise your grandfather is now very old. Who makes sure there is food there?'
H. `My grandfather has got fields. We eat from the fields'.
1. `I see. So you stay down here but you still go to your grandfather's house to eat!'
H. `Yes we do'

All three boys are in school under the Government's free education scheme and enjoy the hustle and bustle of living near the town despite their poverty.

In the second case the children were a girl aged 13 years and twins aged 9 years. In 1996 they had moved to the town of Matholeng because their father, who had been a miner up until that point, was using his retrenchment compensation to build shacks for rental. Their father subsequently died but their mother remained living in Matholeng although the children clearly spent about half their time in Matholeng and half in their grandparents home. They were interviewed at their grandparents home (the household of origin) and were comparing life in Matholeng with their grandparents home:

1. `How is life in Matholeng compared to life here?'
C ‘Life is much better in Matholeng than here because here there is no water, we have to go very far to fetch water while in Matholeng water taps are close by. But we like the food here because in Matholeng we eat very little food’. (Girl 5008)

One boy, Tankiso (again not his real name), had a father who was a miner in Johannesburg but his mother remained in Lesotho with the children. Tankiso in fact had never really left home and he was only included in this study because he happened to be absent in South Africa when the survey was done in 2002. By the time of the interview he was back home. He therefore should be classed as a fluid leaver.

Both these households, where the children fluctuate between two different places, demonstrate a factor which is not always taken into account in studies of poverty. In both cases the household of destination is the one where money is being earned. However, what enables the children to remain free from severe hunger is the fact that the households of origin have land and are able to grow their own food, or at least supplement their diet by field and garden produce. Members of these households therefore had to make a choice. The first option was to follow work and to earn money, but become a landless household dependent on paid work for everything. The second was to stay where there was little prospect of work but where food could nearly always be grown to feed the family but not in sufficient quantities to provide other necessities such as salt, soap, clothing etc. These two households have survived by combining both strategies but it is not clear what will happen once the older household has died off.

8.5 The role of schooling

In the conversations, one factor came over very strongly from nearly all the children and that was with regard to the role of schooling in children’s lives. Between the years 1993 and 2002 there was a dramatic rise in the percentage of Basotho children attending school. In 1993, 63% of children aged between 5 and 16 in the survey were in school. By 2002 this percentage had risen to 79%. That so many poor children were able to attend school is undoubtedly due to the Government's policy on free primary education. Primary education started to become free in 1999 and each year
the Government of Lesotho has added another year’s free schooling so by 2003 the first 4 years of primary education were free. However free only means that the tuition and examinations were free. The children’s families still had to find money for uniform, books and if necessary transport. Going to school also meant receiving free school meals. Although there are still some problems with the system, most of the children in this study who were in school would have been receiving a meal at lunch-time in school. This meal would probably only have been maize meal porridge and vegetables but it would have still provided some nutrition during the day. The critical role of this meal should not be underestimated as, when interviewing children at school for the group discussions, many children told us it was their first meal of the day and that was at 12.30pm after a full morning at school and maybe a two or three mile walk.

The majority of children interviewed were in school and seemed to appreciate the critical role it had in their lives. Four of the children were no longer in school – two because they had got married, one because he had completed primary schooling and could not afford secondary and one who had left to attend initiation school although he intended to go back to mainstream schooling. The majority of children were also still attending primary school, even though some of them were 18 years old, with only three having made a start at secondary school. They expressed the importance of school to them in a variety of ways.

Firstly it was seen as a passport out of poverty. Many of the children could see the value of gaining qualifications as a means of getting a job and not repeating the kinds of lives their parents had had. When asked about what they would like to be in the future most of their aspirations depended on gaining qualifications from school. These included becoming a teacher, a civil servant, policeman, doctor, dentist, nurse and nun.

I. ‘When you look at the way your parents live now, do you think you will live better than they do or not?’
C. ‘I think I’ll live better than they do because of the education I am getting.’
I. ‘I see, what would you like to be when you grow up?’
C. ‘I would like to be a doctor’.
'If you become a doctor, which diseases would you like to heal?'

'I think I would like to be a dentist.'

'So if you succeed in becoming a dentist and earn money what would you do with the money?'

'I would help needy people and I will improve myself with further education.' (Girl 2913)

School was therefore giving children aspirations and helping children to work towards a life without poverty. The converse of this was that those children who had left school or whose schooling had been cut short due to poverty had very low aspirations and clearly regretted that curtailment of their education. The following quote is from a girl who had to leave school because she was pregnant and now finds her life very difficult:

'What would make it (life) better?'

'I would like to get a job so that I can earn money and go back to school.'

'Have you talked about this with your husband.'

'Yes but he didn't like the idea of me going out to find a job.'

(Girl 4921)

Education is therefore seen as a personal way out of poverty by enabling people to get good well paid jobs and if for some reason that education is not available the children find it hard to think of other ways of improving their situations. The problem with this approach to overcoming poverty is that many of the children may struggle to achieve the kind of grades necessary to fulfil their aims and employment is largely seen in terms of the service sector rather than as part of a business or learning a manual trade. Only one boy mentioned that he would like to be a carpenter, and this despite the high death rate in Lesotho meaning that there is a high demand for coffins so it is presently a fairly lucrative profession.

However, education was not only seen as the way out of poverty for children on a personal basis. Children also saw education as a means for the country to become wealthier. If the population were better educated then more people could get good
jobs and consequently the prevalence of poverty would diminish. The following quote was a typical response when discussing the state of the country:

I. 'Do you think that at the moment things are getting worse or getting better?'
C. 'I think they are getting worse.'
I. 'Why do you think so?'
C. 'Because we are getting poorer.'
I. 'If you are saying people in this country are getting poorer and poorer what do you think can be done about this problem?'
C. 'I think because this severe poverty is caused by a high rate of unemployment in Lesotho, the Government should create job opportunities especially now there is free education. People will have education that will enable them to work.' (Girl 4414)

An educated workforce can therefore lift a country out of poverty if the jobs are available and it is Government’s responsibility to create those opportunities. Previous reports have sometimes criticised the ‘waiting for Government’ approach to poverty alleviation (Gay, Gill & Hall, 1995) but it appears that this generation also subscribes to that approach.

But school was not just about the potential for poverty alleviation. Most of the children were happy to talk about their friends from school and it was clear that school friends were a source of companionship, help and advice to most of them. In the two households which were headed (at least on a day to day basis) by young girls, they spoke of their friends as giving them advice on how to manage situations and general support in their role of caring for the family. In fact school for children in adult-less households was probably one of the few things that gave structure to their day and gave the children regular access to an adult in authority.

School was also a great source of happiness and treats for the children interviewed. All the children were asked to describe one of the happiest times in their lives. Nearly all recollected something to do with school. This is in contrast to the most difficult time of their life which was usually to do with a death in the family or sickness of a family
member. Many of the children described school trips to South Africa or historical parts of Lesotho:

C. ‘My trip to Durban was the most interesting incident of my life. I was very happy to be in the Republic of South Africa. Durban is very beautiful. I saw the ocean and we had a chance to swim in the sea.’ (Girl 2823)

Or:

C. ‘We took a trip to Thaba Bosiu at the 'Melesi Hotel. It was a farewell party for the Standard 7 pupils, so we went there with our teacher and the Standard 6 pupils. We were dressed in our own clothes, in new clothes, but the Standard 6 pupils were all in school uniform. We played games and told stories, danced and ate very good food.’ (Boy, 5001)

For children in the western world for whom school is compulsory it would not be surprising that most of their discussions around friends and happiness were connected to school. Although most of these Basotho children were in school at the time of interview or had attended school many had not had that many years schooling. In addition it had only been the recent policy of free schooling that has given many of these children access to schooling at all. The impact of having a generation of children, the majority of whom will have attended school at least for a few years cannot at present be measured. That children see school as a force for good in their lives comes through in the interviews. For them school is a source of friends, the provider of happy memories, the assuager of hunger, the source of aspiration and is seen by some as the potential eradicator of poverty. The lack of schooling leads to growing hopelessness and loneliness. Although queries have been raised as to the quality of the education received in Lesotho schools (Turner, 2003), particularly given the rapid expansion of the primary school sector, the very fact of going to school clearly plays a central part in many children’s lives.

