



**TANZANIA**

**2002/3 Tanzania Participatory Poverty Assessment**

---

**Summary Report for the  
Concluding Synthesis & Analysis Workshop, 8<sup>th</sup> - 12<sup>th</sup> July 2002**

## 1. Introduction

The Tanzanian PPA 2002/3 Concluding Synthesis and Analysis Workshop was held at the Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF) Conference Hall on the 8<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> of July 2002. It was composed of PPA Implementing Partners and external specialists from Government institutions – including the Ministry of Agriculture & Food Security, Ministry of Finance and National Environmental Management Council – and the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, U.K.

The Workshop's overall objective was to identify key issues and messages to weave into the 2002/3 National Report and Policy Briefing Papers. Specific Goals included drawing on fieldwork experience to:

- Identify the most powerful and pervasive impoverishing forces (both at local and higher levels) in Tanzania
- Interpret the meaning of vulnerability in relation to impoverishing forces
- Explore when, how and why impoverishing forces affect diverse social groups differently
- Explore when, how and why people in different social groups react to impoverishing forces as they do
- Understand the complex consequences of various coping strategies
- Explore historical changes in the nature of impoverishing forces and how people have responded to them
- Recommend a framework for the National PPA Report
- Recommend priority subjects for Topical Briefing Papers

## 2. Procedure

Following fieldwork, the next task of the TzPPA is to generate clear, compelling, useful reports. This Workshop was designed to involve participants in ordering, analysing and interpreting field data and in developing and evaluating alternative organizational models for communicating research results.

As such, the Workshop aimed to ensure that Research Partners play a larger role in the production of final reports than merely providing field data to a core group of analyst/authors. This purpose reflects the PPA's commitment to:

- Sharing real decision-making power amongst Implementing Partners (and, in particular, Research Partners) so that information developed during fieldwork is accurately re-presented in project reports
- Engaging researchers in all aspects of the process so that they gain a *holistic* repertoire of participatory policy research and advocacy skills

In order to tap the knowledge and creative potential of Workshop participants, discussions took place in plenary and small groups using a variety of visual methods to facilitate and triangulate critical thinking.

The Workshop's full Report is more than thirty pages long. This Summary Report has been written for the benefit of non-participants who might want an overview of the Synthesis & Analysis process and insights into its core conclusions.

### 3. Vulnerability

The Workshop began with a discussion about the meaning of “vulnerability.”

The term “vulnerability” is used by a wide variety of actors. With regards to poverty, preliminary PPA results suggest vulnerability to be a *relationship* between exposure to impoverishing forces and recourse to response options. Accordingly, individuals subject to multiple impoverishing forces - but having many response options - may be less vulnerable than people threatened by relatively few impoverishing forces but having few effective response options...

This idea (i.e. that vulnerability describes a *dynamic relationship* between impoverishing forces and response options) seems to have great explanatory power and offer policymakers many inroads for action. Therefore, it was used as a basis for organizing subsequent Workshop activities.

### 4. Impoverishing Forces

The first Workshop activity focused on “impoverishing forces.” The goal was for participants to (a.) elaborate a list of significant impoverishing forces encountered in the course of fieldwork and (b.) use this as a tool for reflecting upon and theorizing about the nature of significant impoverishing forces.

The guiding questions for small group work were:

1. Which forces do people perceive as impoverishing them?
2. What are the causes of those impoverishing force?
3. What are the consequences and or implications of the impoverishing force?
4. Does this vulnerability have any geographic diversity?

#### 4.1 A Tentative Typology

The types of impoverishing forces identified during fieldwork included:

**Social** (e.g. life cycle, ill health, death, social security, divorce, widowhood, and polygamy)

**Economic** (e.g. declining prices of agricultural products, lack of marketing information to farmers, poor and inaccessible roads, as well as lack or inadequate financial resources at household level)

**Environmental** (e.g. drought, flooding, unreliable rainfall, declining soil fertility, deforestation, declining fish catches, poor environmental sanitation and degradation of material base such as wildlife, fruits etc.)

