

Research Proposal

THE IMPACT OF NATIONAL ADJUSTMENT ON  
VULNERABLE GROUPS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA:  
TOWARDS AN AGENDA OF ACTION TO REDUCE THE COSTS.

Supervising Fellow: Reginald Green  
Research Officer: Caroline Allison

Institute of Development Studies  
at the University of Sussex

February 1985

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
I. Rationale of Proposed Research	1-4
II. Aims of Research	4
III. Conceptual Issues	5-8
IV. Key Questions to be Tackled	8-9
V. Research Methods	10-15
VI. Programme of Research	15-16
VII. Question of Case Studies	16-18
VIII. The Context	18-19
Tables I, II, III, IV and V.	a - f

## I. RATIONALE OF PROPOSED RESEARCH

The emphasis in most of the analysis, and much of the debate on recession, rehabilitation and recovery in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) has been on demand reduction and - less prominently - supply expansion as means of regaining external and internal macro-economic balance. The inherent relationships between production and distribution - which are central to economics narrowly defined and crucial to political economy - have, at most, tended to be treated as footnotes. As a recent UNICEF Study points out:-

At present the process of 'economic adjustment' largely excludes the human dimension, attempting to set the economy right while neglecting the impact on the population. This is an unnecessary extreme - socially, politically, even economically (since it neglects the importance of maintaining investment in human resources). (UNICEF: The Impact of World Recession on Children, New York 1984: 139)

Defining the primary challenge in the recessionary climate as that of making optimal use of scarce resources with a view to reasserting the longer term economic benefits of investment in 'social sectors', UNICEF has embarked on a programme of research - international in character - to evaluate the implications of recession and national policies adopted in response on the welfare of children. (see initial publication, Jolly, R and Cornia, G. A, The Impact of World Recession on children, Pergamon Press, New York 1984)

Allbeit often neglected at the levels of policy analysis and research, children - especially those of poor, low income households - are perceived as the weakest, most vulnerable members of society. Nor is the significance of

familial and wider socio-economic circumstances in determining the relative wellbeing of children within and between societies in dispute. Nevertheless very little substantive research has to date been concerned to analyse national adjustment from the perspective of children and still less of vulnerable groups more broadly defined. This gap is severe from a knowledge and applied operational perspective in the context of SSA where vulnerability raises issues not only of the day to day survival of many, but the future economic and social participation of most.

There is nonetheless increasing recognition of the seriousness in both economic and political-economic terms of the neglect of distributional concerns in production orientated analysis and prognosis. (see for example, paper presented to Conference on Rehabilitation and Recovery in Sub-Saharan Africa, OECD/Development Centre, IDS, CERDI November 1984 by Colclough, C 'Competing Paradigms - and Lack of Evidence - In the Analysis of African Development: Reflections on the Debate About Agricultural Pricing Policy' which stresses the need to develop a theoretical framework to explain why domestic policies have failed to enhance either distribution or production).

The most recent World Bank Report (IBRD, Toward Sustained Development in sub-Saharan Africa, Washington D.C 1984) unlike its predecessor (IBRD, Accelerated Development in sub-Saharan Africa: An Agenda For Action, Washington D.C 1981) accepts that production orientated adjustment may fail to meet the needs of some low income groups and that specific provision to avoid such an outcome needs to be made. Discussion is also said to be taking place within the IMF on the need for a protective, complementary policy package designed to safeguard vulnerable groups from the negative effects of stringent adjustment.

It has been argued, however, that it is not adjustment but recession which is

potentially damaging in its implications for vulnerable groups, and that the former in laying the foundations for long term sustainable growth is by definition positive. Although there is clearly a need to distinguish the recessionary impact from the impact of attempted cures this line of reasoning raises two important issues.

First, the choice of policy instruments, adopted with a view to regaining internal and external balance are far from uniform in terms of their distributional effects and implications for vulnerable groups irrespective of whether these are selected on the basis of 'conditionality' or national politico-economic imperatives. At this level of analysis the key question is not how to achieve economic consolidation/adjustment without cost, but how the costs can be distributed in such a way as to cause least damage to those most vulnerable in any given context. Such choices involve political as well as economic considerations, the outcome of which is determined in large part by the relative power of decision-taking coalitions and relative strength of different socio-economic groups in perpetuating or maintaining their interests.

