



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

Qualitative research on the impacts of social protection programmes on decent rural employment

A research guide

(Updated version)




PtoP
from PROTECTION
to PRODUCTION

Qualitative research on the impacts of social protection programmes on decent rural employment

A research guide (Updated version)

Terry Roopnaraine, Pamela Pozarny, and Elisenda Estruch
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

The From Protection to Production (PtoP) programme, jointly with the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), is exploring the linkages and strengthening coordination between social protection, agriculture and rural development. PtoP is funded principally by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the European Union.

The programme is also part of a larger effort, the Transfer Project, together with UNICEF, Save the Children and the University of North Carolina, to support the implementation of impact evaluations of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa.



For more information, please visit the PtoP website: www.fao.org/economic/ptop

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2016

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org.

Contents

Abstract	vi
Abbreviations and acronyms.....	vii
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Key research hypotheses and questions.....	3
2.1. Hypothesis and research questions	3
2.2. Community profiles in qualitative fieldwork.....	10
3. Overall research process	10
3.1. Introduction	10
3.2. Overall process.....	10
3.3. Training and piloting.....	11
3.4. Sampling of research sites.....	11
3.5. Fieldwork phase	13
4. Step-by-step research process by community	15
4.1. Introduction of research and research team at district level and key informant interviews	15
4.2. Introduction of research and research team with village head/influential community members.....	15
4.3. Community well-being analysis with key informants	15
4.4. Focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and in-depth beneficiary household case studies	16
5. Research methods and approaches	18
5.1. General conduct during fieldwork	18
5.2. Ethical considerations	19
5.3. Conducting a focus group discussion.....	20
5.4. Data handling	24
5.5. Daily debriefs summarizing and analysing findings.....	25
5.6. Reporting guidelines	28
6. Question guide.....	30
7. Participatory tools.....	39
7.1. Community well-being analysis (using 100 seeds proportional piling)	39
7.2. Social mapping.....	42
7.3. Livelihood matrix analysis.....	44

7.4.	Seasonal calendar, gender division of labour and household activities	46
7.5.	Decision-making matrix.....	48
7.6.	Wealth ranking	49
	Annex Proposed training schedule	51
	References	53

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the many individuals and organizations who contributed to the development and update of this research guide. First, we wish to thank the research teams in Zambia and Malawi, led by Gelson Tembo and Maxton Tsoka, respectively. Their expertise and commitment to conduct high quality fieldwork was essential to turn the research guide into actual fieldwork. Second, we are grateful to the community committees (CWACs), community leaders, and the households who generously gave their time to participate in the interviews. Third, we would like to recognize the logistical and technical support from Zambia's Ministry of Community Development, Mother and Child Health (MCDMCH) and Malawi's Ministry of Gender, Community Services, Social Welfare and the Elderly, both at national and district levels. Moreover, we acknowledge as well the support from FAO and UNICEF in both countries. The authors would like to recognize the excellent technical advice obtained from Dr Eleanor Fisher in the revision of the guide after the fieldwork in Malawi.

Abstract

The Social Protection and Decent Rural Employment research programme of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has grown out of the Social Protection Division's research platform, "From Protection to Production". The research seeks to gain a better understanding of how social protection policies and programmes can affect – and be improved to enhance impacts upon – decent rural employment.

Two case studies will analyse the impact of social protection programmes on decent rural employment, considering in particular the impacts of cash transfer programmes on employment dimensions, including labour allocation, employment creation, decent working conditions, migration patterns and child labour reduction.

Based on previous experience through the From Protection to Production (PtoP) programme, the case studies use a mixed-method approach that combines qualitative and quantitative methods. To achieve comparability and enable cross-country analysis, the research methods are implemented systematically across countries.

This **Qualitative Research Guide** describes in detail the sequencing, timing and methodology of the research process to be implemented in each country of study: training; fieldwork preparation; a simple and clear fieldwork roadmap; the theory of change hypotheses for the studies; guiding questions and research tools. The Guide will be used for conducting qualitative research as part of this programme and will also serve as a basis for future FAO research in social protection and decent rural employment.