8.6 Households of Origin in 2002

The question arises as to whether the children interviewed would have been better off if they had stayed in the original households. These original households were
interviewed in 1993 and also again in 2002 – a year before the interviews with the children were conducted. Of the 12 households that these 19 children came from, 8 were actually classed as non-poor in 1993. However they were not particularly rich either. The mean income per member per year was M343 in 1993, considerably above the poverty line of M153 but not in the very high income stakes. In fact an income of M343 placed a household in the third or middle income quintile in 1993. By 2002, only four of the 12 households were still above the poverty line – four had descended into poverty, two which were very poor to start with had remained very poor and two had actually managed to improve their position but not sufficiently to take them above the poverty line. However one of those which had improved their position had actually deteriorated again by 2003 when the interviews with the children were undertaken so in fact their relative wealth was very short lived. This was a household where the parents drank heavily and one can surmise that it was this drinking that led to the father losing his job.

The households had also tended to become more elderly in nature as the younger parents had moved out which meant the prospect for improving their incomes had deteriorated. The loss of income is usually associated with loss of work particularly mine income. In one case where the father was a miner and then died the household had been able to maintain a reasonable income but only through casual work and rental income. In some ways, therefore, although not below the poverty line now, this household’s income has become more precarious and fluctuating. In another case the father who was a miner had also died and the mother and daughter had moved out. However, the household of origin still had access to mine remittances through another son of the household. In this case the girl and her mother would have been better to have stayed or returned to the original household. In the only other case where the household income had improved this was where the father had become a traditional healer or lethuela. He, by 2002, was earning a reasonable sum of money from his work as a healer. However this income would also have been very precarious and his family had suffered a great deal of poverty before he had built up his clientele.
Conclusion

Very few factors predict whether a child is likely to remain within a household or not, largely because there are a multitude of reasons why households re-configure or why people leave households. Children who are the child of the household head are least likely to move but others may well move because their parents wish to establish their own households or because parents wish to live nearer their places of work. As would be expected there does not appear to be anything intrinsic to the child therefore which makes it more or less likely that a child will not remain in their original households. However there are certain household characteristics which may make it more or less likely that a child will move. In particular, the acquisition of waged work by someone in the household (and it may be hypothesised in particular by the father or mother of a child) makes it more likely that the child will move. However, where there is no change in the number of waged workers the poverty status of a household will affect a child’s likely mobility and in general the poorer the household the more likely the children in that household are to have to move.

In this study, children moved with their parents or without their parents and could end up either being part of a newly configured household or joining an existing one. Some children however, fitted neither of these categories and fluctuated between two or even more households. This fluidity in the make up of households makes quantitative measurements based on households uncertain and seems rarely to be taken into account in surveys. In this small qualitative study of the children from twelve families, children from two of them lived in two places on a regular basis – in this case keeping one foot in the household of origin as it were and one in the household of destination. The reason for this fluidity is to spread the burden of child raising, not primarily in terms of childcare but in terms of material provision for the children. Each place provides something, such as food or access to school and other facilities such as clean water.

The necessity for children moving was brought about by a variety of factors. Life stage of the household was clearly important with particularly sons wanting to move out from their parent’s home once they had established their own families. However the acquisition of some form of employment was normally a prerequisite of this type of move. Retrenchment, loss of job and death of a family member also tended to
precipitate a move and in this case the child may well be sent out of the household alone or purely with siblings to be looked after by other members of the family. This study did not find evidence that these children were treated any differently from the children of the receiving household but this may have been either because they were the only child in the household, or of a very different age, or because in only one interview, often with the carer present, they were unlikely to go into details of their treatment. However, children in Basotho society are usually considered a valuable resource and it was clear that these children contributed substantially to their receiving households and gave status to the household of destination.

The increased mobility of children and indeed whole families cannot be divorced from the decline in mining employment in Lesotho. Whilst mining in the South African mines was a very dangerous job which necessitated the absence of men for sometimes up to 11 months in a year, there was a highly organised system of recruitment and remittances to the man’s family. This meant that families could stay together in the rural areas and at the most each generation would only have had to move within the village as the sons built their own houses. Now the nature of employment in Lesotho is much more precarious and does not have the efficient system of remittance payments that was developed by the mining houses (Boehm, 2003). This has meant that families are more likely to move closer to the source of work and less money is remitted back to rural households.

Childhood mobility is therefore a response to the particular circumstances a family finds itself in and, in particular where the family’s income had declined, either the parents and children or just the children are likely to move out. However, this mobility should be seen as an active decision by the family in response to increasingly difficult circumstances (Young & Ansell, 2003). Poverty has sometimes been expressed in terms of a lack of choices (Narayan, 1999; CoPPP, 2000). Although this is true in many ways yet poor families in Lesotho are faced with a multitude of choices – it is just that none of the solutions are necessarily ideal. Parents with children often have to make the choice between living somewhere with land but with no job prospects or moving to take up employment but living without land (and often forfeiting their right to land in the process). Parents can also face the choice of whether to work away themselves, particularly in South Africa, but leave the children alone to bring themselves up or to remain at home but not have the resources to support their
children. In cases where parents have chosen the former they have tended to move their children to the border areas where they are more accessible for short visits. Whether to marry at a young age or to wait is another choice facing particularly poor rural girls. The hope is that marriage would provide a way out of poverty and enable the girl to gain some independence but given the chancy nature of this strategy the alternative is to wait and try and develop a livelihood strategy of their own. Where the parents have no options for employment, poor parents can choose whether to send their child to be brought up by relatives who are in a better position to support them or to try and keep them within the confines of the nuclear family.

The question as to which strategy works best for children is a moot one. For most of the children we spoke to their mobility had increased their material well-being. Particularly those children sent to live with relatives had increased access to food, clothing and schooling. Similarly those children who fluctuated between households survived by this type of composite livelihood strategy and those children living alone had access to the resources their parents acquired for them through working away. The only children who were not materially better off were those girls who had married young and whose husbands would not or could not support them. As they in turn had also become parents they were also facing the options of whether to send their children away or try and keep them with them. But as many studies have pointed out material well-being is not the only measure of poverty and what is missing from this study is whether, in the long term, children are less impoverished by being brought up consistently by their biological parents or whether the emotional impact of being sent out of the family, or being left alone, or of living in two households has any effect on the future of these children.
Introduction

The previous three chapters have investigated three aspects of poverty in Lesotho. In chapter 6 we looked at the movements of households with children under ten years of age in 1993 in and out of poverty over a nine year period until 2002. This was done using a purely monetary measure of poverty but comparing it to other measures such as ownership of assets and access to services. In chapter 7 we looked at the scale and prevalence of poverty amongst children in both 1993 and 2002. The usefulness of monetary measures as measures of poverty for children was also touched upon. An experiment was made using latent class analysis to form a type of index of child poverty based upon children's own definitions of poverty. It was found that whilst measures of material wealth – such as income and assets – measures of children’s opportunities and measures of health all clustered together, trying to measure the kind of care a child received was not so sensitive to these other measures. In chapter 8 we investigated what might have happened to those children who were no longer in the households in 2002 and speculated as to whether poverty had been a determining factor in their removal from the original households.

In this chapter we will bring these elements into the global arena and compare the findings from Lesotho with findings from other countries, particularly in the Western world. To do this we will be returning to the questions that we asked in chapter one. Firstly are there any commonalities between child poverty in the global North and global South and if so how are those commonalities expressed? Secondly, what do children themselves say about poverty and how might their opinions be incorporated into measurements of poverty? Thirdly, can child poverty be measured in the same way as adult poverty is measured and, as a corollary to that, is child poverty in fact different from adult poverty? Finally, we asked whether quantitative and qualitative methods can be combined in exploring child poverty in Lesotho.

The first section of this chapter will be looking at what the Lesotho data tells us about various measures of child poverty and how it compares with other data particularly from the UK. We will therefore be looking at the scope of poverty amongst children
and what aspects of their daily life it affects, and we will show how by listening to children we gain some insight into how they would define it. We will also be looking at the prevalence or scale of poverty (however defined) globally amongst children as compared to Lesotho; the dynamics of poverty, in this case particularly the economic mobility of households with children in the South and North; and finally we shall briefly consider some of the coping strategies that families employ to protect their children from poverty, or mitigate it's impact on them, in a country like Lesotho and a country like the UK.

In section two we compare adult poverty with child poverty before moving on to summarise the use of qualitative and quantitative methods in this study. Finally we take a brief look at what this study says about measuring child poverty in the five different contexts we identified in chapter one.