Second, there is the question of short term costs as distinct from longer term benefits. At a general level of analysis it is true to say that increased future production will benefit all members of society, although how much is largely contingent on the way in which production gains are distributed. In addition it is difficult to see how when a steadily growing proportion of the continent's population is being forced into the vicious circle of poverty, ignorance, ill health starvation and low productivity future productive capacity is to be enhanced.

The research issue is not one of measuring costs against some pre recessionary

period and allocating them to recession or adjustment. It is to study and estimate differences in cost burden and timing of alternative economic policy instruments or alternative adjustment packages.

## II. AIMS OF RESEARCH

It is against this backcloth that the primary aims of the proposed research may be summarised as follows:-

- i) to identify vulnerable social groups (rural-urban) in one or more selected SSA country case studies;
- ii) to analyse the differential impact of a number of policies adopted in response to recession as part of national adjustment strategy on the vulnerable groups identified and the ways in which they respond to and cope with negative effects;
- iii) to assess the effectiveness of policies implemented with a view to countering vulnerability in the short (e.g 'food for work' 'free food' schemes) and in the longer (e.g increased cost effectiveness of investment in 'social sectors') term;
- iv) to develop a check list of priorities relevant to the country/ies under study for national - and possibly broader - consideration as means of reducing the short and longer term burdens, national adjustment imposes on vulnerable groups.

### III. CONCEPTUAL ISSUES: WHAT ARE VULNERABLE GROUPS?

It has been estimated that the percentage of SSA's population which may be classified as vulnerable in any one year is as high (or higher regionally, nationally and for specific populations, e.g refugees) as 40% and the percentage of very vulnerable (in the sense that their day to day survival is in jeopardy) between 4-10% (R. H. Green, IDS mimeo 1984). Variation in percentage rates and their precise composition over time between SSA countries is determined by the complex interrelationship of a number of apparently diverse factors. These range from differences in economic growth rates; economic structure and policy; the distribution of land, resources, income and skills between socio-economic groups; levels and composition of government spending; degree of political stability; prevalence of discrimination against specific socio-economic groups; patterns of labour use, to population (size and composition); climatic/ecological conditions; degree of popular participation and the structure of the decision-making process.

It is this complexity which makes universal definitions of vulnerable groups and estimates of their relative size untenable or at least unhelpful from a policy orientated perspective grounded in contextual research. Nevertheless it is possible to outline a checklist of criteria contributing to - or a taxonomy setting out the main observable features of - vulnerability as a basis for identification in the field at a national level and as a means of determining the degree of vulnerability characterising different groups (see table I appended)

Although each household within each vulnerable group clearly cannot be expected to meet all the criteria outlined, to the same extent or at all points in time, classification rests on their meeting a number at each point

in time. Thus taken alone, for example, invisibility does not necessarily imply vulnerability but invisibility combined with inadequate access to relevant resources and/or lack of basic services usually does.

Since some of the factors singled out as key contributors to vulnerability are central to definitions and determinations of poverty it is important to ask: how do vulnerable groups differ from poor groups? and what distinguishes vulnerability from poverty? Here substantial conceptual ambiguity exists. In much of the literature focusing on nutrition, for example, certain social groups have been identified as particularly vulnerable on the basis of specific physiological requirements associated with gender and/or age. Thus women who are pregnant or lactating, young children and adolescent girls are defined as vulnerable in the sense that their health, growth and wellbeing are contingent upon certain nutritional needs being satisfied.

Problems emerge, however, when this concept of vulnerability is extended as a basis on which to categorise high risk groups more broadly. First, the concepts of vulnerability and poverty may be conflated rendering the former redundant in terms of explanatory power. In order to disentangle the two we need to distinguish between relative and absolute poverty and the sufficient and necessary conditions of vulnerability. Provided we accept the argument that the concept of absolute - as opposed to relative - poverty is both useful and necessary in the LDC context (see, for example, Sen, A 'Poor Relatively Speaking', Oxford Economic Papers vol 35 no 2 July 1983) we may say that in the SSA context there are empirical grounds for arguing that absolute poverty is a sufficient, but not a necessary condition for vulnerability because the margin of existence implied by this state is so narrow that any additional and unanticipated shock renders survival precarious.