Abbreviations and acronyms

CBO	Community-Based Organization
CC	Community Cluster
DFID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GoM	Government of Malawi
KII	Key Informant Interview
LEAP	Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty
PtoP	From Protection to Production
SCT	Social Cash Transfer
TA	Traditional Authority
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

1. Introduction

Promotion of decent employment and social protection in rural areas are interlinked activities. By strengthening the links between social protection and decent rural employment, social protection will fulfil its main role – to effectively reduce vulnerability, poverty and social exclusion and contribute to facilitating access to more and better rural jobs. This will in turn contribute to more inclusive patterns of rural development. The ultimate objective is to ensure minimum standards of protection for rural people that will allow them to lead productive, healthy and dignified lives, in particular ensuring minimum income security and health care along the life cycle. Its aim is to protect individuals from shocks along the life cycle, whether those individuals be formal or informal workers, wage-paid or self-employed. It is also intended to promote better opportunities and equip workers with the skills and assets to improve their livelihoods and withstand shocks, making them better able to confront risks and adversities. In so doing, workers and their families will be able to sustainably exit poverty and eliminate the risk of falling back into it.

Lack of opportunities for decent rural employment jeopardizes the effectiveness of social protection and impedes access by the rural poor and informal workers to formal social protection mechanisms. Similarly, the lack of access to social protection jeopardizes options for the rural poor to access opportunities for decent rural employment. Action in these two areas can therefore be mutually reinforcing, and accounting for those links is crucial to promote pro-poor growth. Better and more productive jobs can raise incomes, allow social spending by poor workers and help finance social protection. Social protection improves the productivity and employability of poor people. It stabilizes and increases their incomes, and links short-term coping strategies with longer-term growth enhancing and poverty reduction strategies.

The Social Protection and Decent Rural Employment research programme of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) grows out of FAO's programme "From Protection to Production" (PtoP) and FAO's regular programme work on decent rural employment. The research seeks to gain a better understanding of how social protection policies and programmes affect – and can be improved to enhance impacts upon – decent rural employment.

A series of case studies will analyse the impact of social protection programmes on decent rural employment, considering in particular the impacts of cash transfer programmes on various dimensions of employment, including labour allocation, employment creation, decent working conditions, migration patterns and child labour reduction.

Based on previous experience from the PtoP project, the case studies are conducted using a mixed-method approach that combines qualitative and quantitative methods. To achieve comparability and enable cross-country analysis, the research methods are implemented systematically across countries.

This **Research Guide on Qualitative Methods** is designed as an overall guide for the research teams in the case study countries. The Guide provides an overview of the training, fieldwork preparation including site selection, the theory of change hypotheses for the studies and the research process that will be followed in each case study country. It also introduces the participatory tools that will be used to help gather information, and provides guidance for conducting key informant interviews (KIIs) and facilitating focus group discussions (FGDs) and in-depth household case studies.

This guide is structured as follows:

- Section 2 lists the key research hypotheses and questions;
- Section 3 outlines the research process;
- Section 4 explains the research process step by step;
- Section 5 explains the overall research methods and approaches;
- Section 6 provides a detailed question guide;
- Section 7 describes the participatory research tools, their main objectives and how to use them during FGDs.

2. Key research hypotheses and questions

Most of the rural poor depend on their labour to earn a living. However, rural people are often exposed to challenges and exclusions. These include: unemployment and underemployment; poor quality and low-productivity jobs; unsafe work and insecure income; denial of rights; gender inequality; exposure of migrant or seasonal workers to exploitation; lack of representation and voice; and inadequate protection and solidarity in the face of disease, disability and old age. These challenges are defined as decent work deficits and they contribute to the vicious cycle of rural poverty and to food and nutrition insecurity. Conversely, decent rural employment will contribute to breaking this cycle.

Decent rural employment includes both agricultural and non-agricultural employment, and both self-employment and wage employment. It is also work that complies with core labour standards, and thus provides a living income and reasonable working conditions, respects minimum occupational safety and health standards and guarantees some level of protection, thereby empowering rural workers and their families to lead productive, healthy and dignified lives.

The motivation of this research programme is to assess the potential contribution of social protection interventions towards decent rural employment in rural areas. In particular, the analysis looks at the impacts of cash transfer programmes on various dimensions of employment,¹ including labour allocation, employment creation, working conditions, migration patterns and child labour reduction.² Through a better understanding of those impacts, on both beneficiary and non-beneficiary households and communities, FAO aims to support more evidence-based policy-making and programme design. The underlying assumption is that if these likely impacts are accounted for in the design and delivery mechanisms, social protection can also improve access of the rural poor to more productive and decent employment opportunities.

