INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
University of East Anglia
DEV

Working Paper Series

Household trajectories in rural Ethiopia – what can a mixed method approach tell us about the impact of poverty on children?

Laura Camfield and Keetie Roelen

2011

UEA
University of East Anglia

Working Paper 34

The School of International Development, University of East Anglia
Norwich, NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom

DEV Working Paper 34

Household trajectories in rural Ethiopia – what can a mixed method approach tell us about the impact of poverty on children?

Laura Camfield and Keetie Roelen

_____

About the Authors
Laura Camfield is a Lecturer in International Development in the School of International Development at the University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK.

Keetie Roelen is a Research Fellow at the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, Brighton, UK.

Contact:
 l.camfield@uea.ac.uk
School of International Development
University of East Anglia
Norwich, NR4 7TJ
United Kingdom
Tel: +44(0)1603 591885
Fax: +44(0)1603 451999

About the DEV Working Paper Series
The Working Paper Series profiles research and policy work conducted by the School of International Development and International Development UEA (see below). Launched in 2007, it provides an opportunity for staff, associated researchers and fellows to disseminate original research and policy advice on a wide range of subjects. All papers are peer reviewed within the School.

About the School of International Development
The School of International Development (DEV) applies economic, social and natural science disciplines to the study of international development, with special emphasis on social and environmental change and poverty alleviation. DEV has a strong commitment to an interdisciplinary research and teaching approach to Development Studies and the study of poverty.

International Development UEA (formerly Overseas Development Group)
Founded in 1967, International Development UEA is a charitable company wholly owned by the University of East Anglia, which handles the consultancy, research, and training undertaken by the faculty members in DEV and approximately 200 external consultants. Since its foundation it has provided training for professionals from more than 70 countries and completed over 1,000 consultancy and research assignments. International Development UEA provides DEV staff with opportunities to participate in on-going development work, practical and policy related engagement which add a unique and valuable element to the School's teaching programmes.

For further information on DEV and the International Development UEA, please contact:
School of International Development
University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)1603 592329
Fax: +44 (0)1603 451999
Email: dev.general@uea.ac.uk
Webpage: www.uea.ac.uk/dev

Abstract

The paper explores the dynamics of child and household poverty in rural Ethiopia using three rounds of household survey and qualitative data collected by Young Lives, a longitudinal study of child poverty. It uses a mixed-method taxonomy of poverty (Roelen and Camfield 2011) to classify children and their households into four groups: ultra-poor, poor, near-poor and non-poor. Survey and qualitative data are then used to analyse the movements in and out of poverty and explore the factors that underpin these movements. The use of mixed methods in both the identification of the poor and analysis of their mobility illustrates that the combined use of qualitative and quantitative information can lead to deeper insights and understandings. The paper reports a reduction in the percentage of poor households from 50 to 20 percent between rounds 1 and 3 (2002-9), following the 'stages of progress' posited in Roelen and Camfield (2011). However, these changes were not unequivocally beneficial to children (for example, the acquisition of livestock might mean dropping out of school to herd them). Ultra-poverty proved persistent with little change in the circumstances of the one in ten households classified as ultra-poor, who were vulnerable to illness, lending or 'sharecropping-out' land on unfavourable terms and exclusion from the government's food-for-work scheme.

Introduction

In this paper we explore the dynamics of child and household poverty in rural Ethiopia on the basis of three rounds of household survey and qualitative data collected by Young Lives, a longitudinal study of child poverty (see appendix 1). We use the mixed-method taxonomy of poverty and vulnerability developed in Roelen and Camfield (2011) to classify rural Ethiopian children and their households into four groups: ultra-poor, poor, near-poor and non-poor (see appendix 2). We then analyse the movements of these households in and out of poverty, using survey and qualitative data to explore the factors that underpin these movements. The paper employs a mixed-method approach at two different levels. Firstly, the taxonomy used for the classification of households and children is informed by both quantitative and qualitative information and is then used to select the case study households for qualitative analysis (this is discussed in Roelen and Camfield 2011 and only briefly described here). Secondly, the analysis of underlying factors and dynamics builds on longitudinal quantitative and qualitative data. The originality of the paper lies in its combination of household survey data and qualitative data from

children to create 'case archives' for analysis. It is unusual for papers to look at the impact of movements in and out of poverty on the children within the household (see Taylor 2008 for a UK example) or to use longitudinal qualitative data. The combined use of qualitative and quantitative information in this paper illustrates that mixed methods for the analysis of longitudinal child poverty can lead to more profound insights and understandings.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: We begin by highlighting influential research addressing the dynamic nature of poverty before focusing on how qualitative and quantitative methods and data can be integrated to better understand such dynamics. The particular method of case studies is elaborated as well as our understandings of poverty dynamics in Ethiopia as informed by previous research. We briefly describe the mixed-method taxonomy and the resulting classification of households over time. The results section begins with a trend analysis, which assesses the proportions of children in the ultra-poor, poor, near-poor and non-poor[1] groups over the three rounds to gauge whether overall levels of poverty in the sample have risen or fallen over time. We present transition matrices to provide a clear picture of the extent to which households and children in rural Ethiopia are locked into poverty, are likely to move out of poverty or to fall into poor and vulnerable conditions. We explore how the extent and direction of social mobility differs by location (region[2]), characteristics of the household head (gender, age, absence) and composition of the household (dependency ratio). Qualitative data from children collected in 2007, 2008, and 2009 (when they were aged 12-13, 13-14, and 14-15 respectively) is used to gain an in-depth understanding of why some households and their children remain poor whilst others move out of or fall into poverty. This understanding is gained by interrogating eight case studies of children and their households who were classified as ultra-poor, poor, near-poor or non-poor in round 1 and by round 3 had risen, fallen, or remained in the same category. Finally, we draw conclusions about how children and their households move in and out of poverty, how children understand these movements, and how qualitative and quantitative data can be used in combination to investigate the factors underpinning these movements.

---

[1] The classifications refer to the current state of the household and do not acknowledge the amount of time they have spent in that state. For that reason we are not specifically looking at chronic poverty, although we identify households that have, for example, remained poor or ultra-poor over the preceding 7 years.

[2] We had hoped to look at remoteness as a factor; however, the Young Lives sample has an acknowledged 'tarmac bias' whereby the majority of its sites are located near main roads. Additionally, many rural sites are spread-out so even within a non-remote site there may be households that are more than 10 km from the nearest market or heath centre.

Literature review

Dynamics of poverty[3]

A number of reasons can be put forward for the importance of analyzing the durational aspects of poverty with a multidimensional angle, especially for children. From a social justice perspective, one could argue that there is a moral concern to prioritize help to households that have been living in poverty for the longest period of time (Clark and Hulme 2005; Addison, Hulme and Kanbur 2009). Especially in relation to children, the duration as well as the timing of experiences of poverty might increase the likelihood of negative long-term consequences (Brooks and Duncan-Gunn 1997). This provides a strong justification for targeting policies at children in long-term poverty who may not have benefitted from child-focused interventions in their crucial early years (Yaqub, 2002). While the Young Lives dataset currently only follows children for seven years so cannot be used to analyse the effects of chronic poverty or the intergenerational transfer of poverty, we have tried to capture in the taxonomy aspects that relate to children's 'well-becoming' as well as their wellbeing (Uprichard, 2008), for example, nutrition and school enrolment. Many of these factors also affect the extent to which children will be able to provide a materially secure environment for their own children (Bird, 2007; Seeley, 2008). Davis (2011:11) notes, for example, that 37% of his Bangladeshi sample was poor as children and adults, and the percentage increases to 87% for children who were so poor in childhood that they regularly went without food.

An exclusively static perspective on poverty also limits our understanding of why people become or remain poor (Hulme and Shepherd 2003; Clark and Hulme 2005; Addison, Hulme and Kanbur 2009). Such an understanding is crucial to address poverty adequately through policy (Baulch and Hoddinott 2000; Clark and Hulme 2005; Moore 2005; Hulme and McKay 2008) as the characteristics and needs of chronic versus transient poor are generally quite different (Günther and Klasen 2009). For example, Sen (2003) observes that the chronically poor in Bangladesh[4] are characterised by an intersection of social and geographical factors that inhibit them from accumulating assets through strategies such as crop intensification, agricultural diversification, off-farm activity, and irrigation. In a later paper (Sen and Sharifa, 2008), he argues for a more differentiated understanding of poverty as poor people are not an homogeneous group and policies targeted towards the moderate or mobile poor may not reach the extreme or chronic poor. There is also a need for differentiation between chronic and extreme poor (McKay and Perge, 2011), although in this case the overlap between the two groups is much greater (less than 60% in

---

[3] Due to shortage of space we cannot cover the measurement of poverty dynamics, but this is ably addressed in Dercon and Shapiro (2007) and Calvo and Dercon (2009).

[4] Bangladesh provides a good example of how poverty can reduce overall while a core of poverty remains (Shepherd, 2011, p6, fig. 2). This is demonstrated using three panel data sets collected by BIDS, IFPRI and Greeley from 1987 onwards.

two-thirds of the panels reviewed), except during rapid economic growth or when the poverty line is set artificially low.

One important difference between chronically poor and poor households, which we have tried to capture in the taxonomy, is their relationship to assets. This includes the extent to which they can combine them with other assets (for example, land and oxen), obtain fair returns from them (for example, by harvesting their own produce rather than lending or 'sharecropping-out' their land for a small percentage of the produce), and accumulate and protect them. Shepherd (2007:21) suggests that identifying critical assets and asset thresholds in particular contexts are important tasks for poverty researchers and we return to this point in the discussion section. Nevertheless, progress in this field of poverty research has been fairly slow (Clark and Hulme 2005; Hulme and McKay 2008) and studies primarily investigate chronic poverty from a monetary perspective (Baulch and Masset 2003; Hulme and Shepherd 2003; Clark and Hulme 2005; Hulme and McKay 2008; Günther and Klasen 2009). Although we do not have space to offer an alternative perspective here, we plan to do so in a subsequent paper combining Young Lives panel data with life histories for the households identified as chronically or extremely poor (see also Shepherd, 2011, for a summary of recent research in this field).