Newly created vulnerable groups or vulnerable group members, may, however, comprise groups which were not previously, poor at least in absolute terms, although they may have been poor relative to other social groups. They may, for example, become vulnerable as a result of invasion/insurgency/civil unrest; climatic shocks; external economic shocks; or changes in national economic policy. (see table II appended)

Vulnerability, to sum up, is a necessary consequence of absolute poverty but vulnerable group membership is not identical with or limited to absolute poverty. It implies an inability of certain social groups in any specific context to cope with exogenous shocks or attack whether primarily economic, political, social, ecological or a combination of all four. Social groups who are initially less poor relative to others may be rendered subsequently more vulnerable by events outside their control (such as drought, massive reductions in consumer subsidies etc) because they have limited ability to adapt to the conditions in which they suddenly find themselves.

If we accept the concept of vulnerability as defined above it would be mistaken to classify groups identified as vulnerable on a number of specific counts (e.g nutritional requirements) as vulnerable groups in their own right. Thus while it may well be the case that in certain contexts/respects women and/or children constitute those at most risk within a particular vulnerable group it is not gender or age per se which determines vulnerable group membership, unless the dominant sources of vulnerability stem from intra-household access and power distribution.

In assessing the impact of national adjustment on vulnerable groups, major starting points must be careful evaluation of a): the precise composition of household units (see tables III and IV appended) frequently acritically (and

often inaccurately) defined as comprising a male household head and his dependent wife and children; b) income and expenditure patterns within household units (e.g. sources of income, distribution between members as well as the more general allocation of resources).

Of particular importance are, for example, questions relating to: a) the large and apparently growing number of de jure (divorced, deserted, widowed, single women) and de facto (absent husband, male migrant) female headed households in SSA countries; b) the extent to which female headed households are 'self-reliant' or depend on supplementary sources of income from 'boyfriends', migrant husbands, relatives, children; c) the status and position of women in polygamous marriages and that of their children; d) income distribution and expenditure patterns within households units, in particular the way in which responsibilities are divided in respect of the daily maintenance, education and health of younger members.

#### **IV. KEY QUESTIONS TO BE TACKLED**

To look at vulnerable groups from the perspective of national adjustment does not by definition imply a search for strict and precisely measured causality. Such an attempt would not only be empirically impossible but would necessitate extreme reliance on 'other factors being equal' assumptions or very elaborate counterfactual modelling to assess hypothetical, alternative historical sequences. Nevertheless it is both feasible and realistic to analyse the differential impact of adjustment policies for vulnerable groups on the basis of the following:-

- A) identification of rural/urban vulnerable groups in the country case

study/studies under consideration (relative size, composition and socio-economic status);

B) analysis of the relative significance of external/internal factors contributing to economic imbalance and assessment of their broad effects on vulnerable groups;

C) identification of major policy tools adopted as part of the adjustment strategy (bearing in mind the distinction between IMF conditionality inspired and national policy choices) in response to recession and analysis of their possible implications for vulnerable groups;

D) evaluation of the relative significance of, for example, climatic/ecological and invasion/insurgency, refugee factors;

E) analysis of a time frame (ie short, medium and longer term) in which to situate analysis of the potential positive or negative implications of specific policies (for example, the impact of reductions in public expenditure on education is likely to be more significant for future than immediate productivity rates/production patterns as are changes in rural-urban terms of trade, whereas cut backs in emergency relief in a context of climatic shocks or rapid reductions in the real wages of urban workers are likely to have a more immediate impact).

Within this context analysis will focus on three main areas of concern:-  
First, factors influencing the real incomes of vulnerable groups/households.  
Second, the food and nutritional status of vulnerable groups/households.  
Third, access to and quality of basic services. (see Table III appended)

## V. RESEARCH METHODS

It is envisaged that the major emphasis in this project will rest on field research complemented, supplemented and supported by a library survey. This approach is deemed necessary for the following reasons:-

1. Wide divergence in economic/political/social terms exists between and within the countries comprising the region raising with considerable force the dangers of generalisation, resulting in description or analysis which is vaguely 'correct' for all countries, but incorrect for any one viewed separately.

2. Although a substantial body of literature relevant to the present topic has been developed (particularly within the framework of basic-needs/poverty and of macro-economic analysis of stabilisation/national adjustment) the necessary links between micro and macro analysis have not been sufficiently drawn out in the particular context of distribution and equity under conditions of economic contraction.