**Governance** (e.g. corruption, incompetence of leaders, poor timing for taxation, lack of transparency and accountability, inaccessible health services, poor access to water (safe and clean water), and lack or quality, relevant education)

**HIV/ AIDS** (this sticks out as a special category amongst impoverishing forces due to the consequences of continuous ill health, the loss of household manpower and

productive labor, loss of resources for caring for the sick, increasing number of orphans, etc.)

## 4.2 Emerging Issues

Using information generated through the first activity, Workshop participants were challenged to engage in “higher level thinking” and suggest larger lessons learnt from their fieldwork about the nature of impoverishing forces. Observations included:

- Some impoverishing forces affect only one social group or differently affect members of various social groups
- The impact of some impoverishing forces (e.g. drought) differs between livelihoods whilst the significance of others (e.g. ill-health) is relatively constant
- Different livelihood groups are more or less susceptible to particular impoverishing forces
- Impoverishing forces can be more or less widespread, frequent and/or intense. Thus, some devastating forces are relatively rare and some relatively benign forces widespread. Policymakers therefore need to take a sophisticated approach towards prioritising which impoverishing forces to address.
- There are synergies between one impoverishing force and another. For example, being struck by one impoverishing force can make someone more susceptible to other forces
- One impoverishing force can be the cause *or* consequence of another
- Certain ‘impoverishing forces’ effectively inhibit people’s capacity to improve their lives. For example, people consider lack of roads/transport a source of impoverishment because it prevents them from accessing markets and basic social services. Whilst this might not actually ‘take money out of their pockets,’ lack of roads/transport inhibits people’s capacity to improve their lives.
- Corruption is a cause of impoverishment (as well as a consequence) when people have to take money out of their pockets to access public services
- Poor social capital at the community level is an impoverishing force when, for example, it leads to the failure of communal resources (such as water pumps)
- Traditional cash crop prices are declining – particularly in comparison with the cost of farm inputs and basic needs. In other words, worsening terms of trade is impoverishing people.
- Lack of relevant formal education limits the range of people’s response options to an impoverishing force. It was suggested that current education policy & curriculum reflect politically expedient and simplistic assumptions rather than the real needs of ordinary people.
- Poor health impoverishes people due to the cost of treatment *and* lost income.

## 5. Social Groups and Impoverishing Forces

After exploring the complex nature of impoverishing forces vis-à-vis vulnerability, Workshop participants turned to consider how these forces are experienced by different social groups. The first activity in this sequence asked whether, in light of 2<sup>nd</sup> round fieldwork, the social groups identified by stakeholders in the Research Agenda Workshop and Midterm S&A Workshop, remained valid and relevant. Participants agreed that additions and clarifications made during the Midterm Workshop were adequate.

## 5.1 The Nature of Social Groups

Workshop participants were asked to reflect on the following discussion points and assess “what it all means.”

1. What kinds of impoverishing forces do *different social groups* experience?
2. Why do these factors affect them most?
3. How do these factors affect them?
4. When do they affect them?

In other words, Workshop participants were asked to engage in higher-level thinking and complex analysis about the nature of social groups and vulnerability.

Their conclusions included:

- No social group is spared from being vulnerable – what differs is the form, frequency and intensity of their vulnerability
- Children are “particularly vulnerable” because they have such limited response options
- The significance of membership in particular social groups typically varies between communities, but the importance of gender is constant
- Livelihoods are a major part of people’s identity and self-association
- Ideas about who is in what social group change between communities. For example, criteria defining who is a “child” vary dramatically
- Changes in people’s lifecycle expose them to different impoverishing forces
- Most social groups are inextricably linked. For example, we cannot understand the security and privilege of one without seeing how it negatively impacts the security of others ‘beneath’ them.
- The impoverishing forces people are exposed to, and the response options available to them, reflects simultaneous membership in a range of social groups (e.g. female, elderly). Thus, being elderly or a child does not necessarily mean that an individual is highly vulnerable
- The number and effectiveness of response options available to a particular social group shapes their degree of vulnerability
- Whilst the concept of “social groups” is useful to understanding vulnerability, it also entails risks. For example, thinking in terms of common social groups (e.g. children) can encourage us to overlook important elements of heterogeneity (e.g. children whose families are receiving aid from CBOs or NGOs versus children in unassisted families)
- Membership in many social groups (e.g. those defined by age or employment status) changes over time
- Members in some social groups – such as people living with HIV/AIDS – can be difficult to identify and target for assistance
- People often dismiss the important of impoverishing forces that do not threaten them. For example, an inland farmer might not value policies (or the directed flow of resources) aimed at protecting/buoying coastal fish stocks
- Control and ownership of productive assets largely determines the vulnerability of different social groups
- Lack of political voice limits a social group’s capacity to *create* effective response options
- It is difficult for policies to benefit social groups that are typically silent or silenced by others