Few studies capture the subtle fluctuations of household trajectories or the gradual accumulation of assets or liabilities that push a household over or under a poverty threshold. Along with interdisciplinarity, mixing methods and listening to poor people, tracking households over time is something international development researchers feel they *should* be doing more of, hence the combination of these imperatives in edited volumes such as Addison et al (2009) and Narayan and Petesch (2007). Addison et al (2009) highlight the role of qualitative data in increasing understanding of poverty dynamics — over the life-course, across generations and between different social groups. Qualitative data also play a role in expanding the scope of poverty measures to include non-material dimensions and/ or dimensions that are identified as important by the respondents themselves. The dimension of time, for example, in relation to agricultural seasons, key life stages such as pregnancy, or the duration of poverty, is acknowledged to be extremely important. This can be captured through panel surveys or retrospective data, which are often generated during group activities as a form of triangulation due to inevitable problems with recall. Where long-term panel surveys don't exist – which is the case in most developing countries - or where people have left the panel as a result of a sudden change in fortunes, then individual life histories can fill the gaps or provide an explanatory narrative for observed changes in outcomes (see Davis and Baulch's work in Bangladesh, which is described in the following section). Krishna's (2009) participatory and community-based stages of progress method, which has been applied in India, Uganda, Peru and North Carolina was in part born out of the desire to analyze poverty dynamics in the absence of panel data by using structured group

activities to generate the criteria that are used to classify households and track them over time.

The empirical findings from quantitative and qualitative studies of the dynamics of poverty have been summarized in various texts including Narayan (2003) and Dercon and Shapiro (2007). However, the evidence is largely correlational and the strength of the conclusions drawn weakened by heavy attrition (ibid). Unsurprisingly, household and community endowments such as assets and infrastructure support movements out of poverty, while shocks, particularly relating to illness, keep people poor. Other factors have been identified as important in different contexts, for example, avoidance of civil conflict (Uganda) or crop type (Ethiopia), but these findings are rarely generalisable. For this reason there is still a role for detailed case studies of poverty dynamics to flesh out general understandings and guide policy and intervention.

This is especially the case in relation to children; while we know something about their experiences and understanding of poverty (Camfield 2010), we know little about how they experience movements *in and out* of poverty. The research design underpinning the qualitative data used in this study involved regularly visiting a small number of case study children sub-sampled from the main Young Lives sample. They were asked to reflect on past experiences and discuss future expectations through exercises such as drawing a timeline that was reviewed and updated at the next visit. While this generated data on children's experiences of change, the children rarely reflected on the processes underpinning these changes. However, by conducting quantitative analyses of the panel data and triangulating the results using a longitudinal case study approach it is possible to identify patterns that reflect the dynamics of poverty in rural Ethiopia.

Mixed methods research to understand the dynamics of poverty
We can identify three broad approaches to combining qualitative and survey data, or 'mixing methods' within international development that vary in the intensity of their commitment to integration and interdisciplinary working.

Firstly, 'triangulation' or 'putting together' (Shaffer et al 2008) where different methods addressing the same topic are combined to challenge or enrich the data from a single method (for example, quantitative panel studies and qualitative life histories). This first approach includes many of the approaches characterised as 'Q-squared'[5] such as combining household surveys with ethnographies (Adato 2006-South Africa) or life histories (de Weerdt 2010-Tanzania), or quantitative impact assessments with ethnographic (Adato 2000-Mexico) or participatory methods

---

[5] The term 'q-squared' was coined by economist Ravi Kanbur http://www.kanbur.aem.cornell.edu at a workshop in 2001 on combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches in Poverty Analysis.

(Shaffer 2008). De Weerdt's (2010) 10 year study of 47 villages in Kagera, Tanzania found that there were two potential paths out of poverty: diversifying farming activities and engaging in business and trade. Human capital, defined broadly to include the social skills required to develop trust networks and characteristics such as 'sharpness' could be more valuable in moving out of poverty than material capital. However, this only applied in well-connected villages where opportunities such as informal apprenticeships were available. Illness and agricultural shocks had a negative effect on everyone, but their impact depended on whether the households could recover: "one of the most striking observations from the life histories is that poor people's shocks are not more severe than those of others [...] [they] seem to suffer disproportionately from the relatively smaller shocks they receive" (ibid:340).

The second approach to mixing methods can be described as 'sequential integration'[6] where the outputs of one method feed into the design of another (for example, Davis and Baulch 2009 describe how their research design was 'qual-quant-qual', involving an initial phase of focus groups, followed by a household survey, followed by life history interviews). Sequential integration also occurs when techniques used within one approach (for example, random stratified sampling) are adopted by another (for example, participatory appraisal). Other examples are the use of qualitative methods to develop and refine household surveys or the application of sophisticated quantitative sampling and analysis techniques to data collected using participatory methods (Kebede 2009-East Africa). Davis' and Baulch's analyses from Bangladesh (Davis 2007, Davis 2009, Davis and Baulch 2009) draw on a sequential restudy of households surveyed in 1994, 1996 and 2000/03 using a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods. Focus group discussions were conducted in 2006 investigating the causes of decline and improvement and the long term impact of three interventions. These were followed by a quantitative resurvey of panel households (2006-7) and life-history interviews with male and female members of 10 percent of the participating households (2007). This enabled the authors to explore poverty transitions and the processes behind these and investigate mismatches between qualitative and quantitative assessments of poverty dynamics (see also McGee 2004 in relation to Uganda). Their empirical papers identified a range of productive, protective and investment assets that supported upwards trajectories. They also identified liabilities such as debt and illness that countered the positive effects of assets.

Finally, the third approach is one of 'holistic integration' where mixed methods are used intentionally to produce a contextualised 'case archive' that combines different types of qualitative and quantitative data collected at different levels. Examples of these are Burawoy's (1998) 'extended case' method in Zambia, Bevan's (2007)

---

[6]This is the second type of q-squaring identified by Shaffer (2008) which he dubs 'methodological integration'.

'complex dynamic system Q-Integrated approach' in Ethiopia, and Olsen's (2009) work on labour in Andhra Pradesh, India. The third approach includes longitudinal case study methods[7] which are a staple of anthropological research in developing countries (e.g. Seeley et al 2008-Uganda) (in the following section we describe the value of a case study approach to understanding the dynamics of poverty).

Using a case study approach to understand the dynamics of poverty
Case study research is one particular way of holistically integrating methods. It can create thick descriptions and rich understandings of social contexts that have relevance and resonance across societies. Case study approaches can generate theoretical propositions using individual cases or through comparisons of cases, with a small or a medium-sized sample, and with either qualitative or quantitative data and analytical techniques (e.g. Qualitative Comparative Analysis, Rihoux and Ragin 2009). Even a single case can be used as an ideal type or exemplar which is generalisable in the sense that it can be used to develop/ validate a theoretical proposition, even though it is not generalisable in the sense that it can be used to draw valid inferences about a population (Yin 2003; Flyvbjerg 2006). Young Lives data collection is designed to enable the creation of longitudinal case studies by bringing together different types of data collected from different actors over time. The data is used to create a detailed 'mosaic' of information around each child. In selecting the eight case studies for comparison – described in the results section - we have focused on 'extreme' cases that represent good examples of what we are studying. The eight cases vary across two axes - the nature of their starting point, i.e. ultra-poor, poor, near-poor or non-poor, and the direction of travel over the three rounds of data. By comparing pairs of cases that are similar in classification, e.g. both are non-poor, but different in other characteristics such as type of location we can see more clearly the role of different factors in supporting social mobility. This will enable us to develop middle-range theories, or what Mouzelis (1995:1-3) calls 'substantive propositions', through iterative interaction between ideas and evidence. The paper situates the case study children within a broader social and political-economic context, enabling what Neale and Flowerdew (2003) calls the linking of individual biography to history, which gives a sense of the 'textures' of the historical 'times' children are experiencing.

Within international development theorizing from case studies has been used to explore causes and processes of impoverishment and exclusion in Ethiopia, Bangladesh, South Africa and Andhra Pradesh, India (respectively Bevan 2004; Davis 2009; du Toit 2004; Olsen 2009). Due to the longitudinal nature of the Young Lives database we will be able to study the cases diachronically rather than synchronically to look at processes underpinning stability and change in the abstract and reflected in

---

[7] Longitudinal case study methods have been promoted and theorised in the UK through the work of the ESRC-funded Timescapes project (www.timescapes.leeds.ac.uk/).

the concrete histories of particular children and their households: "what actually happened in this specific instance as a result of context, path dependence, the actions and interactions of protagonists, and the mechanisms and processes at work and their consequences" (Bevan 2005:11).

Dynamics of poverty in rural Ethiopia
Ethiopia has a reputation as one the poorest and most donor-dependent countries in Africa with a history of centralised and authoritarian rule dating back to imperial times. This reputation can obscure the high level of differentiation between regions, communities and households, and the speed of social change in some locations (Bevan and Pankhurst 2007). Dercon and Krishnan (2000), for example, found that while cross-sectional studies create an impression of enduring poverty in rural Ethiopia, panel data with frequent resurveys show high variability in consumption and poverty across the seasons. This variability is due to both shocks such as rainfall and crop failure and households responding to changes in the price of goods or labour. They argue that more households are vulnerable to shocks than implied by standard poverty statistics and that consumption measures alone are not reliable indicators of poverty (see also Davis and Baulch 2009). Dercon (2006) reviews the progress of the same panel of households during a period of economic reform from 1989-1995, which included Structural Adjustment from 1992 onwards. While overall poverty fell, different villages and households had very different experiences (for example, in two of the six villages poverty increased). Their experiences depended largely on their location, including whether they had access to a road, and their landholding, which enabled households to withstand shocks such as low rainfall. Bigsten et al's (2003) analysis of panel data covering 1994-97 found that the main factor supporting movement out of poverty in rural areas was the cultivation of a new cash-crop, *chat*, a mild narcotic that is exported to stable markets in the middle-east. They noted, however, that when the changes in poverty are broken down into growth and redistribution "the potential poverty reduction due to increased real per capita income has been to some extent counteracted by worsening income distribution" (ibid: 99).