3. A number of hypotheses as to the probable impact of national adjustment on vulnerable groups can be advanced on the basis of existing knowledge. Given the complex nature of forces generating and perpetuating vulnerability in each particular context, however, these hypotheses would - if general - remain at a high level of abstraction or if specific - be very narrowly bound in context. The resultant middle level gap is that in which applied, policy orientated conceptualisation and analysis normally seeks to operate.

4. The resourcefulness which poor and vulnerable groups have revealed in adapting to extremely harsh conditions has not to date been adequately projected or predicted by desk research.

5. A major objective of the proposed research is the formulation of an agenda of action. It would be unrealistic, inefficient and logically incomplete (on functional and normative grounds) to construct and propose action based on an operational framework which did not incorporate clear understanding of the needs and priorities defined by vulnerable groups and their members themselves

#### A.) Field Research

It is anticipated that field research would consist of the following:-

##### 1. SAMPLE SURVEYS

A) Selection of communities: three rural (including in the case of Zimbabwe an ecologically marginal, disaster stricken or disaster prone zone, a resettlement area and a small-holder community not radically affected by drought) and two urban (including a capital city low income neighbourhood and one in another urban centre). Precise locational decisions will be taken on the basis of a preliminary pilot study and consultations with local researchers/collaborators.

B) Selection of households: at maximum 75-100 households would be interviewed in each sample. Once again the decision as to whether or not the sample will be random (e.g one household in every X within each location or selected in some other way) will be taken in the field. Given the importance

of household composition in determining the relative well being of members and possibly vulnerable group membership a small sample, random approach may not be appropriate.

C) Selection of Respondants: irrespective of the method used to determine 'B)', a primary objective is to compare the relative socio-economic status of households headed by men and women (de facto/de jure). In the case of conjugal units the man and his wife/wives would be interviewed seperately and together, in the case of female headed units the woman alone. A special problem will arise in the not uncommon case of households which are de facto female headed.

D) Selection of interview techniques and frames: the basic sample survey sheet would be structured in such a way as to elicit short and precise responses amenable to rapid compilation given the necessary reliance on local interpretors and minimum use of aides (such as tape recorders). It is probable that a smaller representative sample would be drawn from the basic survey for the purposes of more open-ended, in-depth and group interviews.

#### **B) Library Research**

It is clear that not all the key questions raised by this research will be amenable to elucidation through survey/interview methods. Library research will thus be relied on at a number of different levels:-

1. general background material for the country case study/studies in question;
2. reports of relevant research undertaken in the field;

3. analysis of specific issues such as pricing policy and its implications for rural productivity; cost-effectiveness of basic service provision;

4. macro-economic analysis undertaken in the context of national adjustment/stabilisation/economic contraction;

5. available data on country case study/studies and literature relating to the use and abuse of relatively weak data bases. On the basis of the above, an annotated bibliography will be compiled pointing in particular to gaps in and questions raised by existing sources. Library research will also be relied on in the preliminary identification of specific vulnerable groups - to be verified in the field - and the identification of specific and divergent causes of external and domestic imbalance and differentiating micro and sectoral levels in the country case study-studies.

Literature Survey:- As implied from the above it is envisaged that a literature survey would form an important element of the research and hence warrants consideration of research assistantship. An initial set of 6 bibliographic sources have been identified, many more are known to exist. A substantive body of literature and research on poverty, its measurement, manifestations and implications has, for example, been developed. (for multiple references to poverty in the south and South East Asian context see, Lipton M 'Labor and Poverty' IBRD Staff Working Paper, no 616 1983) Some, although by no means all, work on poverty is embraced by the literature on basic needs and broad (see ILO, Employment Growth and Basic Needs: A one world Approach, Geneva 1976) and country specific (see, ILO/JASPA Basic needs in an Economy under Pressure, Addis Ababa 1981) strategies advanced to enhance their

more widespread realisation.

