

# Social cash transfers, generational relations and youth poverty trajectories in rural Lesotho and Malawi

## Research highlight 1 (Lesotho): Household change 1996-2016

Preliminary findings from an ESRC-DFID-funded research project April 2017



All 44 households belonging to the village were profiled in 2016 and the details compared with profiles from 2008 and 1996.

### Demographic structure

- \* The number and structure of households in the village have responded to shifts in the external environment: declining opportunities for mine work in South Africa; climate stress including drought; the introduction of social cash transfers.
- \* Overall the resident population has declined, particularly since 2008, attributable to a fall in the number of households as well as diminishing household size.
- \* The number of children per household has declined more steeply than other age groups.
- \* More men are now resident in the village, but a growing number of households are headed by women.
- \* Household members are less clear than in the past as to which non-resident relatives 'belong' to their households.

### Changing assets

- \* The number of livestock per household rose between 1996 and 2008 and has since diminished, but this might reflect the impact of recent drought.
- \* The decline in the total number of fields is more surprising; this might suggest that households now depend less on subsistence crop production or that field size has increased.
- \* The only striking change in household possessions is that two thirds of households now have mobile phones.

### Changing livelihoods

- \* Of 43 households, 27 claimed to be worse off in 2016 than 2008, while only 7 said they were better off.
- \* Most attributed the deterioration to the recent drought.
- \* Asked what they did when their harvested crops ran out, several mentioned relying on a pension or child grant. Others referred to piecework, brewing or begging. Relatively few had access to remittances.

### Moving between villages

- \* A number of households had transferred from other villages. Some of these were dependent on social cash transfers and thus did not require fields to be sustainable.

### Do the right households receive cash transfers?

- Six of the seven households receiving child grants have very few assets (jobs, fields and livestock), but some very poor households do not receive any cash transfers.
- Criteria for selection to the child grant scheme are unclear to community members.
- Of the fourteen households with children identified as the most vulnerable using the **National Information System for Social Assistance (NISSA) Proxy Means Test**, six receive child grants—but not the two with the lowest scores.
- In 2016 10 households had a **Multidimensional Poverty Index** exceeding 0.5.
- Of these, 7 households included children but only one was in receipt of a child grant.
- 1 of the 8 households receiving child grants and 3 of the 8 households receiving a pension had a MPI above 0.5.



		1996		2008		2016	
		total	per household	total	per household	total	per household
<b>Population</b>							
	Number of households	*41		47		44	
	Number of adults resident	91	2.2	112	2.4	99	2.3
	Number of children resident	77	1.9	89	1.9	66	1.5
	Number of 18-32-year-olds resident	36	0.9	42	0.9	38	0.9
	Resident population	168	4.0	203	4.3	168	3.8
<b>Head of household</b>							
	Resident male	21	51%	25	53%	28	64%
	Absent male	12	29%	5	11%	2	5%
	Female de jure	7	17%	16	34%	14	32%
	Child	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
<b>Livestock</b>							
	Cattle	175	4.3	217	4.6	161	3.7
	Sheep	398	9.7	578	12.3	426	9.7
	Goats	132	3.2	339	7.2	240	5.5
	Pigs	3	0.1	64	1.4	11	0.3
	Horses	41	1.0	31	0.7	28	0.6
	Donkeys	42	1.0	53	1.1	45	1.0
	Poultry	160	3.9	158	3.4	93	2.1
<b>Fields</b>							
	Owned	81	2.0	89	1.9	62	1.4
	Share-cropped own	17	0.4	6	0.1	20	0.5
	Share-cropped other	10	0.2	35	0.7	37	0.8
<b>Houses</b>							
	Rondavel	64	1.6	73	1.6	71	1.6
	Heisi	8	0.2	3	0.1	5	0.1
	Polata	20	0.5	25	0.5	22	0.5
	Optak	2	0.0	4	0.1	2	0.0
	Total rooms	97	2.4	118	2.5	120	2.7
<b>Other assets</b>							
	Plough	17	0.4	22	0.5	21	0.5
	Radio	25	0.6	37	0.8	32	0.7
	Motor vehicle	1	0.0	2	0.0	2	0.0
	Beds	41	1.0	57	1.2	53	1.2
	Latrine	9	0.2	18	0.4	19	0.4
	Cell phone	0	0.0	11	0.2	50	1.1
	Refrigerator	n/k		2	0.0	1	0.0

\* Six households belonging to the village are located in another village an hour's walk away. These were not profiled in 1996.

An ESRC-DFID-funded three-year collaborative research project (ES/M009076/1)

[www.cashtransfers-youth.net](http://www.cashtransfers-youth.net)

Email [nicola.ansell@brunel.ac.uk](mailto:nicola.ansell@brunel.ac.uk)  
[thandiek@hotmail.com](mailto:thandiek@hotmail.com)

Prof Nicola Ansell, Brunel University

Prof Lorraine van Blerk, University of Dundee

Dr Elsbeth Robson, University of Hull

Dr Flora Hajdu, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Dr Evance Mwachunga, University of Malawi

Ms Thandie Hlabana, National University of Lesotho

Mr Roeland Hemsteede, University of Dundee



**Brunel**  
University  
London



THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF HULL



Research jointly supported by the ESRC and DFID