9.1 Child Poverty in Lesotho

9.1.1 The Scope of Poverty

In common with studies in the North income measures of poverty for children do not give a full picture of children's poverty in Lesotho. Gordon's study found that even in a highly monetised economy such as the UK there was not a complete correlation between income poverty and deprivation of necessities. This he ascribed to inequalities in wealth distribution in the household (whereby parents protect their children from the worst impacts of poverty) and possibly to length of time children have been in poverty (Gordon et al, 2000). In Lesotho this lack of correlation between income and necessities is even more true. Having an income is important in Lesotho. Not everything can be grown or produced by the household and access to school or health facilities or modern means of transport, to salt and soap or being able to build a latrine all need an income. As we have seen those families who had no income in 1993 have disappeared from the data set by 2002 (with the exception of one old lady) implying households without income in Lesotho just cannot survive. If anything, there is a negative correlation with ownership of fields and very little with ownership of livestock, particularly the smaller types of livestock such as sheep, goats and chickens. However, a households' ability to use some of their assets, such as fields, was influenced by the financial resources available to them and the poorer
households (and the wealthiest who perhaps did not need to use their land as they could afford to buy food) were the least likely to produce a harvest.

The temporal nature of poverty in Lesotho is also demonstrated by the data. Even though households may be on similar incomes in 2002 (such as the chronically poor and the descending poor) yet their asset base is different. For instance the descending poor are more likely to own radios and latrines than the chronically poor because they started from a much higher asset and financial base in 1993. Again this echoes Gordon’s hypothesis that the length of time spent in poverty has an impact on access to necessities. The data shows that whilst an income is critical for households in Lesotho, it is by no means the only livelihood strategy. Migration of household members for work who can then remit wages to the household and growing one's own food or keeping animals are also critical strategies for survival. As bovines are the traditional form of currency, certain payments are also usually made in cattle and so these kind of transactions do not appear in the financial records of households at all. For instance, bride-price, fines and payment for traditional services such as traditional healers or initiation schools are nearly always paid for in traditional currency.

Because financial income is critical but not the only form of livelihood strategy engaged in by the Basotho, predictors of household income are sparse and based almost entirely on the human capital available to the household. Deaths in the household, of any age, deplete a household’s resources. This is in contrast to migration out of a household which often improves the position of the household probably because the émigré still acts as a resource even if not living with the other household members. Despite death meaning less mouths to feed, in the case of Lesotho it is the young and fit who are dying and so human capital is depleted. The fact that the presence of a wage worker in the household in 1993 does predict that a household will stay out of poverty suggests that wage work begets wage work. Owing to the rapid turnover in wage workers it is not necessarily the case that the wage worker in 1993 is still earning money in 2002. What the data suggests is that the connections formed whilst working and probably the ability to educate the younger members of the household pays off nine years later with other members of the household gaining jobs. That miners' sons often become miners (Murray, 1981) in Lesotho is well known but there seems to be some evidence that other types of
waged worker can help family members gain jobs. This is important when looking at some of the opportunities open to young Basotho and again has echoes in US data and the social capital literature (McNamee & Miller, 2004). The Lesotho data again shows the critical importance of mother's (or in this case the most senior female's) schooling on the income earning potential of a household.

Perhaps one of the most striking things about this data set is how poverty per se in 1993 did not predict poverty in 2002. This suggests that although wage work is important for keeping the family out of poverty other forms of income do not have the same far reaching effect. Income from informal businesses, casual work, remittances from family outside the household are precarious in nature and cannot necessarily protect a family from long term poverty, nor can farming one's own land or developing livestock husbandry be relied upon to ensure a family's long term prosperity. No wonder, then, that Basotho are sometimes reluctant to invest heavily in farming or small businesses, and see waged work as the best pathway out of poverty.

For children and adults the predictors of poverty are very similar. This is partly because many of the measures in this study were household based. But it is also because the numbers and proportions of adults and children in poverty are similar. However, the odds of children being in poverty are slightly different to adults on each predictor. Whilst ownership of fields and fowl are positively correlated with being in poverty and increase the odds that children will be poor, again the presence of a wage worker and mother's schooling reduces it. This again implies that there is actually a dichotomy between a livelihood based on subsistence and one based on money.

The wage worker though does not increase the odds of children not being poor as much as it does for adults. Instead the presence of an over 65 year old in the household has a major impact on children's poverty status later. This finding needs a lot more exploration but it suggests that some of the more common views on dependency and age may not be universal (Walker, 1990). Somehow older people in the household are protecting children from poverty either through their greater experience or through the assets they have accumulated or by looking after the children when parents die.
If more proof were needed that income alone cannot be used solely as a measure of poverty, this data gives it, with the lack of correlations and predictors between various measures. If a more democratic approach is needed to the development of measures then asking children themselves is one route to take. Few, if any, studies elsewhere have tried to develop indicators from discussions with children – the decision has normally rested with what adults felt to be necessities. This study did not work systematically with children to actually develop definite indicators but it did discuss the theme of poverty with children and asked them how they identified the poor. In these discussions children identified fundamentally the same things as adults did both in Lesotho and, I would argue, as in the UK.

Gordon et al (2000a) divide their list of deprivations for children into five categories – food, clothing, participation and activities, developmental activities and the child’s environment. The highest scoring items were fresh fruit and vegetables daily, three meals a day, new shoes and a warm coat, the ability to celebrate special occasions, books belonging to the child and a bed with bedding. Over 90% of parents in the survey said that all of these items were essential for children in the UK. Parents in Lesotho were not asked in the 2002 survey what they ranked as essential for their children but focus groups with adults had been held in 2001 as part of the preparations for the nation’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper and in these groups adults had described the items they felt were essential for a good life. These covered access to land, income, skills, capabilities and education, assets, food security and health. At first sight these do not seem to have much in common with the Gordon et al index but closer scrutiny reveals links in the thinking behind these categories.

What is termed food security means the ability of parents to feed their children well and this is echoed in British parents desire to give their children three meals a day and fruit and vegetables. Assets in Lesotho, as we have seen, often cover agricultural equipment and other equipment which can be used to generate income but the term also covers items such as a radios, chairs and beds. For a child in Lesotho to have access to its own bed may be seen as an unnecessary luxury, therefore, but parents in Lesotho do recognise that some form of comfort is necessary for children. Parents in Lesotho put a high value on education and, again, although they may not expect to own books they are alike with UK parents in valuing the skills and information that books impart. Being able to participate in local customs and
obligations is also just as important to Basotho parents. Children are traditionally given an item of new clothing at Christmas in Lesotho. In 1993 around 66% of households bought new clothes for their children. By 2002 this had dropped to just under 50% indicating that parents were finding it harder to help their children celebrate in this way. Similarly land, cattle and/or income is essential for undertaking other customs such as contributing to funerals or providing bride-price. Failure to be able to participate can lead to social exclusion for the families concerned.

As we have seen children in Lesotho also did not measure poverty purely in terms of material wealth when asked about it. Although recognising that material wealth, either in the form of assets such as land or cattle or in the form of income were crucial to well being and could provide access to other less tangible benefits, poverty itself was not spoken about purely in those terms. Just like the adults, children recognised that health was an important factor and that healthy individuals were less likely to be poor (as was found in the UK (Gordon et al, 2000a)). In addition children were particularly aware that they need the opportunity to get out of poverty and looked to schooling as a means of doing so. Access to schooling and education was therefore a critical issue for many children in Lesotho. Given that school in the UK is compulsory and notionally free parents in the UK did not overtly focus on attendance at school as an indicator but they were aware that acquiring knowledge and skills at home as well as school was important and rated items such as books, educational toys and a bike highly. In fact discussions with children in the UK are very similar to those held in with children in Lesotho. Group discussions held with British children in 2001 by the Child Rights Alliance across the UK found that children talked about poverty in terms of education, health, ability to participate in society at large, material wealth, hopes and dreams and also the stigmatising aspects of poverty (Willow, 2001). Children's definitions in both countries therefore tended to be more widely encompassing of different aspects of poverty than their parents.

The children in the Lesotho study also put a high premium on good care. This did not appear in the UK study, perhaps because it is so difficult to measure, and did not appear in conversations with adults in Lesotho. Yet children were very definite that children who did not receive good care or especially those who were deprived of their parents were somehow poorer than those who were able to live with their parents, or at least have regular contact with them.
In chapter 7 we saw how although lack of parents was seen as a sign of poverty by children it did not cluster or correlate with the other signs of poverty, namely material wealth, opportunities and health. Chapter 8 showed how it was quite possible for children not to be living with their parents and yet be relatively well-off in terms of access to goods and services, good health and good opportunities. The concerns parents have for their children and the concerns children have about themselves therefore all broadly appear to have the same basis regardless of whereabouts in the world they are. Whilst money may be a more or less important means of accessing goods and services, it is the deprivation of items necessary for life, health, good development and participation in one's own culture that defines being poor. This is particularly true for children who often do not have access to money and who do not have legal ownership or control over goods and services. Different cultures will have different ways of expressing these deprivations but they are common to both Lesotho and the UK and probably to most other countries (see Narayan, 1999). Not to be cared for by one's own blood relatives, in particular parents, also is seen as a form of deprivation by children in Lesotho where the increase in deaths from AIDS has made them far more aware of the potential for growing up without their own parents. UNICEF sees the family as 'the first line of defence' against poverty (UNICEF, 2005) and the fact that grandparents have such an important impact on reducing the likelihood of children being poor supports this view. But children in Lesotho saw the lack of parents (as opposed to other members of the extended family) as a form of poverty. Whether 'care' in one form or another is included in indexes or indicators of poverty is a moot point but that it is seen by children as a form of deprivation is clear and there is evidence that it leads to other forms of deprivation (Black, 2000).