- Many young people – particularly those in urban settings – are not getting the life skills/preparation time they need
- Cultural practices, attitudes and beliefs both create and affect the vulnerability of different social groups
- Some social groups take advantage of contradictory Government policies to subordinate/intimidate others
- Limited options force some social groups to engage in high-risk livelihoods (e.g. commercial sex work)

## 6. Response Options to Impoverishing Forces

In February 2002, the Research and Analysis Working Group (R&AWG) prepared a Concept Paper on Vulnerability to facilitate, in part, preparation for PPA fieldwork. This paper distinguished between people’s prevention, mitigation and coping-oriented responses to impoverishing forces.

S&A Workshop participants were asked to take one “impoverishing force” identified during fieldwork and list people’s actual responses. These responses were then to be organised within the conceptual framework put forth by the R&AWG (i.e. under the headings of Prevention, Mitigation and Coping). The guidelines for the task were:

1. List people’s real-life response options to a given impoverishing force
2. Try to fit these options under the headings of Prevention, Mitigation or Coping. If they cannot fit, then try to figure out what new headings to create...
3. Reflect on the process and come up with three conclusions.

### 6.1 Emerging Issues

- There are no clear demarcations between prevention, mitigation, and coping options
- Many response options aim for “prevention” but, in practice, amount to “mitigation” (at best)
- People in richer socio-economic strata find it easier than poorer people to *act* rather than *re-act* to impoverishing forces
- “Not coping” is another response option (e.g. committing suicide during terminal illness, unemployment, etc.)
- Some response options, if used at different points in time, can fit under each heading
- Some short-term response options can lead to long-term impoverishment and/or limit long-term response options

## 7. Research Findings and Policy

The last day of the Concluding Synthesis & Analysis Workshop focused on linking research results to policy and examining how to present these links in a useful and compelling manner. Special guests from the Vice President’s Office, Poverty Eradication Division (VPO-PED), the Economic and Social Research Foundation and the UNDP attended the morning session.

Activities began with a presentation by VPO-PED on the national poverty policies framework.

## 7.1 Stakeholder expectations & recommendations

Following this presentation, a panel of experts from VPO-PED, the National Environmental Management Council, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, UNDP and ESRF was formed and asked to describe:

1. The expectations their colleagues have in terms of PPA outputs (who do they think it will be written for, what information do they think it will provide, etc.)
2. The form they believe the National Report and Topical Briefing Papers should adopt in order to impact upon their target audiences

The ensuing conversation usefully suggested that all outputs:

- Describe the PPA's methodology so that conclusions are credible in readers' eyes
- Illustrate vulnerability as a relationship between shocks and options
- Represent the diversity that exists between and within communities
- Say something different from previous PPAs
- Exceed stakeholders' expectations and push them to think and see from new points of view
- Challenge the assumptions underlying major policies
- Target the PER/MTEF processes, as well as the PRSP Revision Process. (NB: It was suggested that PPA staff join the Public Expenditure Working Group to enhance the National Report.)