The research covers three main areas of inquiry:

1. Social Protection and Rural Employment Dynamics;
2. Social Protection and Household Labour Allocation;
3. Operational Issues in Social Protection Schemes that Relate to Rural Employment

2.1. Hypotheses and research questions

The hypothesis for each area of inquiry and research questions to be covered by the case studies are shown in Table 1 (below).

¹ For the purposes of the analysis, and considering the type of social protection programme under analysis, the research will make due distinction between those who are labour-constrained and those who are able-bodied. This distinction is particularly relevant in discussions that may consider graduation of recipients from a certain social protection programme through the use of their labour.

² The analysis will consider gender differences systematically. However, the analysis does not focus on rural women's economic empowerment as this issue is covered by a specific set of studies within the PtoP/FAO OO3 Work Programme.

Table 1 Areas of inquiry and fieldwork questions

Area of Inquiry 1: Social Protection and Rural Employment ³ Dynamics	
Hypothesis 1: Social protection schemes affect rural employment dynamics through creating changes in labour participation and intensity in agriculture and non-agriculture activities, generating shifts from more vulnerable/precarious forms of employment, such as daily piecework, to less precarious employment, self-employment or formal/fulltime agricultural wage employment. Social protection schemes also affect migration by reducing liquidity constraints. This may result in either a reduction of distress migration or an increase in outflows as a consequence of reduced migration costs. All these changes are expected to be shaped by gender, age, household assets and other contextual drivers.	
1.1	<u>Sources of income and roles of household member in income generation (women/men/youth/children):</u> ⁴ What are the existing sources of income available (including income generated through agriculture, agriculture and non-agriculture wage employment, and public transfers, remittances, gift-giving, etc.)? Have the sources of income available changed with the implementation of the social protection programme? How? What is their relative share of importance? What are men/women's traditional roles in income generation? Does the household suffer from any labour shortage?
1.2	<u>Employment situation:</u> ⁵ What types of activities/employment do household members perform and spend most hours in? Does the household employ non-family workers? For what? Under what work arrangements? Are any members in the household involved in wage or in kind employment? How does the household decide who is to engage in wage employment? How are wage employment opportunities identified? Is the individual worker negotiating for the pay him/herself or are there intermediaries (household members/social networks/private agents)? Have these practices changed with the implementation of the social protection programme? Explain. ⁶
1.3	<u>Youth employment:</u> What are the opportunities for youth to earn incomes? Describe this situation. Has this changed with the social protection programme? How? Why? Explain.
1.4	<u>Migration:</u> Are there household members who have migrated for the purposes of employment? Who/Why/Where? What type of migration (seasonal, temporary, permanent)? Does the household suffer from labour shortages (or other problems) as a result? Do migrant family

³ The term “rural employment” covers any activity, occupation, work, business or service performed in rural areas for remuneration, profit, social or family gain, in cash or in kind. It applies to waged and salaried workers as well as self-employed workers (including contributing family workers).

⁴ “Household” and “family” will need to be carefully defined depending on local understandings and delineations.

⁵ Given the focus of this research, the term “employment” is used here in a broad sense, including wage labour, reciprocity, in-kind and other arrangements. While broadly defined, the research is expected to adequately distinguish between different types of employment arrangements, as relevant to the context.

⁶ We acknowledge that questions 1.1 and 1.2 may overlap in some contexts; we opt to keep them separated because in some places there will be a greater range of wage employment opportunities.

members send remittances? How? For what are remittances used? Have migration patterns and remittances receipts/use changed with the social protection programme? How? For whom?

- 1.5 Resilience: What shocks effect households in this community? (Prompts: e.g. someone gets ill, the harvest fails, there are floods) How? When/how often do these shocks happen (e.g. every year, rainy season)? In the event of a shock, how does the household decide on what coping strategy to adopt? Does the household increase work hours or engage in other types of work activities? Are children withdrawn from school, for example? Do children work more? Did the programme create changes in these coping strategies in terms of labour allocation in the event of a crisis (harvest failure, sickness, income instability, job loss, work-related injury, etc.)? Explain.
- 1.6 Education and skills: What is the level of education for men/women? What skills are most relevant/necessary to gain access to higher-return income-generating activities and more gainful employment opportunities? Has access to skills development changed for women/men/youth with the social protection programme? How? Which type of skills (agricultural, entrepreneurship/business, managerial, leadership)?
- 1.7 Access to financial services: Are credit, savings and insurance services accessible to all household members? What services (formal, informal, etc.) are used to finance self-employment/household enterprises? Has this changed with the social protection programme? How? Are there differences between agriculture and non-agriculture related activities? Explain.