When considering the four categories the children identified in Lesotho ie Material wealth, Opportunity, Health and Care it could be argued that some of the indices are falling into the trap of only being concerned about the future outcomes for children rather than their experience now. In particular 'Opportunity' implies future reward. However, by identifying attendance at school as 'opportunity' this is a measure of the 'here and now' as well as for the future. We have seen how children put a high premium on attending school not just for any potential future benefits but also because of what going to school offers them now. Similarly contact with a wage
worker not only gives them material advantages now but also opens another part of their world and guides their aspirations.

9.1.2 The Scale of Poverty

On any measure the scale of poverty suffered by children in Lesotho is greater than in the North. In the UK in 2001, about 21% of children were living in households with incomes less than 50% of the overall median. This was second only to Russia and the US and much higher than say Sweden or Finland (Bradbury et al, 2001). As we have seen Gordon et al found that 18% of children in the UK were deprived of two or more necessities (Gordon et al, 2000). In Lesotho, in 2002, the proportion of children living below the official poverty line was 87% about quadruple that of the North. If the same measure of poverty is used, ie taking 50% of median income as a cut off then 33% of the children in Lesotho are living in poverty (the difference between the official poverty line and a line set at 50% of the median also shows how highly skewed household income in Lesotho is). On either measure the scale of child poverty is therefore much higher (as would be expected) in Lesotho than in the North.

However, if we turn to look at the proportions of people in poverty we find some similarities and some differences. Female headed households in Lesotho were more likely to be amongst the chronically poor in 1993 than male headed households but over a quarter of the upwardly mobile households also had female heads so some women were finding means of escape from poverty. But the fact of a household head being female in 1993 did not act as a predictor of poverty later nor did the number of women in a household. This may be partly because household level indicators cannot say much about intra household transfers but in this study there were about the same proportion of men in poor households as women. It would not be true to say therefore in the Lesotho context that poverty ‘often wears a female face’ (Lister, 2004 p55) with the exception of female headed households.

The same was true for children who were no more likely to be in poverty than adults in 1993 but found it marginally more difficult to escape from poverty than adults by 2002. This is contrary to findings from many countries in the North where children tend to be the poorest group. For instance, Canada, Italy, the US and the UK all have higher child poverty rates than for their populations as a whole (Bradshaw, 2000). The reason is that households in Lesotho bear little relation to Northern households. With
an average of 7-8 people per household often at least half of those were adults, sometimes of differing generations and sometimes of the same. In fact, as the smaller households tend to be the wealthier households, they also tend to be the more ‘nuclear’ in structure and so the children start to outnumber the adults. Again part of this finding may be due to the fact that there are no reliable equivalised scales for Lesotho but reducing the per capita income for children would actually give a lower figure for children in poverty.

All this suggests that child poverty is less different from adult poverty in the South than in the North in terms of scale. Indeed it could be argued that poverty in fact blurs the edges between children and adults, in many ways, in a country like Lesotho. However it must be remembered that this study was a longitudinal study and so it is quite possible that the data from these households are different from that of the population as a whole. This data shows that for this group of households over time the children are not a significantly poorer group than the adults.

There is one other way in which poverty in Lesotho from this study differs from the North. During this time in at least the UK poverty amongst children was at least static and even began to diminish slightly in the early part of the 21st century (National Statistics, 2005). As we have seen, in Lesotho, whereas 39% of the children were living below the poverty line in 1993 by 2002 this had risen to 53%. Even if we look at just the children who were present in the households in 1993 and 2002 (ie longitudinal rather than cross-sectional) we find that 49% were still below the poverty line in 2002. In common with other sub-saharan countries, Basotho children and the households they live in, are getting poorer (Commission for Africa, 2005).

9.1.3 Poverty Dynamics
When looking at the dynamics of poverty over time it is very difficult to disaggregate the individual from the household. In terms of the household, about 40% of the households have changed position and about 60% have stayed roughly the same, although the disparity between the rich and poor have grown larger. In fact only the top two income quintiles in 2002 had seen a real rise in income since 1993. The rural areas in Lesotho have been particularly hard hit by retrenchments from the mines in South Africa which means that waged work in the rural areas, particularly amongst men, has also declined. Some Basotho are gaining waged work and this usually
takes the household out of poverty but it is at a far slower rate than the job losses experienced, and is not so well paid.

Loss of waged work is often replaced with an expansion in casual and informal work and increased reliance on subsistence agriculture and the average number of sources of income has expanded over the nine years. Livestock holdings and returns on fields have declined in prevalence but earn more for those households who manage to make a living out of them. In fact 41% of Basotho households now rely on at least two sources of income to support them and this is without counting subsistence farming that is purely for home consumption. This expansion of home based income generation has led to children being required to work at home more than before. Hence, although more children are enrolled at school (but we do not know how often they attend) children are also having to work more. Although herding as a full-time activity for boys has dropped (due to reduced livestock holdings), children are having to help around the house and in the fields more. In addition, as Basotho households rely increasingly on traditional fuels children have about doubled the time they spend in collecting fuel from a median of an hour to 2 hours every day.

Access to water and sanitation services has improved but the chronically poor have benefited the least. More children are also attending school. Both these achievements demonstrate the key role Government policy can have in alleviating child poverty. Throughout the 1990s the Government of Lesotho had an active village water supply and national sanitation programme which subsidised the installation of clean water supplies in villages and the construction of basic pit latrines. In addition, as we have seen, the Government introduced a rolling programme of free primary school education. Both of these policies have mitigated some of the worst impacts of growing rural poverty for children. However, sickness is still a major problem for rural households in Lesotho and AIDS is undercutting many of the achievements of the 1990s.

The evidence from this study shows the strong relationship between death and poverty. Deaths in the family increase the chances of a child becoming poor by over 100%. Death is one of the main drivers of descent into poverty and shows the dramatic impact AIDS is having on rural Basotho households. However, these deaths of mainly ‘parent’ age people not only cause a change in the dynamics of
poverty within the household. They also contribute to another dynamic – that of child mobility and children are more likely to move out of the household when there has been a death there.

The main two drivers for children into poverty in this study therefore are loss of waged work and deaths in the family. These two drivers are very similar to those found by Aber and Ellwood (2001) in the industrialised countries. Here family change was more likely to be due to separation or divorce but the principle is the same – loss of work and family change in both the North and South tend to precipitate children into poverty. However, the responses to the descent into poverty may be quite different in the two regions.

9.1.4 Coping Strategies

The mechanisms whereby Basotho families cope with either being long-term poor or descending into poverty depends on their circumstances but a few strategies stand out. We have seen how Basotho households try and diversify their sources of income particularly as they get poorer. By using a combination of agricultural production, casual work, informal business and exchange of services for goods poor Basotho families scrape by. In addition the 2002 survey showed a high level of what might be termed ‘charity’ from the wealthier village members to the poorer with 45% of households receiving loans from friends and neighbours in the previous year and over a quarter receiving gifts of food in the month before the survey.

Basotho households also use their connections to the utmost with gifts and remittances often being a major source of income. As family members are prepared to migrate to find work they send home generally fairly small amounts of money to the sending household. This is a particularly successful strategy if people can get jobs in South Africa where the pay tends to be higher. Being able to find this work is often based on contacts developed by the family.

All the above strategies show clearly the agency of Basotho poor in coping with their own poverty. This has also been noted by researchers in the North. The use of the informal economy as a means of augmenting income has been well documented (Kempson et al, 1994; Edin & Lein, 1996). Although most of the studies have been geographically very specific yet they show how people in the North use a variety of
informal or casual methods for earning income which is normally not reported for fear of falling foul of welfare assistance rules. Such work encompasses casual work for others, small self-employed enterprises and working for pay in kind (Williams & Windebank, 2000).