Macro-economic analysis of national adjustment policy/stabilisation programmes has been conducted at a general theoretical level as well as at a country specific case study level (see, Killick T (ed) The IMF and Stabilisation: Developing Country Experiences, Heineman 1984). Concern with poverty, access to basic services and meeting minimum consumption needs has in this context focused predominantly on the issue of cost-effectiveness (Colclough, C. L 'Primary Schooling and Economic Development', IBRD Staff WP, 1980) and impact of economic contraction on the welfare of specific groups, in particular children (see UNICEF Study mentioned above). There has to date been comparatively little research into the implications of adjustment/stabilisation for equity and distribution. With a view to bridging this gap a major project has been initiated by the ODI on income distribution in a number of continent wide country cases. Although poverty and the real distribution of income are major concerns these are analysed from a broadly defined distribution perspective. (ODI Working Paper: Macro-Economic Stabilisation, Income Distribution and Poverty: A Preliminary survey, mimeo 1984). This does not aim, however, to identify groups at risk or policies relevant to reducing the costs to them in an ex ante, operational way.

Although much of the work cited above has direct bearing on the questions raised in this research the focus, context and objectives are somewhat different. A primary aim is to embrace these different strands of analysis with the specific goal of shedding more light on the contemporary status and possible future prospects of vulnerable groups. In this respect the project relates closely to the central concerns of the basic needs and poverty literature in the specific context of national adjustment in SSA.



**C) A note on measurement/data**

In addition to primary data collected on the basis of sample surveys conducted in the field the project will evaluate available data on:-

- i) wages/income
- ii) household income and expenditure
- iii) consumer and grower prices
- iv) employment
- v) infant mortality rates
- vi) nutrition indicators
- vii) school enrollment
- viii) government spending on health, education and other basic services.

**VI. PROGRAMME OF RESEARCH**

**Timescale:** It is envisaged that this programme of research would be undertaken and completed over a period of 24 months commencing mid 1985.

**Phasing:** The project will be divided into four major phases.

**Phase 1.** Library research (2 months)

Pilot study (4 weeks)

**Phase 2.** Field research (12 months minimum)

**Phase 3.** Writing up/colating field research materials

and country case study/studies (3 months)

**Phase 4.** Final report (3 months)

## **VII. THE QUESTION OF CASE STUDIES**

As regards country case studies a number of issues remain under consideration.

There is a relatively strong case in favour of opting for one country case study given the time horizon envisaged, scope of the project and need for thorough investigation and analysis of a topic which has tended to be relegated a background position in terms of research priorities or handled relatively schematically at a higher level of abstraction with micro material used illustratively rather than analytically.

Bearing in mind the dangers of attempting too much and ending with superficial appraisals, there is still much to be said for looking at more than one country case. The argument for a multiple case study base may be summarised as follows:-

1. The question of choice between policy instruments in terms of their implications for vulnerable groups could be drawn out with actual policy divergences being observed thereby requiring less reliance on counterfactual model analysis;

2. greater scope would be afforded for analysing the difference factors contributing to vulnerability and therefore the relative significance of adjustment policy vis a vis differently generated and sustained types of

vulnerability;

3. policy recommendations developed on the basis of research undertaken in several countries would potentially have a broader regional or continental relevance either directly or as a starting point from which further analysis could be developed.

On the basis of the above it was originally envisaged that three or four case studies would be selected for their apparent dissimilarity (e.g. Zimbabwe, Cameroon and Ghana). Zimbabwe is a top priority because it represents an interesting example of a country attempting to 'get the economy right' on the basis of least cost to human resources and exhibiting many of the contradictions this path raises, but also because the two main researchers involved in the project are acquainted with it and have reasons to believe local academic participation and official clearance can be secured. Discussion, with among others, members of ODI, and further reflection suggest a third option: namely to consider three countries (two would necessitate too much direct comparison as opposed to highlighting key issues at stake) chosen on the basis of:- a) relative similarity of problems, constraints, degrees of freedom, social/political imperatives and b) familiarity or acquaintance on behalf of the researchers.

Three countries are thus suggested:- Zimbabwe, Tanzania and Mozambique, all in southern Africa, all attempting to pursue what might broadly be termed basic needs strategies in the context of: severe balance of payments problems; agreements with the IMF; and to varying degrees adverse climatic conditions, invasion/insurgency and refugee problems.

Geographical proximity would facilitate coordination of the field research to

be undertaken and reduce the difficulties posed by 'other (to national adjustment) factors being equal' scenario and the particularity posed by any one country case study.