Area of Inquiry 2: Social Protection and Household Labour Allocation

Hypothesis 2: Social protection programmes in rural areas leads to changes in labour allocation within the household as well as decision-making over related earned profits. Likewise, social protection programmes will influence changes in perceptions and aspirations regarding labour allocation and decision-making over income.

- 2.1 Decision-making and control on the use of income: How are decisions made over cash expenditure in the household? Does this depend on sources of income? Does it change according to whom in the household is receiving the transfer? What is the ownership and control structure over household cash income? Who in the household usually saves or keeps cash aside? What is the ownership and control structure among household members over household and productive assets? How does this vary according to type of household structure (female-headed, male-headed, grandparent-headed or child-headed)? Have these structures changed after the social protection programme started? In what way? Why?
- 2.2 Control and decision-making on transfers and new income from the social protection scheme: Is the income from the cash transfer differentiated from the overall household income? How was the income from the cash transfer used? Was this additional income from the cash transfer invested in any business activity (agriculture or non-agriculture)? Was additional income from social protection programmes dedicated to hire

non-family workers? Was additional income dedicated to pay out-migration of some family member? Who made the decisions for the use of the cash transfer and type of choice?

- 2.3 Youth aspirations: What are the general views about the future for youth in agriculture and rural areas? What are the aspirations of youth themselves? Have these views and aspirations changed as a result of the programme? How? Explain.
- 2.4 Children's education and economic activities: What is the general/community view on children with regard to schooling? What contributions do children make to household activities? What outside-of-household economic activities do children engage in? Explain. What activities are considered to be child labour in this community? Have child labour practices changed with the implementation of the social protection programme? How (more/less work, changes in type of tasks)? Why? Explain. What are people's views of these changes? Are there other programmes that have changed child labour practices in this community?
- 2.5 Women's time use (productive and reproductive & care work): What is the general/community view on women's participation in employment/income-generating activities? What are the general/community views about women's time burdens regarding labour participation vs reproductive & care work? Have these views changed after the social protection programme? How? Explain.
- 2.6 Social engagement: Do household members participate in producers' organizations/ cooperatives and rural workers' organizations/trade unions? (List all important ones.) Do men/women/youth engage in separate groups? Explain. Has this situation changed due to the social protection programme? Explain. What are people's views of these changes?
- 2.7 Knowledge about labour rights and access to legal counselling: What mechanisms exist for conflict resolution in the community for the purposes of employment or commercial activities? Who in the household has access to such services? Who in the household has access to job/business counselling and support, when needed? Are members of beneficiary households (especially if employed as wage labourers or if they hire labour) aware of labour rights⁷? Has this changed after the social protection programme? How? Why? Explain.

Area of Inquiry 3: Operational issues in Social Protection Schemes that Relate to Rural Employment

Hypothesis 3: Design and implementation of social protection programmes that facilitate linkages to employment opportunities and entrepreneurship promotion can result in greater impacts and contribute to more effective results in terms of poverty alleviation.

- 3.1 Social protection programmes: What are all the social protection programmes available – formal and informal – in the community? (List all relevant ones.) Can households (members) have access to more than one programme at the same time? Explain - if and why beneficiaries can

⁷ The core labour standards include: freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour; the effective abolition of child labour; and the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

access several programmes simultaneously. What are government policy and design principles of these programs regarding accessing many programs at once? In practice, what in fact transpires? What do people in the community feel about this?