Poor people in the North also use social networks as much as possible to augment income, help find work or to help in the day to day management of just being poor. Kempson et al (1994) found that help in kind was often the preferred form of payment for informal services but Williams and Windebank (2000) found the opposite with people preferring to be paid in cash as a means of augmenting income. They also found that social networks were a source of finding work. All these strategies are used in a very different context by the Basotho again with the same mixture of success and failure. Lister (2004) makes the point that agency, in terms of how poor people manage to survive, is a critical issue and again brings us back to Sen’s views on capabilities and functionings. However, perhaps one of the greatest differences is that migration is a far bigger factor in Basotho coping strategy than in the North. This is partly because of necessity – there is no real welfare provision in Lesotho - and partly because there is a culture of migration for work that has been in existence for 100 years or more.

This mobility is expressed not just by adults moving out to find work but also in sending children out to alleviate the family and to hopefully give a child a better chance in a wealthier family. The data from this study shows that children are just as likely to move with their parents as without but, in this case, it is usually because the parents have found work elsewhere and almost certainly they will be remitting some of their wages back to the originating household. However, children are also sent out without their parents as a way of reducing strain on the family and ensuring that child’s education and welfare. These children should not always be seen as a burden to the receiving household either as they can be an economic and social boon to the recipient household. The strategy of sending children to wealthier relatives is not a new one either in the South or the North although it is rarely used in the North today. Jane Austen’s heroine, Fanny, in ‘Mansfield Park’ was just such a child who had been sent to wealthier relatives to be brought up in early 19th century Britain. It could be argued that the practice of taking children into ‘care’, given that most ‘looked after’ children are from poor backgrounds, is also a way of ensuring children’s survival by
sending (or taking) them out of the original homes. But the evidence from this study and other studies in the South (Ansell & van Blerk, 2004) as well amongst ‘looked after’ children in the North (West, 1995) would suggest that children see this for what it is – a way of coping with poverty and a poor situation rather than the ideal way to live. Studies have shown that growing up ‘alone’ impacts on future potential (Black, 2000) and, whilst the children in this study, largely had their material needs met and were well cared for in their new homes the children themselves saw lack or loss of a parent as a sign of poverty. Either poverty had led them to be ‘alone’ as with those children who were sent to relatives because their parents could not support them or those children whose parents worked away leaving them ‘home alone’ or the death of a parent had precipitated the family into poverty. Either way lack of a parent is closely associated with poverty and becomes part of the same package in children’s minds.

9.2 Understanding Child Poverty in Lesotho

We have looked at the limitations of using income as the only measure of poverty for children. By talking to children we can gain an understanding of some of the concerns of children and how they measure poverty for themselves. This has been used to generate an index of well-being for children which covers material well-being, opportunities, health and care. It is this constellation of factors which give children a good life and also which includes items which appertain to the individual, such as care, items which appertain to the household or family such as income and livestock and those which appertain to society at large and which are a measure of how well children can access vital services such as clean water and schooling. All these factors form a coherent index both theoretically and in practice. The exception may be ‘care’ which is not so closely related to the other factors and stands out as being different. Including ‘care’ in the index has made it more complex. For instance there are three groups of children rather than two – a well off and a poor – and the indicators need to be seen as clustered rather than on a straight continuum, but its inclusion covers real deprivations in child’s lives.

With regard to the other factors we find that child poverty is not that different from adult poverty either in the factors that affect children or in the scale by which they are affected. Part of this is undoubtedly because most of the indicators in this study were household level indicators and children and adults live in households together. They
are also similar because in Basotho society child and adult poverty is treated in largely the same way. Child poverty has not been targeted by Government or donors to any great extent so that what benefits the household will, by and large, benefit adults and children alike. Apart from the provision of free primary schooling there are no other Government programmes aimed solely at children and no cash transfer schemes to aid children, as opposed to adults, in poverty. Basotho who want to help poor children tend to do it through their adult carers and the family is still very much the ‘first line of defence’ in Lesotho. There is some evidence from this study that children are slightly more sensitive to predictors of poverty than adults (in that there are more predictors for children than adults) but this probably is more an indication of the increased vulnerability of children. For instance, dirty water or overcrowding is more likely to affect children’s health adversely than adults.

The exception of course is in terms of ‘lack of care’ which children strongly linked to poverty and which they saw as a deprivation. Losing a parent or having to live away from a parent due to lack of material assets was to them a form of poverty. Living without a parent also radically changes life’s trajectory for children. Instead of being brought up in the village of their birth they may well have to get to know and relate to a completely different set of people or even be responsible for the day to day running of a home and caring for their siblings at a young age. Materially they may be as well off if not better off. They may be able to go to school and they may have access to clean water and more space but they still will not be with their own parents or sometimes wider family. These factors show the critical importance of both qualitative studies to accompany quantitative and also longitudinal studies to accompany cross-sectional.

If this study had not been conducted longitudinally we should not have known that nearly a third of the original sample of children had disappeared from the sample of households. Nor for that matter that over ten percent of the children in the second wave had come into the households when they were over the 9 years of age. It was this loss of children from the original sample that led to the small qualitative study of those children who had left. In order to study poor children in Lesotho therefore, it is not sufficient just to look at their present situation without taking some account of where they have come from and where they are going. Ansell and Young (2004) found that some children whose parents had died, possibly of AIDS, had moved home up to five times, as each household they went to then found that they could not cope
with an additional mouth to feed and the children had to move on. Yet these moves and the impact they have on children are rarely recorded in studies of poverty. The move may sometimes materially compensate children but it can be transitory and does not encompass the full level of deprivation felt by children.

Household indicators on the whole had low predictive power in terms of child poverty. By tracing these children through childhood we can see what are some of the factors children themselves feel affect outcomes for them and also we can account for 'shocks' or 'hazards' which can radically alter the life path for children. This may be in the form of a single shock such as the death of a parent or maybe a web of factors which interact in order to necessitate the child moving or living without a parent such as parents feeling the necessity to go and work in another country. With the impact of AIDS being increasingly felt in countries like Lesotho it will be more important than ever to treat the child as a unit of analysis in their own right and to be able incorporate shocks and hazards as well as more conventional measures when considering their well-being.

9.3 Combining Methods

A study of this type also raises several methodological issues. Firstly its longitudinal character raises issues about tracing missing people. As we have seen a third of the children had disappeared from the original sample (and many of the adults) and they therefore needed to be taken into account when considering the data. Although this study was only able to trace and interview 19 of these children any future study would need to have the resources to trace a sufficient number to be statistically robust if generalisations to the whole population are to be made. This quantitative part of this study is therefore more the story of Basotho households over time than of each individual within those households.

Such tracing and keeping track of individuals is harder in a developing country context. Not only are individuals more likely to be highly mobile, especially younger individuals, but they will probably be harder to trace. In a country such as Lesotho where only a third of the births are formally registered individuals can and have changed nationality relatively easily let alone move from place to place. As we have seen Lesotho has a very limited telephone network, limited electoral rolls and all the
checks that require addresses and proof of identity in the North are mostly missing in a country like Lesotho. Having said that, people in the original villages often knew where someone may have gone, or at least where to start looking, but this form of tracing is extremely labour intensive and expensive. In addition if the people being sought are homeless, living with someone unrelated or, in the case of children, actually gone onto the street it is very difficult indeed to find them. The dearth of longitudinal studies in the developing world is testament to the great practical difficulties of following up on individuals. In this respect possibly not enough use has been made of life histories and retrospective means of data collection but these, of course, are subject to all the problems of accuracy of recall.

However this study was not just faced with the problems of tracing people in a developing country. The data collection for the household survey also faced some major hurdles. The decision was made to restrict the survey to rural populations partly because tracing households in the urban areas is even more difficult. But the sheer inaccessibility of some of the villages visited and the occasionally long process of gaining consent at each village makes this kind of study expensive and arduous. The less than clear cut nature of some of the data also can give problems. For instance in most Northern countries treated water from a tap is normally considered a clean water supply. In Lesotho a covered spring is normally considered one source of clean water but how clean this sometimes is once cattle have been given access to it etc. is debatable. Problems of interpretation also arose during the collection of data. This study used 18 years as the cut off age for when a child becomes an adult but we have seen how in law certain groups never gain their majority and in focus groups with adults age was never given as a demarcation. As one Mosotho adult put it;

'A child is a child when under the control of parents' (Sechaba Consultants, 2000 p167)

Hence several of the ‘children’ traced in this study would not be considered children by many Basotho. It is problematic therefore to treat individuals as a group in the data when they are not necessarily seen as a group ‘on the ground’. These differences in perception, in meanings and in the sheer practical ability to undertake a field survey all have to be taken into account before embarking on either a qualitative or quantitative study.
Perhaps the most major methodological issue this study had to face was how to incorporate qualitative and quantitative measures in the same piece of research. This piece of research typifies at least two ways in which qualitative and quantitative research can be combined. In the first case the qualitative group discussions with children were being held in parallel with the collection of survey data. This meant that the qualitative data could not be fed into the design of the survey but this perhaps did not seriously matter given that the design of the 2002 survey was constrained by what had been collected in 1993. However, the data from qualitative research was used as the basis for analysis of the quantitative data. The Child Poverty Index was based on the categories of deprivation children had identified in the discussions. This, of course, meant there were limitations as there was no guarantee that the concerns raised in the qualitative discussions would be reflected in the survey data at all and certainly, on reflection, other quantitative data could have been collected which would more closely match the concerns of children. However, this would have meant that the longitudinal nature of the quantitative data might have been lost.