And that the National Report should:

- Continue to build on its consultative and participatory way of operating
- Have a TOR approved by the PPA Steering Committee
- Highlight linkages between sectors and issues
- Avoid taking "sectoral approach" that obscures the complexity of people's realities
- Capture "cross-cutting issues"
- Be no more than 200 pages
- Have a brief Executive Summary

And that a "condensed version" of the National Report be written. This report should:

- Be less than 50 pages
- Be translated into Swahili and, perhaps, be rendered in a "popular version"

## 7.2 Alternative Frameworks for the 2002/3 National PPA Report

In keeping with the principle that Research Partners should be involved in higher-level analysis and decision-making, Workshop participants were asked to reflect on the results of previous activities and develop best-bet organizational frameworks for the National Report.

Each Research Team generated their own framework and argued its merits in plenary. All proposals prioritised inclusion of the following sections:

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Methodology
  - A. Methods

- B. Research Agenda
- C. Site Selection
- D. Process of Data Analysis
- E. Methodological Strengths & Challenges
- 4. Overview of “Vulnerability”
- 5. Overview of “Social Groups”
- 6. [Main Text]
- 7. Conclusions
- 8. Policy Recommendations

Though there were constructive variations between all Teams, their discussion about an appropriate framework for the Main Text suggested two basic formats. The first was a “sectoral approach,” in which it was proposed to divide the National Report’s main body along the lines of social service sectors (e.g. health and education). The major arguments for this format were:

- Government typically makes budget and other management decisions according to sectors. Thus, this approach would facilitate *intra*-sectoral planning.
- Members of the Report’s broad target audience could readily focus on the sector(s) that are most relevant to their interests and work responsibilities

The challenges to this format were:

- It may be difficult (and perhaps misleading) to represent people’s complex realities along sector lines
- Meaningful discussion of crosscutting issues, such as HIV/AIDS, cannot take place in discreet, sector-based chapters. Indeed, treating such important issues in a piecemeal manner (e.g. in relation to agriculture productivity, then in relation to education, etc.) would only obscure their cumulative impact.

The second format proposed focusing on:

- 1. Impoverishing Forces
- 2. Response Options
- 3. Impoverishing Forces and Response Options in Relation to Specific Livelihoods
  - Agriculture-based livelihoods
  - Fishing-based livelihoods
  - Livestock-based livelihoods
  - Urban-based livelihoods
- 4. Crosscutting Factors in “Vulnerability”
  - Social Services (water, health, education)
  - Governance
  - Economic Infrastructure
  - HIV/AIDS

This format might help policymakers better understand what makes people vulnerable, what they are trying to do about it and the contribution that policymakers could make. This format would also highlight diversity between livelihoods and help policymakers assess whether or not a single approach to poverty eradication can meet the needs of everyone in Tanzania.

Both formats exhibit pros and cons. The PPA Management Team will consider a best-bet arrangement that reflects other research outputs (including Topical Briefing

Papers). The outcome of this consultative deliberation will be presented to the Implementing Consortium and PPA Steering Committee for final approval.

### **7.3 Priority areas for Topical Briefing Papers**

The final Workshop activity was designed to identify and prioritise potential subjects for Topical Briefing Papers.

Participants began by breaking into small groups and brainstorming about important subjects that arose in the course of fieldwork. Afterwards, a process of collective reflection and voting resulted in the following priority clusters:

- Good Governance
- The Environment
- Health & HIV/AIDS
- Education
- Land
- Economic Opportunities and Rural Incomes
- Food Security

It was agreed that the subjects of Topical Briefing Papers should ultimately be chosen on the basis of this list and in combination with the interests/needs of policymakers.

## **8. Conclusions**

This Synthesis & Analysis Workshop is not the end of collaboration between PPA Implementing Partners in the writing-up process. Indeed, Round-table Discussion Groups, consisting of Research Partners and appropriate external specialists, will periodically be formed as a means of:

- Cross-checking the accurate portrayal of fieldwork results
- Gaining insights into the significance of fieldwork results
- Getting feedback on the clarity of organizational frameworks and written reports

Implementing Partners will also be key to the PPA's dissemination of, and later advocacy efforts around, Topical Briefing Papers and its National Report.