#### VIII. THE CONTEXT

This research project falls under the umbrella of the National Adjustment Cluster programme at the IDS, the research programme of which comprises four other major components:-

1. review of the available frameworks for analysing the adjustment process in both the short and long run;

2. critical appraisal of international evidence on the effects of price changes;

3. analysis of the politics of adjustment;

4. a range of country case studies to: test the hypotheses developed in the general survey work, narrate the history of policy responses to adjustment, analyse alternative adjustment programmes and appraise the organisation of adjustment packages. Country case studies are to focus largely on agricultural pricing policy, exchange rate determination and its impact plus labour markets and wage determination, with the vulnerable group project concentrating on the micro impact of and response to macro-economic policy.

It is envisaged that a symposium workshop of the National Adjustment Cluster

will be organised early in 1986 and that an IDS Bulletin would be produced from work in progress. Preliminary findings of the vulnerable groups project would be published in IDS Discussion Paper form. A joint cluster publication and/or a separate publication would be considered on completion of the project.

The creation of an advisory committee to oversee the proposed project and provide a forum for the exchange of ideas is anticipated. It would include members of the National Adjustment Cluster and IDS fellows working in fields of relevance to the project in addition to a number of African (including local researchers and government officials in the country case study/studies) and international organisation (e.g ILO, AAWORD, UNICEF) members. Its basic style of operation would be by written contact and personal consultations made possible by overlapping itineraries.

If more than one case study is to be considered there are strong grounds in favour of employing not simply involving one local researcher in each. This requires a larger budget, but has positive implications for the development of local skill capacity.

Table I

**FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO AND IDENTIFIABLE COMPONENTS OF VULNERABILITY**

**A. Endemic Low Productivity**

- inadequate skills/education/training
- inadequate access to relevant resources (e.g. land, labour, services, technology, fertilisers)
- poor health and low nutritional standards
- conflicting work requirements in reproduction and production
- disablement of one or more household members

**B. Location (Geographic and socio-political)**

- lack of markets
- lack of inputs
- lack of basic services
- lack of basic goods
- lack of social/political power

**C. High degree of Exploitation**

- plantation 'kulak' employees
- sharecroppers
- 'putting out' system employees
- casual/seasonal/temporary employment

**D. Gender specific**

- cultural bias/exclusion
- invisibility
- specific health problems/requirements
- conflicting demands on labour/time/energy
- position within family, division of labour, division of responsibilities (e.g. income/expenditure demands), lack of remuneration/recognition for labour inputs.

**E. Specific to Children**

- specific nutritional/health vulnerability
- specific educational requirements
- demands on labour time within household/production.

**F. Specific to Disadvantaged Groups**

- refugees and migrant workers and their families
- domestic refugees (civil war/invasion)
- domestic economic refugees
- old people
- 'minority' communities
- disabled and chronically sick

**G. High Risk/New Members of Vulnerable Groups**

- ecologically marginal rural areas
- natural disaster victims
- unemployed formal sector workers

## NEWLY CREATED

## Rural

rural households/small farmers hit by successive drought or floods, natural disaster and/or invasion/insurgency;

households which were previously (to recession and/or the introduction of adjustment policies) either self sufficient in food or able to generate a surplus sufficient to meet basic needs and have been hit by, for example, massive increases in real food prices, commercial margins and farm inputs and/or severely reduced access to basic consumer goods, marketing outlets, transport etc.

Refugees brought into being by civil war/invasion and/or changes in national economic climate;

## Urban

workers employed on a small scale, self employed, small employer basis whose livelihood is threatened by reduced access to imports (?)

wage earners employed in the formal sector rendered vulnerable by declining real wages, rising food and other basic goods prices;

new members of the unemployed who have been thrown into the urban informal sector;

informal sector workers whose real incomes decline as a result of high unemployment the pressure this creates on the informal sector;

migrant workers and their families.

## ABSOLUTELY POOR

## Rural

the rural landless whose numbers have swelled considerably in recent years - in many zones of a substantial number of SSA states;

households pushed onto ecologically marginal land areas as a result of the combined effects of population pressure and land distribution patterns or adverse climatic conditions;

households unable to produce sufficient food either to meet the basic subsistence needs of their members or to generate a marketable surplus sufficient to meet basic needs.