Devereux and Sharp (2006) find similar inequalities at the regional level in a comparative analysis of national data sets and their own data from Wollo. Despite reported improvements nationally (e.g. World Bank 1999) they found an increase in destitution and vulnerability. They also found a decrease in the number of households wealthy enough to support others, indicating that this decline in livelihoods is a universal phenomenon. Devereux and Sharp question the reality of the national trend given the limited sample and estimation method, which is prone, for example, to bias from food aid receipts (Bevan and Joireman 1997). They argue, as we do, that poverty estimations need to be supplemented by qualitative data on a range of wellbeing outcomes such as "hunger ('We simply watch those who eat'), destitution ('Living by scratching like a chicken'), assetlessness ('We sold everything

we have and have become shelter-seekers'), powerlessness ('We are left tied like straw'), social exclusion ('What is life when there is no friend?'), or lack of family support ('My relatives despise me and I cannot find them')" (ibid:597).

Finally, a Young Lives' report from analysis of the second round of survey data (Woldehanna et al 2008) found that the percentage of children from the younger cohort living in households in the lowest categories based on wealth and asset indices decreased significantly in all regions except Tigray. Across the same period the percentage of underweight children in the older cohort increased –the older cohort are the focus of our study - suggesting that communities and households are experiencing differential changes in their level of poverty. The dissonance between the results for the older and younger cohorts points to the value of combining qualitative and quantitative data to understand the dynamics of poverty.

As described in the above studies, during the past thirty years Ethiopia experienced climatic, economic and political crises. These were inadequately addressed by existing 'food-for-work' schemes and locked households into an annual cycle of food deficit and asset disposal (Dercon 2004). In 2005 the Ethiopian government introduced an ambitious donor-supported Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) which aimed to reduce household vulnerability, improve resilience to shocks, and decrease dependence on food aid. The program has over 8 million participants, which makes it the largest scheme in Sub-Saharan Africa, and is entering its third phase. It provides food or cash for work such as digging ditches, and direct support to a smaller number of households with no adult labour. Evaluations of the first phase suggest it is only partially successful (Devereux et al. 2006 and 2008; Sharpe et al. 2006; Hobson 2009) with concerns relating to the selection of participating households and the extent of 'elite capture', the timing and size of the payment in a context of rising food prices, and the feasibility of 'graduation' after 3 to 5 years of participation. Graduation is encouraged via compulsory membership of the Other Food Security Program (OFSP) which encourages agricultural diversification by providing households with agricultural extension, fertiliser, credit to purchase livestock or bee hives, and other services (there is an element of risk in this, illustrated by the experience of three of the case study children whose animals died between survey rounds). Evidence of the effect of PSNP on children's wellbeing is mixed (Emirie et al. 2009; Woldehanna 2009; Hoddinott et al. 2009). The nature of the effects, for example, whether time spent working increases, is dependent on the age and gender of the child and whether OFSP is used to purchase livestock that then need to be herded (ibid).

A mixed method taxonomy for child poverty and vulnerability in Ethiopia
This paper builds on the taxonomy for child poverty and vulnerability developed in Roelen and Camfield (2011). It is a context-specific taxonomy that operates at the child and the household level, which was constructed for the specific purpose of

capturing poverty dynamics for rural children in Young Lives sites in Ethiopia. The taxonomy is mixed-method because qualitative information is used to inform the classification of children and their households on the basis of quantitative indicators. The qualitative information from child and adult FGDs allows for the identification of various stages of progress which capture households' routes out of poverty and the effects of these on their children[8]. These stages are subsequently considered in tandem with the quantitative panel data to translate them into measurable indicators. The taxonomy classifies children and their households into four different categories, namely ultra-poor, poor, near-poor and non-poor. The individual indicators and category thresholds are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Indicators and thresholds for the mixed-method taxonomy

Category	Indicator	Threshold
Ultra-poor	*Child* malnourishment (z-scores height and weight) not currently enrolled in school *Household* no animals no land used for agriculture unreliable credit (in an emergency would borrow from money lenders	Child/ household is considered ultra-poor when not meeting the threshold for at least two of the indicators in this category
Poor	*Child* consumes insufficient food (<3 meals per day) worked for money during past year *Household* no draught animals/ oxen	Child/ household is considered poor when not meeting the thresholds for at least two of the indicators in this category OR lives in a household without draught animals or oxen
Nearly poor	*Household* no membership of organisations offering political capital or credit no corrugated iron roof no land irrigated	Child/ household is considered nearly poor when not meeting the thresholds of at least two of these indicators OR when not meeting thresholds of any combination of at least two indicators in the ultra-poor, poor and near-poor categories

Data

This paper uses Young Lives data from the cohort of children who were aged 7-8 years in round 1 in 2002 and living in rural areas. Table 2 presents the sample size of

---

[8] See Roelen and Camfield (2011) for a full discussion of the formulation of the taxonomy with its stages of progress, including the specification of the indicators and the indicator thresholds (summarised in appendix 2).

the panel data in total numbers and across gender and region. In addition, it reports on the total sample sizes and population shares of the three rounds of cross-sectional data. Although the data suffer from modest attrition (Outes-Leon and Dercon, 2008), the population shares do not point to this attrition being biased towards specific demographic groups. Boys are slightly over-represented across all rounds as well as in the panel data set. Regional shares suggest proportional representation across all three rounds and in the panel data set.

Table 2 Sample size and population shares of panel and cross-sectional data

	panel		R1	R2	R3
	#	%	%	%	%
total	552	552	599	584	570
boys	289	52.4	52.1	51.9	52.5
girls	263	47.6	47.9	48.1	47.5
Amhara	135	24.5	25	24.5	24.7
Oromia	136	24.6	24.9	24.7	24.6
SNNP	138	25	25	25.2	24.9
Tigray	143	25.9	25	25.7	25.8

The qualitative data was collected from children in three of the thirteen rural sites in 2007, 2008 and 2009[9]. The qualitative dataset includes individual and group activities with children and adults and fieldworker observations, although in this paper we only use data from interviews with children, triangulated with life history interviews conducted with their parents in 2009 to check key dates. The three sites and the characteristics of the eight case study children are described in the results section.

Trend analysis

A trend analysis allows for a first insight into the poverty situation of children in our sample and the changes over time. Table 3 reports the child poverty headcounts according to our taxonomy[10]. Results clearly indicate that the overall situation with respect to poverty has improved over time. Whilst more than half of all children were identified as being poor or ultra-poor in round 1, this proportion reduced to 25 percent in round 3. Households have largely followed the stages of progress as identified in the taxonomy as estimates point towards a shift from poverty to near-poverty from round 1 to round 2 and from round 2 to round 3. Rates of ultra-povertyhave been largely stable with even a temporary increase in round 2. This temporary rise may relate to the drought in the earlier part of 2006, followed by flash floods, overflowing rivers and outbreaks of watery diarrhea in the latter part of the

---

[9] The qualitative research team visited the sites in 2009 for a sub-study on social protection, vulnerability and social mobility and took the opportunity to interview the case study children about changes in their lives since their last visit in 2008.

[10] These estimates are based on the cross-sectional samples of round 1, round 2 and round 3 rather than the panel data sample.

year. Nonetheless, there has been some 'churning' of ultra-poor households, which we discuss in the next section.

Table 3 Trend analysis taxonomy[11]

category	R1	R2	R3
ultra-poor	7	8.6	8.4
poor	49.8	24	17.2
nearly poor	35.6	55.5	41.8
not poor	7.7	12	32.6

Transition matrices

Against the backdrop of overall poverty trends within the sample, we move to the analysis of movements and transitions in and out of poverty. Although a trend analysis provides an indication of overall improvements or deteriorations in aggregate poverty levels, it does not give insight into individual-level movements in and out of poverty and the underlying factors behind such dynamics. Tables 4 and 5 present the movement from one category to another as a proportion of the total sample.

Table 4 Transition matrix round 1 to round 2

R1 poverty status	Total R1	R2 poverty status			
		ultra-poor	poor	Near-poor	non-poor
ultra-poor	6.7	1.81	2.54	1.99	0.36
poor	49.82	5.62	17.93	23.19	3.08
Near-poor	36.23	0.91	2.9	26.81	5.62
non-poor	7.25	0	0.54	3.44	3.26
Total	100	8.33	23.91	55.43	12.32

Table 5 Transition matrix round 2 to round 3

R2 poverty status	R2 total	R3 poverty status				
		ultra-poor	poor	near-poor	non-poor	
ultra-poor	8.33	3.08	3.08	1.45	0.72	
poor	23.91	1.09	11.05	7.25	4.53	
Near-poor	55.43	0.91	5.43	29.53	19.57	
non-poor	12.32	0.36	0.18	3.62	8.15	
Total	100	5.43	19.75	41.85	32.97	

Estimates in the transition matrices largely confirm findings from the trend analysis. The largest movement from round 1 to round 2 is from poor to near-poor, accounting for almost a quarter of all children. From round 2 to round 3, one in five children moved from near poverty out of poverty. Despite these positive dynamics, there

---

[11] Estimates are based on cross-sectional samples for R1, R2 and R3 and can differ from estimates based on the panel sample due to attrition.

were also groups of children that experienced downwards mobility. From round 1 to round 2, 5 percent of all children dropped from poverty into ultra-poverty. A similar proportion of children dropped from near poverty into poverty from round 2 to round 3. The notion of a persistent and hard-to-reach group of chronically and ultra-poor is widely acknowledged (Moore et al 2008; Shepherd 2011) and has been identified in Ethiopia (Sharp 2007), challenging the common perception that everyone in Ethiopia is ultra-poor. However, this analysis suggests that while the proportion of ultra-poor remains stable, the composition of the group has changed considerably with three-quarters of the ultra-poor moving up between rounds 1 and 2 and over one third between rounds 2 and 3. Nonetheless, nearly a quarter of the children who were ultra-poor in round 1 were still ultra-poor in round 3 and it will be interesting to see whether the slowing of the exit rate between rounds 2 and 3 continues between rounds 3 and 4.

Tables 6 and 7 provide information about the demographic characteristics of those children having moved out of or into poverty or remained stable[12].

Table 6 Demographic characteristics poverty mobility groups

	upwards	stable	downwards
	%	%	%
Sex of child (0.894)			
Male	56.1	33.2	10.7
Female	54.4	33.8	11.8
Region of residence (0.001)			
Amhara	54.1	26.7	19.3
Oromia	64.7	30.1	5.1
SNNP	55.8	34.8	9.4
Tigray	46.9	42	11.2
Total	55.3	33.5	11.2

Note: p-values for chi-squared test of equality of means are given in parentheses

There were no significant differences between male and female children in relation to their likelihood of moving out of poverty across the rounds. However, region of residence was a significant factor with households in Young Lives sites in Oromia, which typically have better access to markets, being more likely to move out of poverty, while the more remote rural sites in Tigray which have fewer economic opportunities were more likely to have remained stable (see also Woldehanna et al 2008).