But this does show a means of combining qualitative and quantitative data in a way which does not violate Bryman’s concerns about incongruity (Bryman, 1995). There could be concerns that analysis of quantitative data was based on a non-representative sample’s views of what is relevant (Ravallion, 2002) but this practice is so wide-spread in sociology as to be generally accepted.

As well as parallel collection of data there was also sequential collection of data. The initial results from the quantitative survey showed that a third of the sample of children were missing. Because of this it was decided to try and trace the missing children but not in sufficient numbers or in random enough ways to ensure any kind of statistical validity. This puts these elements (conducting a survey and then qualitative interviews) firmly in the Sequential Mixed Model category (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998) whereby each phase of the data collection is undertaken and analysed separately and sequentially but one feeds into the other. The next phase would be, of course, to undertake a quantitative survey of mobile or missing children. Such sequential use of quantitative and qualitative research is common, but possibly it is not so common to undertake the research in this order whereby the quantitative informs the qualitative. What both the different ways of combining the data show – either in parallel or in sequence - is the organic nature of combining the two types. In
that sense this research has been exploratory rather than confirmatory in nature (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

Hentschel (1998) distinguishes between data and method and between less contextual and more contextual. As he is prepared to admit highly contextual methods (which are usually qualitative in nature) can produce quantitative data (which are normally less contextual in nature) he is at odds with Bryman's views on congruity of data and method. In this study the qualitative data from the traced children was highly contextual and qualitative in nature. The data from the group discussions however, was used to inform less contextual quantitative data collection. However, longitudinal data is by its very nature highly contextual quantitative data (Hentschel, 1998) and we know very little about those households we did not find. Therefore although statistical techniques have been used on the household survey data it should always be remembered that this was not a truly random sample and in both the quantitative data collection and the qualitative the data came from those households or individuals which could be traced.

9.4 Child Poverty in Context

The measurement of child poverty, therefore, needs many factors to be taken into consideration. In addition to using different methodologies the context of the research has to be understood, as discussed in Chapter 1. If we now look at each context in turn we can see how they relate to measuring child poverty in Lesotho.

The Cultural Context

As we have seen, Lesotho is caught between two cultures. On the one hand is the modernising influence of a monetary economy and the increase in access to global communication systems. On the other hand is the traditional way of earning a living, of educating children, of treating illness and ultimately burying the dead. In order to understand child poverty account has to be taken not just of the monetary income and worth of families but also of the traditional value of factors that contribute to child well-being. Hence land and livestock are a form of wealth that is actually negatively associated with monetary forms of wealth. A Mosotho is poor if she has no money but she is also poor if she cannot undertake those activities which make her a Mosotho. So the ownership of cattle, a place and land in a village, knowing her own culture and
paying certain fees and debts in the appropriate currency are critical to growing up as full member of Basotho society.

The Societal Context
Lesotho is a poor country by global standards. Whilst there is value in comparing her GNP or GNI against those of other countries it is also important that the poor in her society can be compared with the not so poor. In the rural areas where there is widespread poverty it is necessary to consider what factors lead to exclusion from mainstream society. In this respect, for a child, not going to school is clearly an isolating factor for many children as is disability and also being sent away from home for several months of the year to herd livestock. But Basotho society is also changing in terms of the waged work available to its members (Turner, 2003) and the relatively stable, but fatherless for much of the time, households of miners have given way to households which rely on the erratic gifts of women who have gone to the towns to work in the textile factories. This in turn has meant that households without waged workers have become poorer, both in income and other terms, and this has an impact on the well-being of children.

However, from this study it is also clear that children who have had to change homes, perhaps several times, find it harder to engage with the wider society. As the problems and deaths from AIDS worsen so does the issue of mobile children or children who are left to head up households themselves. The issue then is how are these children going to engage with society in Lesotho both in the future and now? And how is society changing as a result of the epidemic? These questions were only started to be asked in 2002 but they have an impact on how children grow up and engage with their compatriots.

The Policy Context
Even though governments in the South can sometimes be weak and communications, amongst other things, can make any kind of national strategies difficult yet the policy context for children can be vital to their well-being. We have seen how national strategies in Lesotho on water and sanitation and free schooling has had a major impact on children. Not only does this show that government policy does have an effect when backed by adequate resources but it also shows the value of welfare transfers to children. It is possible that just by increasing family incomes children
may have had increased access to schooling but such activities as supplying clean water to a village usually need a much more corporate approach to improving living standards. Conversely the lack of effective government policy on such matters as the provision of anti-retroviral medication for AIDS victims is also apparent in the number of young deaths Lesotho is experiencing.

However, it is not just specific policies which can affect children’s well-being. The Government of Lesotho, in common with most other governments also upholds the family as the main unit for nurturing children and policies are directed towards strengthening that unit. In 2002/2003 this unit was still just about holding, even though children were having to be moved around family members or even left in households at a distance. As the AIDS crisis deepens the ability of the family to be able to respond to crises is likely to weaken and new policies which look beyond the boundaries of the family may have to be introduced. These will inevitably have an impact on the ability of children to stay out of poverty.

The Child Context
Hitherto many measurements of child poverty have tended to be based on adult measures. The exception has been deprivation indices but even these have either been drawn up by adults or use indicators that apply to adults and children alike. This study has shown how in many ways child and adult poverty are similar and similar deprivations affect all ages just through the fact that they are all human beings. However, we have also looked at the differences between adults and children in terms of increased vulnerability and because the children have to operate within a framework over which they have even less control than adults.

How child agency affects poverty status needs much more research although we know that working children often are significant contributors to household income and functioning (Marcus & Harper, 1996). But the increased vulnerability of children and their relative powerlessness when faced with adult decision making has been clearly shown. In the case of Lesotho even girls who have got married have had little choice over their subsequent destiny. As we have seen girls, particularly those who husbands cannot or will not support them, are considered children in Lesotho and treated as such. But other young people may be considered adults because they have undergone the appropriate ceremonies or undertaken the responsibilities of
adults in their communities. What a society means by childhood and who they consider children is therefore very important when considering child poverty. Whilst the large multi-lateral agencies may have decided that all under 18 year olds are children, the experience of, say, teenagers on the ground may be quite different and they may be faced with issues which are quite different from those who are still regarded as children.

This study has used the internationally recognised cut-off age of 18 years but the data has shown how diverse the experience of this age group can be, particularly from the interviews with traced children, some of whom are parents themselves. This needs to be taken into account when seeking to measure child poverty. One way to do this is to increase participation of children in the research process. By involving children in the process of research, the relevance of measures to children’s lives can be established. In particular their views should be sought when trying to draw up indicators for large scale quantitative studies.

The Practical Context

It is tempting to try and carry out a water tight piece of research which methodologically is comparable to other studies throughout the world so that cross-country comparisons can be made and everyone can be confident in the quality of the data. The reality in many countries is, however, that it may be very difficult to gather all the data required. Not only may there be little comparability across indicators (for instance good sanitation can mean different things in different parts of the world) but the sheer difficulty of reaching certain population groups may make the process of data collection problematic. The difficulty may be in terms of problems of access or locating the desired populations, or of gaining permissions, or it may also be in terms of logistical support and the practical difficulties of just finding and getting to a place.