## Urban

workers employed on the fringes of the informal sector;

workers employed on a casual/seasonal/temporary basis;

open unemployed - although this has tended to be a transitional group or one whose members are supported by, for e.g. above average income relatives - since few Africans can afford to remain fully unemployed for long periods.

Table III

**TPOLOGY OF HOUSEHOLD UNITS**

Male household head  
wife  
children

Male household head  
wives  
children

Male household head  
wife  
children  
relatives

Male household head  
wives  
children  
relatives

Female household head  
children

Female household head  
children  
relatives/female friends/  
resident-semi-permanent/  
'boyfriend'/'boyfriends'

Female household head  
children  
absent husband/migrant husband  
relatives

---



Table IV

**FACTORS INFLUENCING THE RELATIVE WELLBEING OF  
VULNERABLE HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS**

the age composition of members (i.e. number of dependents, potential income generators/wage earners);

extent of familial cohesion (e.g. as regards members contributing to household income);

spatial location of household (e.g. marginal rural areas/high yield area, squatter settlement/'residential' urban location)

number of income generating/wage earning members, sources and relative size of incomes;

degree of food self-sufficiency and/or availability of cash;

power and authority relations within the household as they relate to distribution/expenditure/consumption of income;

access to, availability and quality of basic services (e.g. health, education, water, housing).

Table V

**KEY FACTORS TO CONSIDER IN ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF NATIONAL  
ADJUSTMENT ON VULNERABLE GROUPS**

**FACTORS INFLUENCING THE REAL INCOMES OF VULNERABLE GROUPS AND  
HOUSEHOLDS**

**Rural Producers**

Transport costs - commercial margins  
Availability and cost of basic inputs  
Access to buyers and time lag between sale and payment  
Structure of reward/renumeration of labour inputs within household  
production unit  
Access to land/labour/inputs/extension services/credit/transport  
Structure of grower food prices  
Urban-rural remittances  
Availability of seasonal/casual/temporary employment and wage  
levels therein

**Urban Groups**

Access to employment-self employment  
Real wages/incomes and differentials  
Unemployment and implications for informal sector incomes  
Substitutability of income sources  
Inflation and parallel markets

**FOOD AND NUTRITIONAL STATUS OF VULNERABLE GROUPS**

**Production for household consumption**

Access of household food producers (usually women) to  
land/labour/inputs/extension services  
Gender division of labour in production-reproduction  
Structure of decision-making process within household

**Rural Food Purchasers**

Availability/sources of cash and intra-household financial  
management structures  
Domestic food prices and relative cost of basic necessities

**Urban Food Purchasers**

Structure and scale of consumer subsidies  
Domestic Food prices relative and cost of basic necessities  
Nature and scale of 'Food for work', 'free food scheme' provision

**Disaster Areas**

Quality and Quantity of emergency relief

**Additional and Specific to women and children**

Taboos governing distribution/allocation of food available for  
household consumption  
Quality and quantity of food crops produced/quality and relative  
prices of purchased foodstuffs  
Breast feeding and weaning patterns

Table V (cont'd)

**ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF BASIC SERVICES**

**Water:-** supply (location, labour inputs fetching/carrying, quantity measured in terms of household consumption and production requirements, deterioration of natural/project sources, maintenance of pumps etc/skills, participation in project design/implementation).

Quality (pure - poor, health and sanitation, environmental hygiene),

User-charges (differential access, patterns of use, implications for health standards)

**Transport**

Access (public-private, commercial/individual costs, spread and availability of services);

Quality (supply of vehicles/spare-parts/inputs, maintenance).

**Housing:-**

Access: (location:- urban provision/provision in disaster stricken areas, rents/user charges, registration/allocation, public/private);

Quality (housing conditions, environmental and family health).

**Healthcare:**

Access to services (location, range, scope and spread, user charges, underutilisation, traditional practitioners)

Quality (basic supplies/drugs, MCM care, prevention-detection-cure common illnesses/child spacing)

**Education:**

Access: (basic primary/adult/non-formal/technical/vocational, rural-urban/male-female differentials, user charges, nominal-real participation, linkage-formal-non-formal, education-productivity/employment)

Quality: (basic supplies/teachers/text books, content of education/relevance)

**All basic services:**

Cost-effectiveness, deterioration in availability/quality.

Nominal supply and actual services.