---

[12] A child is considered to have moved upwards when doing better in round 3 in comparison to round 1 and a child is considered to have move downwards when being in a worse poverty situation in round 3 in comparison to round 1.

Table 7 Household characteristics poverty mobility groups[13]

	upwards	stable	downwards
	%	%	%
Gender of hh head (0.000)			
Male	58.8	33.1	8.1
Female	40.4	34.6	25

Note: p-values for chi-squared test of equality of means are given in parentheses

In relation to the characteristics of the household head, the only significant difference related to their gender with children in female-headed households more likely to experience downwards movements whilst children in male-headed households are more likely to move out of poverty. While the age of the household head shows a U-shaped pattern with a higher chance of upwards mobility and lower chance of downwards mobility for children with household heads aged 41-50 in round 3, this was not significant due to the size of the sample. Disability status, dependency ratio and the frequency with which the index child saw their mother or father were also not significant and are not reported here.

Eight case studies

The eight case studies of children born in 1994 or 1995 were selected to explore further movements from poor and nearly poor in both directions across the three rounds of quantitative data collection (2001/2 – 2009) [14]. They include boys and girls and span three regions – Amhara (Masresha, Legesse and Gabra), Oromia (Dibaba, Naomi and Degife), and Tigray (Miniya and Ephrem) and two types of site - near-rural (Tach meret in Amhara and Leki in Oromia) and remote (Semhal in Tigray). They were purposively sampled from a potential 20 cases where we had a full qualitative dataset as they presented the greatest range of experiences for analysis. Table 8 presents their basic characteristics from the quantitative panel data as well as their movements across the taxonomy over time. The last two columns provide an indication of the mobility across the different rounds, suggesting that the downwards mobility for Miniya, Gabra and Naomi was a fluctuating rather than a linear process. Table 9 provides information about the household that the children live in, also taken from the quantitative panel data.

---

[13] Household characteristics reflect the situation in round 3.

[14] All names of children and sites are pseudonyms.

Table 8 Household trajectories from panel data

Rising or stable						
Name	sex	region	site	transition	transition R1R2	transition R2R3
Masresha	boy	Amhara	Tach meret	Upwards	Near-poor to Non-poor	Non-poor to Non-poor
Legesse	boy	Amhara	Tach meret	Upwards	Poor to Non-poor	Non-poor to Non-poor
Degife	boy	Oromia	Leki	Upwards	Poor to Poor	Poor to Non-poor
Ephrem	boy	Tigray	Semhal	Stable	Near-poor to Near-poor	Near-poor to Near-poor
Declining						
Miniya	girl	Tigray	Semhal	Downwards	Near-poor to Ultra-poor	Ultra-poor to Poor
Gabra	girl	Amhara	Tach meret	Downwards	Poor to Non-poor	Non-poor to Ultra-poor
Naomi	girl	Oromia	Leki	Downwards	Poor to Near-poor	Near-poor to Ultra-poor
Dibaba	boy	Oromia	Leki	Downwards	Near-poor to Near-poor	Near-poor to Poor

Degife (male), Dibaba (male) and Naomi (female) come from a near-rural site in Oromia where many households have access either to irrigated land or work on the commercial vegetable farms. None of these three children have progressed beyond Grade 3 (at age 15 they should be in Grade 8 or 9): Degife and Dibaba have repeatedly dropped out to support their parents and Naomi is chronically ill.

Masresha (male), Legesse (male) and Gabra (female) are from another near-rural site, albeit a dispersed one, on the edge of a small town. Legesse and Masresha are in Grade 6 but struggling due to their workload outside school. Gabra is in Grade 8, despite doing 45 hours paid work each week in addition to household chores. She is a paternal orphan and acutely aware of the difference between her life now and the life she wants for her children when she has "better economic status": "Now, I am wearing plastic shoes. However, my children may wear sneakers and leather-made shoes […] And now I am wearing clothes like this [worn out traditional clothes], however, my children may wear silk and jeans".

Finally, Ephrem (male) and Miniya (female) are from a remote rural site in Tigray where the main economic activities are cattle breeding and work on the Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) or in the stone crushing plant. Ephrem is the youngest boy in his household so he herds cattle and helps in activities such as selling stone. He is not enrolled in school. Miniya is an orphan who lives with her grandmother and is supported financially by her aunt, who lives in the regional capital. She is in Grade 8 and apart from occasional work during school holidays only does household chores.

Table 9 Characteristics from panel data

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Gender Hhd R3	Age Hhd R3	Activity Hhd R3	Orphaned/ separated	Social programme support R2	Social programme support R3
Rising or stable								
Masresha	boy	Amharic	Male	49	Farming	No	Yes	No
Legesse	boy	Amharic	Male	47	Stone selling, farming	No	Yes	No
Degife	boy	Oromo	Male	53	Daily labour	No	Yes	Yes
Ephrem	boy	Tigrayan	Male	64	Farming, vegetable growing	Yes	Yes	No
Declining								
Miniya	girl	Tigrayan	Female	57	PSNP, weaving	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gabra	girl	Amharic	Female	48	Cleaning haricot beans	Yes	Yes	No
Naomi	girl	Oromo	Male	53	Vegetable growing	No	Yes	No
Dibaba	boy	Oromo	Male	45	Daily labour	Yes	Yes	Yes

Three of the households are female-headed (Miniya, Gabra and Dibaba) and one of the households has an older head (Miniya) so following the quantitative results in Table 7 we might expect to see these households doing less well than the others. We might also expect that the two households from Tigray will show little change across the rounds, while the three households from Oromia will be more likely to have an upwards trajectory than households from the other regions (although in all regions 55% of households show an upwards trajectory, see Table 6). All children in round 2 lived in households receiving social support in the form of cash and/ or food (wheat, oil), which was either conditional to work ('food-for-work') or in the case of elderly or disabled household heads given unconditionally as 'direct support'. However, in round 3 only three out of eight children were enrolled in PSNP. Linking this information to poverty outcomes proves difficult as it could be an indication of improved living conditions, that is, the families had done so well that they were able to graduate from the programme (this might be the case for the households of Masresha, Legesse and Ephrem who were on a stable or upwards trajectory). However, it could also be indicative of changes in the programme design or the size of the quota provided to the local authority which often necessitated more restrictive eligibility criteria. In the following section we report the qualitative and quantitative data on the eight case studies and summarise some of the factors underpinning their transitions.

Table 10 Indicators accounting for changes in taxonomy across the three rounds

Name	sex	transition	Status in R1	Status in R3	Indicator
Rising or stable					
Masresha	boy	Upwards	Near poor	Notpoor	<u>Up</u>: Household acquired corrugated iron roof
Legesse	boy	Upwards	Poor	Notpoor	<u>Up</u>: Household acquired draught animals
Degife	boy	Upwards	Poor	Notpoor	<u>Up</u>: Household acquired draught animals and corrugated iron roof, stopped borrowing from moneylenders
Ephrem	boy	Stable	Notpoor	Notpoor	<u>No change</u>: (Household lost access to irrigated land, acquired iron roof)
Declining					
Miniya	girl	Downwards	Notpoor	Poor	<u>Down</u>: Household lost livestock; <u>Up</u>: Household has land available for use, however now food insecure
Gabra	girl	Downwards	Poor	Ultra-poor	<u>Up</u>: Gabra stopped working for money, food secure, Household acquired iron roof; <u>Down</u>: Household lost livestock, Gabra working for money again
Naomi	girl	Downwards	Poor	Ultra-poor	<u>Up</u>: Household acquired draft animals and irrigated land; <u>Down</u>: Household borrowed from money lenders, Naomi not enrolled in school
Dibaba	boy	Downwards	Not poor	Poor	<u>Down</u>: Household lost draught animals

Table 10 lists the changes in indicators that underlie the children and their households' changed classification according to the mixed-method taxonomy across the rounds. The families of Masresha, Degife and Ephrem replaced the roof on their house with a corrugated iron roof, whilst those of Legesse and Degife acquired draught animals. Loss of draught animals and livestock also plays a considerable role in downwards mobility and (partly) underlies the drop in poverty for Miniya and Dibaba. The qualitative data confirms the direction of the change in taxonomy and the change in the individual indicators underpinning such movements. However, the reasons behind these changes are more complex than can be captured in a simple taxonomy. In the next section we briefly outline the other factors accounting for these movements and how these have affected the children.

Masresha's household moved from nearly poor to non-poor in round 2 when they acquired an iron roof. They bought this using money saved through diverse agricultural and labour activities such as growing eucalyptus trees and looking after communal grazing land. The household was encouraged to diversify their activities by the household head's training as a model farmer, which he plans to pass on to his son: "my father said to me that you should know my work because it will help you in

the future if you could not be successful in your education; he says that you can be a good farmer". Masresha continues to progress in school – he is now in Grade 6 – and despite "work[ing] the whole hours out of school time" he has not missed any school this year. However, his household has experienced two years of crop failure due to drought and low productivity: Masresha describes how "they tell us [in the past] grain was put in big clay-made barrels and there was plenty of harvest. This time you put your grain in small sack". They also have a 1,600 ETB[15] loan to the Amhara Credit and Savings Association which they may struggle to repay given since they lost two cattle worth approximately 2,000 ETB and were excluded from PSNP because his father had been a 'model farmer'.

Legesse's household has become more prosperous, showing many of the criteria we are using to indicate movements out of poverty. For example, they have purchased draught animals (donkeys) to transport stone to market and acquired irrigated land to grow vegetables for their own consumption. However, some of the positive changes in the household have been at the cost of Legesse's health and schooling. In 2008, he described how "sometimes [my parents] make me to drop out from my education and other times I get [too] tired to study. Therefore, carrying the stone is not good both for my education and for my health because it cuts my body [and] I feel pain on the back of my body." One year later he said that he was getting low grades because "in the last year, there was a lot of work load. So I did not study enough". Nonetheless, he appreciated the fact that due to his work, "I get to eat until I will be full". His family was not included in PNSP as they have "one cow, one ox and three sheep and one donkey and a horse", in addition to having sharecropped land owned by an elderly villager.