The drawing up of research plans, therefore, needs to realistically assess what is possible in the circumstances. The tracing of children in a developing country is a good case in point. Even if we know where they once lived, to then locate them and get to the desired location, to gain permission from whoever may be responsible for looking after them (if anyone) and to interview them in such a way that there is no further distress, and the responsibility of the interviewer towards the child is recognised, is indeed a challenge for social research.
Conclusion

The kind of deprivation which children experience is not necessarily that different in different parts of the world, although it is usually expressed differently and needs different ways of measuring it. If primarily household measures are used then children and adults experience a similar type of poverty and in a country like Lesotho on a similar scale. However, when children’s views are taken into account, children, at least in Lesotho, place a higher premium on care and living with their own family unit than adults do. In order to fully explore child poverty not only do children’s views need to be taken into account but a variety of different methodologies need to be used. In addition the context in which children live and grow up needs to inform the data and the research process needs to take account of the mobility of this particular group.

Future surveys of child poverty and possibly elsewhere, need to take into account some of these issues. In particular children’s own views of what constitutes poverty should be sought and indicators developed from them, prior to a survey taking place. As the AIDS epidemic continues to worsen in Lesotho children will not only feel the lack of material goods but many other facets of their lives may well be affected. From the discussions held with children in this study it is clear that loss of parents constitute deprivation in many children’s minds. But the question is also, how does the kind of mobility that children often have to undergo as a result of poverty or being orphaned impact on children and how do they perceive it. Whilst the discussions held with children as part of this study have highlighted issues around the care children experience, children were not asked about mobility or the effect of living with relatives, other members of the community or even alone.

Such discussions with children and young people would ideally be held before any survey took place, and with their help better indicators of deprivation could be drawn up which encompassed the full breadth of children’s experience. At the very least indicators of health, opportunity and material wealth should be included but the critical nature of ‘care’ for children in Lesotho today means that it should be included even if it does not appear to correlate so closely with the others. Children themselves would be able to have input into what makes a good indicator of an underlying condition if they are asked in a way in which they find it easy to respond. In addition children should
be asked to validate any results of from a survey and are often the best people to ask
to explain any anomalies in the data. Although this study looks primarily at the
phenomenon of child poverty in Lesotho I would argue that it shows how, by involving
the population of interest first hand in formulating the research questions, a much
more comprehensive picture can be gained which will be of use to other researchers
and policy makers alike.
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Appendix 1 – Questionnaire Used in 1993 and 2002 study

Pages 1-2: 1993 Study

Pages 3-9: 2002 Study
1. HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH Member</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age (Yrs)</th>
<th>Rel to HH Head</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Highest School</th>
<th>Years of School</th>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Brings Income?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEX

1. Male
2. Female

RELATION TO HH HEAD
0. None
1. Head
2. Spouse
3. Child
4. Grandchild

2. INFORMATION ON CHILDREN UNDER 6 YEARS OF AGE (use codes or specify other disease)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member no. from 1</th>
<th>Age in months</th>
<th>Height in centimetres</th>
<th>Weight in kilograms</th>
<th>Illnesses in last 2 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. NUMBER AND TYPE OF HOUSES IN HOUSEHOLD

Rondavels 2 Flats — Heisi — Optak — Total rooms 2

4. CEREAL STOCKS IN HOUSEHOLD (bags and tins)

Maize 0/ Sorghum 0/ Wheat 0/ Phoofo 5 (units) Kg

Distribute — she depends on market
1. Iem 110. Item No. Item No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plough</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Sewing/knitting machine</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Coal stove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planter</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Scotch cart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Tractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Gas stove</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. HOUSEHOLD OWNERSHIP OF FIELDS AND LIVESTOCK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIVESTOCK TYPE</th>
<th>NO. OWNED BY TYPE</th>
<th>FIELDS/FENCED GARDEN &gt; .1 HECTARE</th>
<th>FIELD NO.</th>
<th>PLANTED 1993</th>
<th>SIZE CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>No. owned</td>
<td>Field 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1 m x m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equines</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>No. rented in</td>
<td>Field 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small stock</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>No. rented out</td>
<td>Field 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3 English acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>No. sharecropped</td>
<td>Field 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. CROP PRODUCTION DURING THE LAST SEASON (1992) (Give amounts in bags and tins)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field No.</th>
<th>Crop grown</th>
<th>Harvested 1992</th>
<th>Sold or given away 1992</th>
<th>Cut already 1993</th>
<th>Sold or given away 1993</th>
<th>Still on field 1993</th>
<th>Experienced theft 1993 Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. HOUSEHOLD INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wage work in Lesotho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine work in RSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other work in RSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual labour in Lesotho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock &amp; products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions/disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts (money from daugh.</td>
<td>30,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. HOUSEHOLD FACILITIES (circle if used now) (tick if exists but not used)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER SUPPLY</th>
<th>FUEL</th>
<th>TOILET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piped on site</td>
<td>1. Electric</td>
<td>1. WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private borehole</td>
<td>2. Gas</td>
<td>2. VIP (NESP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal piped</td>
<td>3. Coal</td>
<td>3. Other VIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal handpump</td>
<td>4. Paraffin</td>
<td>4. Latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered spring</td>
<td>5. Govt wood</td>
<td>5. Bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other spring</td>
<td>6. Other wood</td>
<td>6. Fly screen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater tank</td>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td>7. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam</td>
<td>9. Dam</td>
<td>9. Shrub/weeds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minutes to collect: __________

9. DOES ANYONE IN THE HOUSEHOLD HAVE A BANK ACCOUNT NOW? 1. Yes (c) No Amount ________

10. EXPENDITURES IN LAST WEEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoofo</th>
<th>Moroho</th>
<th>Sugar</th>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. EXPENDITURES IN LAST 6 MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Furniture</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Clothing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. FARMING EXPENDITURES THIS SEASON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fertilizer</th>
<th>Seed</th>
<th>Pesticide</th>
<th>Ploughing</th>
<th>Labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. HORTICULTURE Number of fruit trees ______ Number of garden crops ________
**Reasons for Water Supply Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Household Facilities (Check main use, tick others used)</th>
<th>5. Other Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIGTHING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER SUPPLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOILET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Household**

- Number: [Household number]
- Year: [Year]
- Reason: [Reason for change]

**Crops**

- Corn
- Rice
- Other

**Cash earned**

- [Amount per month]
- [Total amount]

**Assets**

- [List of assets]
- [Total value]

---

**General**

- Date: [Month/Year]
- Field Check: [Field Supervisor]
- [Interviewer]

---

**Poverty Questionnaire 2002**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN WHAT WAY?</th>
<th>REGISTERED</th>
<th>BORN</th>
<th>WHERE</th>
<th>DISABLED</th>
<th>RESIDENCE</th>
<th>PLACE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>RELATION TO HEAD</th>
<th>BORN</th>
<th>SEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF CHILD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHLD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Use 1993 household number even if person not present now.
6. CHILDREN AWAY FROM HOUSEHOLD
Are there children under 18 but who do not live here, whose parents are in this household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Mem Number</th>
<th>Sex - Male Female</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>What doing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. CHILDREN'S ACTIVITIES
For each child between 6 and 18 or at school NOW up to Form E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member number</th>
<th>Has attended initiation school</th>
<th>Has attended informal learning</th>
<th>If in school standard</th>
<th>If out Activity</th>
<th>If out, Why?</th>
<th>If in school standard</th>
<th>If out activity</th>
<th>If out Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Yes 2. No</td>
<td>1. Yes 2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTIVITY**
1 Herding for family
2 Herding for outside the family
3 Looking after younger sibling
4 Housework
5 Paid Domestic outside family
6 Other paid work
7 Initiation school
8 Other

**WHY NOT IN SCHOOL**
1 School too far
2 School too expensive
3 Physical impairment
4 Mental impairment
5 Sick/temp disabled
6 Not performing well
7 Has failed at school
8 Has finished school
9 Not interested
10 School not relevant
11 Working
12 Needed at home
13 Family needs money
14 Family cannot support
15 Got married
16 Learning informally
17 Pregnant

8. EXPENDITURE IN LAST 12 MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Uniform</th>
<th>Clothing</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Gifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>Feasts</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>Fertilizer</td>
<td>Seed</td>
<td>Pesticides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GIVEN GIFTS IN KIND**
Clothing 1. Yes 2. No
Food 1. Yes 2. No

9. LOANS FROM OUTSIDE FAMILY > M100 IN LAST 12 MONTHS

Is the household in debt? 1. Yes 2. No

If 1, Why?