Degife's household appears to be moving upwards; however, as they have a small landholding (1/8 hectare) they are dependent on working as daily labourers, including in PSNP. This makes them vulnerable to food price rises and reductions in the number of household members included in PSNP due to changes in the regional budgetary allocation. Degife has one sibling with learning disabilities, who cannot work, and four siblings who are studying in the local town. Consequently, the responsibility for herding and household chores falls on him, particularly when his mother had another child in 2008. Although the data records his enrolment, every year he dropped out to carry out a range of activities including watering, harvesting onions, collecting hay for sale, and working as a guard on an investor's vegetable farm. As a result he has never progressed beyond Grade 1.

Ephrem's household remains just above the poverty threshold, however, there have been a number of negative changes in round 3 which may push them back into poverty in round 4. For example, his father took fertilizer on credit (700 ETB), which

---

[15] £1 = ETB 28.06 (exchange rate 22/08/11)

he cannot repay due to crop failure and has taken a loan from his equb (savings association) to buy food. Although they had livestock, the drought has affected all the households in the area, so they received little money for them when they sold them. Additionally, their household is about to be excluded from PSNP because they took credit offered via the OFSP to buy oxen[16]. While emergency aid will be provided to all households in Tigray, this is in the form of millet, which is seen as less desirable than the wheat provided by PSNP. These negative changes are likely to affect everyone in the household. However, even when the household was prospering Ephrem was not enrolled in school because as the youngest child he was needed at home to herd cattle and support his mother. Paradoxically, now the cattle have been sold and he will no longer be required to work on PSNP he may have more chance of receiving schooling.

Miniya's household seems to be on a stable trajectory, although the accounts of Miniya and her grandmother, who also completed the survey, differ in their sense of optimism towards the future. Both agree that food shortages are a problem, given that the grain component of the PSNP only covers two weeks' consumption and they only receive a quarter of the produce from their land which they hire out to sharecroppers. However, Miniya feels more positive about the future as she is supported by her aunt in the regional capital with school materials, 'ready-made' clothes and nail polish – important signifiers of urban wealth - and plans to start Grade 9 next year in the local town.

Gabra's household, which has been headed by her mother after her father's death in 2004, showed some signs of improvement between rounds 1 and 2. The reason for this was that the house acquired an iron roof and she restarted school and started work cleaning haricot beans: "If I didn't have a job, I couldn't have attended class because I would have a financial constraint. Furthermore, our living standard has been improved since I started work". Between rounds 2 and 3, however, the dust from cleaning the haricot beans and the cramped working position were starting to affect her health and education: "The work which I perform at home does not affect my education. However, the daily labour has effects on both my health and my education [as] it shares my studying time". There was a period when the household couldn't work due to lack of opportunities; however, Gabra explained that this meant "we could not get as much income as we were getting earlier […] which resulted in lack food for consumption". By round 3 she was working 45 hours per week and had missed school for 10 days to earn the relatively small sum of 40 ETB (she works alongside her mother and sister and they are paid a piecework rate). They

---

[16] The 'family package' (OFSP) is designed to help households 'graduate' from PSNP by encouraging them in activities such as livestock breeding. Remaining within the programme is conditional on taking advantage of this, despite the risks for poorer households (Pankhurst 2009).

are excluded from PSNP due to the size of their landholding, even though the majority of this is sharecropped-out.

While the economic situation of Naomi's household has remained stable across the rounds, Naomi's own trajectory has been downwards due to a recurring swelling on her neck which caused her to repeat Grades 1 and 2 and drop out at the age of 14 after joining Grade 3 (she joined school one year late as her parents could not afford school materials due to the death of their livestock). Their current financial problems relate to the cost of Naomi's treatment, although they have been supported in this by a European investor who employs her brother-in-law: "It was the ferenj [foreigner] who gave […] us 140 birr and we went to Kuyera. [… The doctor] took blood and gave me many medicines [...] we had to call a relative who could give us some money [as] my parents had 50 birr only". Her great uncle, who used to send them money, has recently died and they have been excluded from PSNP because they have irrigated land, although as this is sharecropped-out they get little benefit from it.

Dibaba's household has been on a downwards trajectory since his father was first imprisoned in 2007 for beating his mother and setting his grandmother's house on fire. Dibaba describes how even though his father had tilled and sowed the seed they had a poor harvest because "there was no one to protect the crop. Children used to pick the crop from the farm". He dropped out of school to work on their farm and plant onions for cash with his mother. When his father returned from prison he rejoined school and initially things were going well as his father's mental health had improved and he had sharecropped-in land to grow onions with his brother. His father got a job as a guard on a commercial farm, although by this point he was drinking heavily and had temporarily separated from Dibaba's mother. Unfortunately, in 2008 an irrigation pump was stolen while his father was on duty and his father was imprisoned again and fined 500 ETB which he paid by selling their oxen (ultimately he will also have to pay back the cost of the pump: 20,000 ETB). This meant that they had to sharecrop-out their land and no longer benefit from it. His mother attempted suicide and shortly after this Dibaba dropped out of school again. In 2009, the household was surviving on Dibaba's income from daily labour and PSNP, loans from relatives and neighbours, and support from his grandfather.

Four of the households appear to have stable or upwards trajectories, although the qualitative data from 2009 suggested that they were also facing crop failure and rising food prices. This may mean that future rounds of data collection show default on credit taken for inputs or consumption. Where households have been successful this is due to factors such as agricultural diversification, non-farm activities such as

selling stone, and remittances from relatives[17]. It is worth observing, however, that there is often a trade-off between the prosperity of the household and the wellbeing of children within that household, which makes it difficult to capture both within a single taxonomy. Legesse, Degife and Ephrem were all excluded from full-time education as they were required to support their household's economic activities. Moreover, the upwards mobility for Legesse is at expense of his health as he is performing hard physical labor.

Downwards trajectories were due primarily to lack of oxen or male labour which led to the sharecropping-out of land. They were often exacerbated by exclusion from PSNP, ironically in some cases because households used the credit offered as a condition of remaining in PSNP to buy oxen, or reductions in the number of household members covered by PSNP. Other factors were more idiosyncratic; for example, imprisonment, illness and the cost of medical treatment (see also Davis 2006, Krishna 2010).

Discussion and conclusions
The conclusions that can be drawn from this paper are two-fold: substantive conclusions relating to the dynamics of poverty for children and their households in Ethiopia, and methodological ones relating to the use of a mixed method approach for analyzing poverty dynamics and the impact of these on children.

With respect to the dynamics of poverty we see a reduction in the percentage of poor households from 50% to 20% between rounds 1 and 3. Most households' trajectories were not affected by the intervening economic crisis and food price rises, although this may reflect the relative isolation of parts of rural Ethiopia and its insulation from global markets (certainly the effects of food price rises, which even the government acknowledged were in excess of 60%, were felt in the capital, Addis Ababa). The changes in household's trajectories followed the stages of progress outlined in Roelen and Camfield (2011). However, ultra-poverty, which affects nearly one in ten households (8%), appears persistent with little change over time in the size of this group. The characteristics of this group are very different from the characteristics of the transiently poor. For example, Gabra whose household is ultra-poor has a female household head, land that is sharecropped-out and subsists on piece work carried out by the whole family. Degife, whose household is transiently poor, may only have a small landholding, but also has four educated siblings likely to provide support in the future. De Weerdt (2010) and others note the increased vulnerability of ultra-poor households to illness and agricultural shocks and their cumulative nature – illustrated in this paper by the example of Dibaba whose father has been imprisoned.

---

[17] Dibaba, Naomi and Degife had siblings working for a Dutch flower company in the neighbouring town, however, this was to cover their educational expenses rather than provide support to their parents.

The analysis of quantitative outcomes in tandem with qualitative data shows the impact on children of the duration as well as the timing of spells of poverty. For example, by 2009 Gabra, whose family support themselves by piecework cleaning haricot beans, appears depressed by her experiences: "when I think deeply and try to do difficult [mathematics] problems, my mind gets sick and sometime I get unconscious […] It is because of the sickness that I could not improve my education". Degife and Naomi also suffered from the timing of their households' poverty as in their cases delaying the start of schooling lead to cyclical drop-out. The qualitative data also enables exploration of how children understand the changes in their households: Legesse provides a good account of his household's progress from before round 1 when they were "very poor […] so busy and working very difficult and tough works", between rounds 1 and 2 when everyone "worked very hard to have an improved life", and in round 2 with less work, better diet and more time to play. The data provides examples of trade-offs between household prosperity and children's wellbeing, especially where assets are livestock-based and so involve children in herding (e.g. the relatively prosperous households of Ephrem and Degife). This creates the counterintuitive but probably not uncommon situation of a poor child in a non-poor household (the reverse may be true in urban areas if particular children receive support directly from local NGOs). The analysis also illustrates a problem with multi-dimensional measures in that households can move up by some criteria while moving down by others.

Returning to the distinctive nature of the ultra-poor group within this sample, there is potential to use the focus group data that was used to construct the taxonomy to identify Carter and Barrett's (2006) 'Micawber threshold'[18]. This is the level of assets that distinguishes those who have the wealth needed to accumulate further wealth from those who do not. The specification of the Micawber threshold is central to debates within Ethiopia and PSNP over whether it is appropriate to encourage farmers to take risks with new crops and livestock given the uncertainty of the rainfall and limited access to veterinary care. Pankhurst (2009) argues powerfully that households identified as vulnerable or 'off-track', for example, ones that are female-headed, short of labour, unfamiliar with agricultural technologies, etc. should not be encouraged to take credit as they may end up indebted and using money lenders to repay loans (this was a characteristic of the ultra-poor in our taxonomy). He recommends instead that social protection includes "a third track more appropriate to vulnerable households. This should involve introducing an insurance component against idiosyncratic shocks that particularly affect vulnerable off-track

---

[18] Wilkins Micawber is a fictional character from Charles Dickens' 1850 novel David Copperfield. He is famous for setting one of the first poverty lines with his observation "Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure nineteen pounds nineteen and six, result happiness. Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds ought and six, result misery."

households, with an emphasis on health and livestock insurance" (ibid:1; this point has also been made by Dercon op. cit.).

The combination of qualitative and quantitative data shows how households' movements up and down are a function of household and community endowments (e.g. the NGO-funded irrigation pump in Leki) and to some extent household's ability to diversify their activities (e.g. Legesse's household, see also Bigsten et al 2003). In relation to the case studies upwards movements are caused by agricultural diversification, non-farm activities and remittances, and downwards by illness, sharecropping-out land and exclusion from PSNP. Nonetheless, location is very important – both de Weerdt (2010) and Dercon (2006) identify that assets such as land or education are not sufficient without roads and access to markets respectively. In relation to our findings, this may explain the slightly slower progress of households in Semhal, the remote site in Tigray.

From a methodological perspective the paper demonstrates that asking children or adults to review the preceding year or their life so far captures seasonal dimensions of poverty that have been identified as important in other studies (e.g. Dercon and Krishna 2000). The qualitative data confirms the importance of looking at asset-based as well as monetary transitions (cf Davis and Baulch 2009), especially in situations like Naomi's where the household has made large medical expenditures, or Ephrem whose household has taken large amounts of credit.

Finally, the combination of quantitative outcomes with qualitative data, including children's perceptions of changes in their living situation supports a richer and more diversified picture of poverty dynamics. Whilst quantitative indicators may point to an improvement in observable living conditions, such as acquisition of draught animals and irrigated land, qualitative data nuances these improvements by pointing towards serious sacrifices in terms of children's education and health. Although an indicator of educational enrolment is included in the taxonomy, it does not capture drop-out, regularity of attendance or other factors affecting education such as tiredness, time for study, and difficulty concentrating due to the psychological impact of chronic poverty. This vital subjective dimension can rarely be captured through survey research due to the difficulty of measuring the quality of people's experiences. Qualitative research also acknowledges the double-edged nature of many outcomes, for example, when acquisition of livestock increases children's work and excludes the household from PSNP. Finally, the combination of the two highlights the need for outcomes such as land ownership to be context-specific so that land that is sharecropped-out on unfavourable terms due to lack of male labour does not become part of a narrative of upwards mobility.

Acknowledgements

References

1. Adato, M, Carter, M, May, J. (2006)'Exploring poverty traps and social exclusion in South Africa using qualitative and quantitative data', Journal of Development Studies,42:2,226-247.

2. Adato, M. (2000). The impact of PROGRESA on community social relationships. International Food Policy Research Institute working paper.

3. Addison T., Hulme D., R. Kanbur (2009), Poverty Dynamics. Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Oxford University Press.

4. Baulch, B., Hoddinott, J. (2000). Economic Mobility and Poverty Dynamics in Developing Countries (London: Frank Cass).

5. Baulch, B., Masset, E. (2003). Do Monetary and Nonmonetary Indicators Tell the Same Story About Chronic Poverty? A Study of Vietnam in the 1990s. World Development, (31/3), 441-453.

6. Bevan, P. (2004). 'Exploring the Structured Dynamics of Chronic Poverty: a Sociological Approach'. WeD Working Paper No. 6. Wellbeing in Developing Countries (WeD) ESRC Research Group, University of Bath, Bath.

7. Bevan, P. 2005. 'Studying Multi-Dimensional Poverty in Ethiopia: towards a Q-Integrated Approach'. Working Paper No. 15. Q-Squared, Toronto.Bevan and Pankhurst, 2007

8. Bevan, P. (2009). 'Working with Cases in Development Contexts: Some Insights from an Outlier', Chapter in D. Byrne and C. Ragin, Handbook of Case-Centred Methods London: Sage.

9. Bevan, P. and Joireman, S. (1997) The perils of measuring poverty: identifying the 'poor' in rural Ethiopia, Oxford Development Studies, 25(3), pp. 315–43.

10.   Bevan P. (2007). 'Researching Wellbeing Across the Disciplines: Some Key Intellectual Problems and Ways Forward' in I.Gough and J.A McGregor (eds.), Well-Being in Developing Countries: From Theory to Research.

11.   Bigsten, A., Bereket Kebede, Abebe Shimeles, Mekonnen Taddesse (2003) Growth and poverty reduction in Ethiopia: evidence from household panel surveys, World Development, 31(1), pp. 87–106.

12.   Bird, K. (2007). 'The intergenerational transmission of poverty: an overview' Working Paper 99, Chronic Poverty Research Centre, University of Manchester. Available at http://www.chronicpoverty.org/pdfs/99Bird.pdf

13.   Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G. (1997). The Effects of Poverty on Children. The Future of Children, 7(2), 55-71.

14.   Burawoy, M. (1998). The Extended Case Method. Sociological Theory 16(1): 4-33.

15.   Calvo, C., S. Dercon (2009). Chronic Poverty and All That: the Measurement of Poverty over Time," in Poverty Dynamics: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, ed. T. Addison, D. Hulme, and R. Kanbur. Oxford University Press US, Washington, DC.

16.   Camfield, L. (2010). 'Even if she learns, she doesn't understand properly'. Children's understandings of ill-being and poverty in five Ethiopian communities. Social Indicators Research, 96 (1), 85-112.

17.   Carter, M. R., C. B. Barrett. (2006). "The Economics of Poverty Traps and Persistent Poverty: An Asset-Based Approach." Journal of Development Studies 42, no. 2(2006): 178-99.

18.   Clark, D. A., Hulme, D. (2005), 'Towards A Integrated Framework for Understanding the Breadth, Depth and Duration of Poverty', GPRG Working Paper 20, Universities of Manchester and Oxford, UK.

19.   Davis, P. (2007). Discussions among the poor: Exploring poverty dynamics with focus groups in Bangladesh. CPRC Working Paper 84. Manchester, UK: Chronic Poverty Research Centre (CPRC).

20.   Davis, P. (2009). Poverty in time: exploring poverty dynamics from life history interviews in Bangladesh in T. Addison, D. Hulme & R. Kanbur (eds.) Poverty Dynamics: Interdisciplinary

21.   Davis, P. (2011). Passing on poverty: the intergenerational transmission of wellbeing and ill-being in rural Bangladesh. CPRC Working Paper no. 192.

22.   Davis, P., Baulch, B. (2009). Parallel Realities: Exploring Poverty Dynamics using Mixed Methods in Rural Bangladesh. Paper presented at 'Escaping Poverty Traps: Connecting the Chronically Poor to Economic Growth' conference, Washington DC, February 26-27, 2009.

23.   De Weerdt, Joachim(2010) 'Moving out of Poverty in Tanzania: Evidence from Kagera', Journal of Development Studies, 46: 2, 331-349.

24.   Dercon, S. (2004). Growth and shocks: evidence from rural Ethiopia. Journal of Development Economics, 74(2), 309-329.

25.   Dercon, S. (2006). Economic reform, growth and the poor: Evidence from rural Ethiopia. Journal of Development Economics 81 (2006) 1 – 24.

26.   Dercon, S, Krishnan, P (2000) 'Vulnerability, seasonality and poverty in Ethiopia', Journal of Development Studies, 36: 6, 25-53.

27.   Dercon, S., Shapiro, J.S. (2007). Moving on, staying behind, getting lost: Lessons on poverty mobility from longitudinal data. Working Paper 75, Global Poverty Research Group.

28.   Devereux, Stephen and Sharp, Kay (2006) 'Trends in poverty and destitution in Wollo, Ethiopia', Journal of Development Studies, 42: 4, 592 — 610

29.   Du Toit, A. 2004. 'Social Exclusion' Discourse and Chronic Poverty: A South African Case Study. Development and Change 35(5): 987–1010

30.   Emirie, G, W. Negatu, and D. Getachew (2009) 'Impacts of Productive Safety Net Programme on Child Poverty Reduction: Implications for Child Education', Young Lives IDRC Paper, Addis Ababa.

31.   Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). "Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research." Qualitative Inquiry 12(2): 219-245.

32.   Günter, I., & Klasen, S. (2009). Measuring Chronic Non-Income Poverty. In T. Addison, D. Hulme & R. Kanbur (Eds.), Poverty Dynamics: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. New York: Oxford University Press.

33.   Hobson, M. (2009) 'The Food Price Crisis and Its Impact on the Productive Safety Net Program in 2008', Humanitarian Exchange Magazine 42.

34.   Hoddinott, J., D.O. Gilligan and A.S. Taffesse (2009) 'The Impact of Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Program on Schooling and Child Labour', Journal of Development Studies 45(10): 1684-1706.

35.   Hulme, D., & McKay, A. (2008). Identifying and Measuring Chronic Poverty: Beyond Monetary Measures? In N. Kakwani & J. Silber (Eds.), The Many Dimensions of Poverty. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

36.   Hulme, D., & Shepherd, A. (2003). Conceptualizing Chronic Poverty. World Development, 31(3), 403-423.

37.   Kanbur, R (ed) (2002) Q-Squared: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods of Poverty Appraisal. Permanent Black, Delhi.

38.   Kanbur, R. and Riles, A. (2004) 'And Never the Twain Shall Meet? An Exchange on the Strengths and Weaknesses of Anthropology and Economics in Analyzing the Commons'. Working Paper for the project on 'Conversations between Anthropologists and Economists' Cornell University.

39.   Kanbur, R. and Shaffer, P. (2007) 'Epistemology, Normative Theory and Poverty Analysis: Implications for Q-Squared in Practice', World Development, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp183-196.

40.   Kebede, Bereket(2009) 'Community Wealth Ranking and Household Surveys: An Integrative Approach', Journal of Development Studies, 45: 10, 1731 — 1746

41.   Krishna, A. (2009). "Subjective Assessments, Participatory Methods and Poverty Dynamics: The Stages of Progress Method." In Tony Addison, David Hulme, and Ravi Kanbur, eds., Poverty Dynamics: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

42.   Krishna, A. (2010). One Illness Away: Why People Become Poor and How they Escape Poverty. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

43.   McGee, R. (2004) 'Constructing Poverty Trends in Uganda: A multidisciplinary perspective', Development and Change 35.3:499-523, The Hague : Institute of Social Studies.

44.   McKay, A, Perge, E. (2011). Is severe poverty a good proxy for chronic poverty? Evidence from a multi country study. Chronic Poverty Research Centre, Working Paper 179.

45.   Moore, K. (2005). Thinking about youth poverty through the lenses of chronic poverty, life-course poverty and intergenerational poverty. CPRC Working Paper, Chronic Poverty Research Centre.

46.   Moore, K., Grant, U., Hulme, D., Shepherd, A. (2008). 'Very Poor, for a Long Time, in Many Ways … Defining "the Poorest" for Policy Makers.'