Source: 1 Church 2 Union 3 Friends 4 Employer 5 Bank 6 Burial society 7 Savings group 8. Other

8. EXPENDITURE

### SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital/ Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. RECEIVED GIFTS IN-KIND LAST MONTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF FOOD</th>
<th>Cereals</th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Meat</th>
<th>Milk</th>
<th>Beans</th>
<th>Salt</th>
<th>Sugar</th>
<th>Eggs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITY kg/ltr</td>
<td>Times/Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. FOODS EATEN YESTERDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eaten</th>
<th>Bought</th>
<th>Home produced</th>
<th>Gift from outside household</th>
<th>Communal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papa/sorghum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat/fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN LAST 12 MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>TIMES YEARLY</th>
<th>MEMBER EARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wage work in Lesotho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine work in RSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other work in RSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual work in Lesotho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fato-fato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of crops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of vegetables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of animal products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of wool/mohair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of joala (net)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of dagga (net)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of beer (net)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of assets (net)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal business (net)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawking (net)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of fruit (net)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sale (net)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal business (net)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension/disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts (monetary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. TOTAL IN SAVINGS/BANK ACCOUNT
   Lesotho __________ RSA __________

14. LACKS
   In the last 12 months how often have you or your family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Often</th>
<th>2 Sometimes</th>
<th>3 Rarely</th>
<th>4 Never</th>
<th>5 D’know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felt unsafe from crime in your home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone without medicine or medical treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone without clean water to drink or cook with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone without enough to eat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone without fuel for heating or cooking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   How do you compare yourselves to others? 1 Poorer 2 Average 3 Better off

15. FOR OLDEST ADULT aged 16-65 – what has hampered or helped you achieve the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindrance</th>
<th>Hindrance</th>
<th>Hindrance</th>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Help</th>
<th>Help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waged Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing farming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up own business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding casual work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Hindrance
   1 None  11. Other
   2 Lack of land
   3 Not qualified
   4 Too sick
   5 lack of capital
   6 No ideas/ knowledge
   7 Problems of officialdom
   8 No work available
   9
   10 Don’t know

   Helps
   11. Other
## 16. SHOCKS AND WINDFALLS

In the last 8 years have any people in the household suffered from the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident</th>
<th>Member Response</th>
<th>Member Response</th>
<th>Member Response</th>
<th>Member Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence from Outside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocktheft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land dispute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchcraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence from Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious accident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was in prison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had drink/drug problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gained a study
- Scholarship
- Inherited or
- Won money
- Received lobola

### HHD MEMBER DEATH / RESPONSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HHD Member</th>
<th>Death / Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99 Whole HHD</td>
<td>1 Murdered, 2 Accident, 3 Sickness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sell assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Borrow money/credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Take children out of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Economise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Children sent out to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Find another way to make living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Get help from family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Get help from police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Get help from chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 17. SOCIAL CAPITAL for CHILDREN UNDER 18YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes, a Lot</th>
<th>Yes, Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>If Rare or Never Why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does/do your children play with other children in the village?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you leave your children with someone else in the village for a whole day if you need to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you look after other people's children whenever they need help?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you ever worry that someone in the village might hurt your children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you feel other adults in the village provide support and help to your children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do other adults discipline your child?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. GROUPS ATTENDED BY CHILDREN
Do any of your children do any of the following:
1. Attend a local religious group
   eg Choir, Boys Brigade
2. Attend an organisation eg Girl Guides
3. Belong to self help group eg football team
4. Go to election or political rallies
5. Take part in protests against the government
6. Attend Pitsos

19. POLITICAL
1. Did you vote in the last election
2. How often do you get news from the radio?
3. How often do you discuss political affairs with friends?
4. How often do you follow government and public affairs?

   1. Yes 2. No

FREQUENCY (how often)
1. Everyday
2. Few times a week
3. Few times a month
4. Less than once a month
5. Never

20. IN THE LAST 8 YEARS HAS THE ECONOMY OF THE HOUSEHOLD GOT:

CONFIRM CONFIDENTIALITY

and

THANK THE HH
## Appendix 2 - Child Poverty Study 2002
### Constituencies and Villages in Sample Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Hhd</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Number of households with under 10s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Mokone/Ntja Bokone</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Lebakana</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nkotoane</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chaba-li-maketse</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Mpharane</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Hloahloeng</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Mokotjo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sankoela/Shoaepane</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Makunyapane</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mosututsoana</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lithakaling</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Makoabating</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Makhoareng</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Sekokoaneng</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Liqala</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Makanese</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Zisindene</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Sikare</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Khubetsoana/Qaqatu</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Malephane</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Mosoeu</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Mohloka-Kobo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ramatlallla</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Maporoteng</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Households with children Under 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>131 Tsilo</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132 Sekhobe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>40 Ha Mothae</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 Ha Makhalanyane</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28 Matukeng</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 Temaneng</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>165 Teboho</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>166 Mahlanyeng</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>142 Raanye</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148 Sofonia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>163 Mokuba</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164 Thotanyana</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>38 Ha Taaso</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 Rolong</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>181 Hlajoane</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>182 Potjo</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10 Morolong</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Mpotla</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>175 Sekoto</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176 Matoli</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>156 Likoting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157 Liphaleng</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>172 Makateng</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173 Khoaba Laeja Bohobe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>153 Thabana Tsoana</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154 Mohale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>168 Khukhune</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>169 Sebatoalong</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170 Matebeleng</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>146 Sheeshe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147 Taung</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150 Tae</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 - Interview Schedule for Children's Groups

The interviews will be conducted with children between about 8 and 10 years old in groups of about eight. The techniques used will be based on participatory tools which do not rely on a high degree of literacy or verbal ability. However these are tools only and the discussion around the activities will be critical to the analysis. The groups will (children permitting) be audio-taped and transcribed. However, poverty can be a very sensitive and painful subject so it will be important not to make children feel they have to answer personally unless they wish to.

Below a variety of ideas are presented not all of which will be used. They will need piloting to select the best for the particular culture involved and are not presented in any particular order.

Research Questions

How do children assess who is poor and who is not poor. What criteria do they use?

Do children have a concept of poverty?

If they do, how do they see poverty. Eg is it a state that is amenable to change or static; is it self inflicted or brought about by forces beyond people's control?

What are some of the main things that prevent people from becoming poor?

Tools

1. To assess what material aspects of poverty children use to make judgements:

Ask the children to draw a schematic map of their village/area and mark out the houses of rich people and those of poor. How do they know this is where rich or poor people live?

2. To assess life chances and choices of children normally regarded as poor:

Present the children with the beginnings of a short story about a certain child and ask them to finish the story about what might happen to that child and why. The child could be one of the following depending on the experience of the group; a street child; a child not in school; a working child; a disabled child; a child whose parents have died of AIDS; a child who is a refugee.

3. To assess what children rate as important in their lives;

Ask the children to fill in charts in pictures or words with; The best thing that ever happened to me was........; The worst thing that ever happened to me was............

4. To assess if children see themselves as having a role in the household economy:

a) Ask the children 'Whose job is it to......? by giving the children cards with pictures/words saying 'Government', 'Parent', 'Grandparent', 'Village', 'Neighbour' etc on them and then a list of tasks and asking the children to put the relevant card next to the task. The questions would include such items as 'Whose job is it to bring
money into the household?’, ‘whose job is it to make sure family members get
treatment when sick’ etc.

b) Ask children to fill in a circle as to how they spend their day/week. What do they
do? What contributes to the well being of the household? What do they term play?
What are their favourite times? What do they see as their most important tasks?

5. To assess children’s aspirations:

a) Ask the children ‘If you had three wishes what would you wish for?’
b) Ask the children ‘If you had a million (local currency) what would you do with it?’
c) Ask them to draw/write what they want to be when they grow up and why? Ask
them what might stop them achieving this and what might help them.

6. To assess what children regard as the most important things in life:

a) Present the children with cards on which there are pictures of many different
aspects of life eg. Material things such as money, clothes etc; social items such as
friends, family, community; more abstract matters such as citizenship, peace etc.
Ask them to rank them as to which is the most important for a happy life (nb this is
very difficult to do but it is the discussion around the cards that is the most important
thing).

b) Show children a wide variety of pictures of people who represent certain
‘conditions’ eg someone unemployed, a child who shoe shines, someone who lives
without their family but has something desirable (radio, mobile phone etc) and ask
‘Are any of these people poor?’ ‘If so why?’

7. Using domain analysis, to assess what children associate with the word ‘poverty’

Develop a set of maybe 20 cards each with a word on it denoting something bad or
good but which features in their lives and they are familiar with eg crime, death, dirt,
peace, family, fun and ask children to place in them in various groups depending on
which they think belong together and then discuss why. This can be analysed using
SPSS to see how often certain cards appeared with other cards and what clusters
were formed.
Appendix 4 – Cards Used in the Children’s Groups
TLHOKAHALO EA MOSHE BE TS'
SEKOLO
SA
LIKHUTSANA
SEKOLO MOTE