47.   Mouzelis, N. (1995) Sociological Theory: What Went Wrong? London: Routledge.

48.   Narayan, D. 2003. Moving Out of Poverty: Growth and Freedom from the Bottom-Up. A Global Study Proposal. PREM, World Bank.

49.   Narayan, D. and Petesch, P. (eds) 2007. Moving Out of Poverty: vol. 1, Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Mobility. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan for the World Bank.

50.   Narayan, D., Pritchett, L. and Kapoor, S. (2009). Moving Out of Poverty: vol 2, Success from the Bottom Up. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan for the World Bank.

51.   Neale, B., Flowerdew, J. (2003) Time, Texture and Childhood: The Contours of Longitudinal Qualitative Research International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 6 (3): 189-199

52.   Olsen, W K. (2009). "Non-Nested and Nested Cases in a Socio-Economic Village Study." In Handbook of Case-Study Research, ed. D. Byrne and C. Ragin, Sage.

53.   Outes-Leon, I, Dercon, S. (2008). Survey attrition and attrition bias in Young Lives. Young Lives Technical Note 5.

54.   Pankhurst, A. (2009). Rethinking Safetynets and Household Vulnerability in Ethiopia: Implications of Household Cycles, Types and Shocks. Paper presented at the World Conference of Humanitarian Studies, Groningen 4-7 February 2009.

55.   Rihoux, B., & Ragin, C.C. (Eds.) (2009). Configurational Comparative Methods: Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Related Techniques. Los Angeles etc.: Sage.

56.   Ravallion (2001), "Can Qualitative Methods Help Quantitative Poverty Measurement?" in Kanbur, R. (ed.) "Qualitative and Quantitative Poverty Appraisal: Complementarities, Tensions and the Way Forward", Contributions to a Workshop Held at Cornell University.

57.   Roelen, K., Camfield, L. (2011). A mixed-method taxonomy of child poverty – the case of Ethiopia (manuscript in preparation).

58.   Seeley, J., Kabunga, E., Tumwekwase, G, Wolff, B, Grosskurth, H. (2008). The Impact of the AIDS Epidemic on the Lives of Older People in Rural Uganda. DEV Working Paper 04.

59.   Seeley, J. (2008). 'The intergenerational transmission of poverty during the AIDS epidemic in Uganda'. CPRC Working Paper 110. Manchester, UK: Chronic Poverty Research Centre (CPRC).

60.   Sen, B. (2003). 'Drivers of Escape and Descent: Changing Household Fortunes in Rural Bangladesh'. World Development, 31(3): 513-534.

61.   Sen, B., Sharifa, B. (2008). Identifying and Targeting the Extreme Poor. CPRC Working Paper 123.

62.   Shaffer, P, Kanbur, R, Hang, NT, Aryeetey, E. (2008). Introduction to Q-Squared in Policy. International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches, 2(2).

63.   Shaffer, P. (2008). "Behavioral Responses to Changes Accompanying Reform: A Q-Squared Analysis from Thanh Hoa Province, Vietnam". 2008. Q-Squared Working Paper No. 53. Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto.

64.   Shepherd, A. (2007). Understanding and explaining chronic poverty. An evolving framework for Phase III of CPRC's research. CPRC Working Paper 80.

65.   Shepherd, A. (2011). Tackling chronic poverty The policy implications of research on chronic poverty and poverty dynamics. Report, Chronic Poverty Research Centre, Manchester.

66.   Taylor, S. (2008). Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Researching the Dynamics of Childhood Poverty. ENQUIRE, 1(1): 1-13.

67.   Uprichard, E. (2008). Children as 'Being and Becomings': Children, Childhood and Temporality. Children & Society, 22: 303–313.

68.   Woldehanna, Tassew, Tekie Alemu and Alemu Mekonnen (2008) Young Lives: Ethiopia Round 2 Survey Report, Oxford: Department for International Development.

69.   Woldehanna, T. (2009). Productive safety net programme and children's time use between work and schooling in Ethiopia. Young lives working paper 40.

70.   World Bank (1999) Ethiopia: Poverty and Policies for the New Millennium (Washington, DC: World Bank).

71.   Yaqub, S. (2002) Poor children grow into poor adults: harmful mechanisms or overdeterministic theory? Journal of International Development 14 pp1081-1093.

72.   Yin, R. K. (2003). Case study research, design and methods, 3rd ed. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Appendix 1: Description of Young Lives (summarised from http://www.younglives.org.uk/)

Young Lives is a unique international study of childhood poverty following the changing lives of 12,000 children in 4 countries – Ethiopia, India (in the state of Andhra Pradesh), Peru and Vietnam - over 15 years.

They are following two groups of children in each country:

   2,000 children who were born in 2001-02; and
   1,000 children who were born in 1994-95.

Through a large-scale household survey of all the children and their primary caregiver, interspersed with more in-depth interviews, group work and case studies with a sub-sample of the children, their parents, teachers and community representatives, they are collecting a wealth of information not only about their material and social circumstances, but also their perspectives and aspirations, set against the environmental and social realities of their communities.

As their work spans 15 years in the lives of these children – covering all ages from early infancy into young adulthood –they are also able to examine how children change over time, whether growing up in rural or urban contexts, poor or not-so-poor areas, in large families or as migrants, and a variety of other factors.

They completed the third round of household data collection in early 2010 and are about to publish initial findings (in September 2011). The first survey round took place in 2002 and the second in 2006. These will be followed by further rounds of the survey in 2013 and 2016. Young Lives is using a combination of quantitative methods – a regular survey of all 12,000 children and their primary caregivers – together with in-depth qualitative research with a sub-sample of the children in order to build up a broad-based understanding of child development and childhood in developing countries at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

Household and child survey
The longitudinal survey at the heart of Young Lives consists of a survey of all 12,000 children and their primary caregivers every 3 years. This is combined with in-depth qualitative research with a sub-sample of the children in the intervening years.

The survey consists of 3 main elements:

   A child questionnaire
   A household questionnaire
   A community questionnaire.

The household data they gather is similar to other cross-sectional datasets (such as the World Bank's Living Standards Measurement Study). It covers topics such as household composition, livelihood and assets, food and non-food consumption and expenditure, socio-economic status, social capital, economic changes and recent life history, childcare, child health and access to basic services, parental background and education. This is supplemented with additional questions that cover caregiver perceptions, attitudes, and aspirations for their child and the family.

They also collect detailed time-use data for all family members, information about the children's weight and height (and that of their caregivers), and test the children for school outcomes (language comprehension and maths). An important part of the survey asks the children about their daily activities, their experiences and attitudes to work and school, their likes and dislikes, how they feel they are treated by other people, and their hopes and aspirations for the future.

The community questionnaire provides background information about the social, economic and environmental context of each community. It covers topics such as population, ethnicity, religion and language, economic activity and employment, infrastructure and services, health and education facilities, political representation and community networks, crime and environmental changes.

In Round 1, they also used a caregiver questionnaire for the Younger Cohort to gather information about the child's mother, pre-natal and post-natal care, and the child's very early life.

In Round 3 they introduced several new elements:

    a self-administered questionnaire for the Older Cohort to introduce questions about health, relationships and personal experiences that young people may feel uncomfortable discussing with adult researchers.
    a school-based component to find out more about the resources available for children's education – the buildings, teacher training, and quality and effectiveness of classroom interactions and learning.
    collecting data about the health and nutrition and education of siblings of the younger cohort children (in all countries except India), in order to understand intra-household differences and dynamics.

The survey is carried out by teams of local researchers, supported by the Principal Investigator and Data Manager in each country.

Table 1: Ages of children at different points in the research

	Year	Younger Cohort	Older cohort
Round 1 survey	2002	6 to 18 months	7 to 8 years
Round 2 survey	2006-7	4 to 5 years	11 to 12 years
Qualitative Round 1	2007	5 to 6 years	12 to 13 years
Qualitative Round 2	2008	6 to 7 years	13 to 14 years
Round 3 survey	2009	7 to 8 years	14 to 15 years
Qualitative Round 3	2011	9 to 10 years	16 to 17 years
Round 4 survey	2013	11 to 12 years	18 to 19 years
Qualitative Round 4	2014	12 to 13 years	19 to 20 years
Round 5 survey	2016	14 to 15 years	21 to 22 years

Qualitative research

The household and child survey is complemented by in-depth qualitative research that is building a set of 200 'nested case studies' to supplement the data provided by the household and child surveys. This work consists of two main strands:

A longitudinal study tracking 50 children in each study country, using a case-study approach to document their changing life trajectories over time

Shorter, focused enquiries on particular topics, for example orphanhood in Ethiopia or the impact of the National Rural Guarantee Scheme in India.

The first data were collected in 2007 with a second round in 2008 and a third round taking place in 2011.

The main focus of the qualitative research is children's own experiences and the circumstances of their daily lives. Combined with the longitudinal design of Young Lives and the detailed information gathered in the household and child surveys, it enables them to situate children's experiences of poverty in relation to the people around them, and the socio-cultural context, institutions, services and policies that shape their lives and opportunities.

Great attention is given to children's (and caregivers') detailed narrative accounts which reflect on their childhoods (past, present and future). This includes their own views on what has contributed to shaping their current situation and their well-being, their aspirations and goals, as well as their expectations for the future.

Sampling
The qualitative research is being carried out in 4 sites in each country (5 in Ethiopia), selected to enable exploration of variations in location, ethnicity and social and economic circumstances, and how these characteristics interact with and affect access to services and government support. In each country the sites are selected from different regions, including two rural and two urban sites, two that are poor and two that are less poor, and sites that reflect the main ethnic or caste groups within the country.

Within the sites, the children were purposively selected from within the larger Young Lives sample – an equal number of boys and girls, and an equal number of Younger and Older Cohort children.

Methods
Young Lives use mixed and multiple methods to work with children and the key adults in their lives in a flexible and reflexive way, that is age-appropriate and acknowledges that research with young people may pose challenges for adult researchers, particularly in highly hierarchal societies that marginalise children's views.

This approach has informed the development of a set of tools that can be applied in diverse cultural contexts, marked by variations in children's daily lives, their relationships with adults (including adult researchers), and preferred ways of communicating their ideas and feelings. The toolkit includes a range of methods based on drawing (e.g. community mapping, life-course draw-and-tell and happy day/sad day comparisons), writing (a daily activity diary), talking (semi-structured interviews) and other creative techniques (such as photo elicitation and child-led tours of the neighbourhood).

In each country a Lead Qualitative Researcher coordinates a small team with one or two assistant researchers and a team of fieldworkers. The country teams work alongside two researchers in Oxford, who coordinate the work to ensure consistency of approach across the 4 countries. The disciplines represented in the qualitative research team include anthropologists, education specialists, psychologists, social workers, sociologists.

Appendix 2: Summary of Roelen and Camfield (2011) (in press, Young Lives working paper series http://www.younglives.org.uk/our-publications/working-papers)

The paper uses qualitative data from adults and children about their understandings of wealth and poverty, some of which was collected using Krishna et al's (2007) 'stages of progress' method, to create a sensitive quantitative measure. The measure is used to classify a sub-sample of households whose trajectories are studied in the current paper across three rounds of survey data and beyond using case study methods.

In Roelen and Camfield (2011) we aim to develop a taxonomy that is informed by both quantitative and qualitative information to reflect the situation of households and their members with respect to poverty and vulnerability. The taxonomy uses Ethiopian data from Young Lives qualitative and quantitative rounds and was developed with the purpose of analysing life trajectories of children and the households that they live in.

The academic debate about the measurement of poverty and well-being, and the concurrent classification of households and individuals by poverty status, is long-standing. Monetary poverty measures have dominated the discourse since the beginning of the 20th century. Non-welfarist measures gained momentum with the development of Streeten's basic needs approach and Sen's seminal work on the capability approach. It is now well-recognized that the measurement of poverty and well-being should go beyond the mere measurement of economic resources or purchasing and should include indicators reflecting other areas of well-being. As such, this paper starts from the premise that poverty and well-being is multi-faceted and requires a taxonomy reflective of this multidimensional nature.

The taxonomy incorporates both individual level and household level information, thereby acknowledging both the value of data collected directly from children and that children do not live in isolation but are part of a wider living environment. The approach aims to not only reflect multiple dimensions but also to capture and provide insights into changes over time. It enables the classification of Ethiopian households into four categories of ultra-poor, poor, near-poor and non-poor that can be tracked over time using case study methods as Bevan and Pankhurst have done with the Wellbeing in Developing Countries ESRC Research Group data from Ethiopia (see Bevan, 2009). The approach also aims to capture movements in and out of poverty and provide insight into the underlying mechanisms.

Table 1 Source of the qualitative data used to develop the taxonomy

Respondent	Description	Method	Villages[1]	Regions
Children aged 13-14, n=20 (one focus group per site with five participants)	2008 general qualitative fieldwork	Characteristics of poor and non-poor families; how families become poor or non-poor ('poverty tree' used as a visual aid)	Leki, Tach Meret, Semhal	Amhara, Oromia, Tigray
Children aged 11-15, n=40 (two focus groups per site with five participants)	2008 IDRC funded study on the impact of social protection on children	Criteria for wealth or poverty in relation to inclusion within Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP)[2]; whether and how PSNP supports social mobility	Tana, Negele, Galafi, Aseb	Amhara, Oromia, Tigray, SNNPR
Adults, n=80 (four focus groups per site with five participants)	2008 IDRC funded study on the impact of social protection on children	Criteria for wealth or poverty in relation to inclusion within PSNP; whether and how PSNP supports social mobility	Tana, Negele, Galafi, Aseb	Amhara, Oromia, Tigray, SNNPR
Adults, n=28 (one focus group per site with seven participants).	2009 sub-study on social protection, vulnerability and social mobility	How households move out of chronic poverty, which expenditures are the first to be made, how these affect children in the household. Asked to identify a poverty threshold and discuss this in relation to criteria for PSNP entry and 'graduation'	Leki, Tach Meret, Semhal, Loyada	Amhara, Oromia, Tigray

1. All village names are pseudonyms
2. The Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) which was introduced in 2005 aims to reduce household vulnerability, improve resilience to shocks, and decrease dependence on food aid. The program has over 8 million participants and provides food- or cash-for work such as digging ditches and direct support to a smaller number of households with no adult labour.

The approach builds on a wide range of studies on chronic poverty that have been undertaken from both a quantitative and qualitative perspective, although largely in separated manner. Quantitative studies analyzing the dynamics of poverty have primarily focused on the use of monetary poverty measures with recently an increasing body of research on hope to extend such measures to incorporate other non-monetary indicators. Panel data or, to a lesser degree, retrospective household surveys are used to track changes over time. Qualitative studies are more participatory and rely on life histories provided by community leaders or household members. Apart from a few recent studies (e.g. Baulch and Davis in Bangladesh, de Weerdt in Tanzania), quantitative and qualitative approaches towards the analysis of chronic poverty have largely developed in separate silos with little cross-disciplinary interaction. In this paper, we add to this body of research by developing a taxonomy using a mixed-method approach; in other words, qualitative information is used to inform the decision-making processes around appropriate quantitative indicators and thresholds for the analysis of poverty and well-being. As the YL qualitative data collection was not specifically designed to classify poor and non-poor households, the information does not allow for a poverty analysis on purely qualitative terms. The data does, however, contain valuable and crucial information about what community and household members think constitutes poverty and well-being and what is required to move out of this situation or prevent a fall into vulnerable conditions. In this paper, we use this specific information to inform the choice of quantitative indicators for the taxonomy used for the actual classification. Using all three rounds of YL data for the case of Ethiopia allows for verification of such indicators over time and strengthens the robustness of the approach to analyze life trajectories in concurrent research.

Key references

Bevan, P. 2009. Working with Cases in Development Contexts: Some Insights from an Outlier. In: Byrne, D, Ragin, C (eds). Handbook of Case-study research. London:Sage.

Davis and Baulch (2010) Casting the net wide and deep: lessons learned in a mixed-methods study of poverty dynamics in Bangladesh. CPRC Working Paper No. 155, CPRC

Baulch, B. and Davis, P. (2008). Poverty dynamics and life trajectories in rural Bangladesh'. Special Issue on The Use of Qualitative and Quantitative Methods of Poverty Analysis in Decision-Making, (Eds) P. Shaffer, R. Kanbur, T. Nguyen and E. Bortei-Doku Aryeetey. International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches, 2:2.

Krishna, A. (2007) Subjective assessments, participatory methods and poverty dynamics: the stage-of-progress methods, CPRC Working Paper 93, CPRC

Krishna, A. et al. (2006) Escaping poverty and becoming poor in 36 villages of Central and Western Uganda, Journal of Development Studies 42(2), 346-370

Pankhurst A 2006 'Wealth, Poverty and Life Quality Dynamics: Objective and Subjective Measurement and Interpretation based on a Case Study Approach from Dinki' Addis Ababa: Proceedings of Fourth Ethiopian Economics Association International Conference.

Table 2 Example of focus group data used to inform taxonomy and selection of indicators

Indicator	Importance	Illustrative quotes	Mapped to quantitative?
Food (frequency, quantity, variety, quality)	Mentioned first in all sites	"they eat only shiro sauce all the time but we eat a variety of sauces every time" (children, Aseb) "they are carrying kitta [homemade bread] as [carelessly as if] it were cow dung while our children chase them begging for the kitta" (men, Tana)	√ Could not capture variety or quality
Clothing	Mentioned first or second in almost all sites	"they are well clothed and hence are proud to mix with the community in places where the community meets" (female household heads, Tana) "we always buy new clothes to our children at time when school is opened [otherwise] they will complain and their morale to attend education declines" (mixed adults, Negele)	X Mentioned in R2 and 3 only
Animals (poultry, sheep, goats, cattle)	Mentioned in almost all sites, usually ranked third, fourth or fifth	"those who are wealthy they milk the cow, they herd goat and sheep which they have never before. Yes they have improved their life" (women, Tana) ""an individual can start by buying one goat then he can add one sheep then he can add donkey then one ox ,cow and he can go that way up to buying mule and camel" (mixed adults, Semhal)	√
Oxen	Mentioned in the majority of sites, usually as the threshold between poor and non-poor	"if an individual buys a pair of oxen then he is considered as [...] equal to others since he is able to farm own land independently" (mixed adults, Leki) "[Oxen are] the source of livelihood as they can be shared out and it saves the household from renting two oxen for farming" (mixed adults, Tach Meret)	√
Land	Mentioned in the majority of sites	"the criteria give more weight on having land than ox. This is because cattle are mortal, but land is fixed" (male household heads, Tana) "we are starving. Why? We don't have land. I used to rent land. But the price has gone up, I can't afford it any more" (men, Negele)	√
Access to medical treatment	Mentioned in the majority of sites	"people prefer to go to holy water because they don't have money for medical expenses" (children, Aseb) "if parents have money at hand, no doubt that they will take the ill	x Only asked in response to severe illness so the number of respondents was small

		child to the health centre. But the difference comes when there is no money at hand. In such cases [rich families] are in a better position because they have sheep and goats that they could sell it for such emergency" (children, Tana)	
Daily labour	Mentioned in at least a third of sites	"the demand for daily labour in our village is too low and periodic [there is money only] in big cities like Addis Ababa, where there is continuous demand for daily labour works" (mixed adults, Galafi)	x
Irrigation	Mentioned in at least a third of sites	"irrigated land helps the house hold to produce different kinds of cash crops including onions, tomatoes, etc. The income obtained from the sale of the vegetables helps the owners to expand the irrigated land by renting land from the poor" (children, Leku)	√
Having a corrugated iron roof	Mentioned in at least a third of sites	"they eat as they like and have covered their house with corrugated sheets of iron" (women, Tana)	√
School performance	Mentioned in at least a third of sites	"school performance of our children is getting better [now we have more money]. For example my daughter stood third in her class. Our children are being awarded for their rank" (mixed adults, Galafi)	x Mentioned in R3 only
Uniforms and school materials	Mentioned in at least a third of sites	"if they go without wearing their uniforms, they will be chased out of school. Due to fear of that, they miss school days" (children, Negele)	x Mentioned in R2 and 3 only
Connections to govt.	Mentioned in at least a third of sites	"those who have nothing, even a single hen to dig the compound, let alone an ox are excluded [from PSNP...] It is those government elites and local elites. They include their relative until the quota is full" (men, Tana)	√
Children not doing paid labour	Mentioned in at least a third of sites	"being poor is thinking about daily labour in class because daily labour is the work of the poor" (children, Leku)	√

Note: Not needing to migrate and own house were mentioned by all the groups in Tigray, but nowhere else, illustrating the need to be sensitive to local priorities