- 3.2 Targeting in social protection: How did you find about this social protection programme? How were you or those selected chosen to become a beneficiary? Who makes these decisions in the community? Why? How? Do you perceive the decision-making process as fair? In your opinion, who should be a beneficiary of social protection programmes? To your understanding does your view comply with the actual programme targeting strategy? Do people (women/men/youth) understand why those receiving the transfer are selected and what its intended use should be? Explain how.
- 3.3 Obtaining cash or asset transfers: How are transfers delivered to beneficiaries? Describe the process, from notification to travel to receiving the transfer and use of the cash. How are you informed when it is time to get transfers? What is the distance travelled to collect these transfers? How do you travel this distance? Are there implications for your employment activities (work time, employer permissions, etc.)? Are any events/activities organized around payment points? Explain.
- 3.4 Accessing employment through public works: Are there public works programmes? If yes, explain the process of how access to these opportunities is decided? For whom? Who in the household participates in public works? Why? What is the process for accessing/implementing public works, from request/notification to transport to payment? Do the public works sites fulfil basic labour standards, in terms of safety in the workplace, decent pay, gender equality, child care facilities, working hours, etc.? How long does it take for participants to reach work sites? Do participants make reference to wage/pay rates for public works to bargain wages for other labour activities (e.g. wage employment, contract farming)?
- 3.5 Skills development in social protection programmes: Are there skills development trainings as part of the social protection programmes? What skills are developed through such trainings (technical, business, life skills)? For what purpose? Who in the household receives this training? Why? What benefits, opportunities have accrued due to these skills?
- 3.6 Participation in rural livelihoods programmes and/or micro-entrepreneurship development programmes:⁸ Are there micro-entrepreneurship development programmes? If so, who in the household participates? Why? What is the process for accessing such programmes, from request/notification to transport, payment and storage of payment? Is there any conditionality? Is there any linkage or intentional coordination between these programmes and the social protection programme? Explain.

⁸ Micro-entrepreneurship programmes may include providing skill and business training and other support to set up micro-enterprises, as well as helping to establish business support services and representative organizations for micro-entrepreneurs.

- 3.7 Participation in youth in agriculture/youth employment programmes: Are there youth development programmes? If yes, do youth in the household participate? Why? What is the process for accessing such programmes, from request/notification to transport, payment and storage of payment? Is there any conditionality? Is there any linkage or intentional coordination between these programmes and the social protection programme? Explain.
- 3.8 Implementation and communication mechanisms of the social protection programme: How do the implementation mechanisms of the cash transfer programme operate at the local level? How is the composition of the implementation committee decided? Explain. How does the implementation compare to the actual programme design? Are the main programme features communicated adequately to the beneficiaries? If yes, how - Through which channels (formal/informal)? What is the process of getting information - from whom/where? If no, why not? In either case, what do beneficiaries know about main aspects of cash transfer programmes or other interventions that affect them? What are the main constraints to effective communication and why? Does the cash transfer programme foresee a grievance mechanism or complaint processes? How do these work and at what level? Are beneficiaries informed of this? How do beneficiaries make their voices heard and claim their rights? Explain.
- 3.9 Exiting the programme / graduation: Do beneficiaries exit the programme? When? Why? Who decides? Explain. What do beneficiaries know about why they exit the programme? Is a graduation strategy part of the design of the programme? Is it being implemented? Explain.

Secondary Data and Key Informants:⁹

- 3.1 Targeting: Why did the social protection scheme adopt its particular type of targeting? What are the goals to be achieved by targeting in this way?
- 3.12 Gender-sensitive design: Was gender analysis conducted in order to inform the design of the social protection scheme? How are gender inequalities related to employment/labour market participation addressed in programme design? Does the social protection scheme have special features? Which ones?
- 3.13 Youth inclusion: Does the programme address youth in any way (e.g. opportunities for income generation for rural youth)? How? Explain. Are there features in place in order to meet this objective? Are youth challenges and aspirations taken into account in the programme? If so, what impacts have been observed? What are the current limitations and how might these be overcome?

⁹ Key informants will be interviewed covering the whole set of research questions and, as an option, they may be asked an additional set of focused questions in view of their position within the community or in relation to the programme.

- 3.14 Child labour reduction and prevention: Are there any features in place to meet the objective of preventing child labour, especially in its most hazardous forms? Explain. What are the impacts to date? How could these be further strengthened?
- 3.15 Migration: Were migration patterns (permanent/seasonal) considered during the design of the social protection scheme? How are the implications of migration addressed in programme design? Does the social protection scheme have special features to address migration issues? Which ones? (Does the programme take into account how migration can affect its implementation and impacts? How could the programme design be adapted to leverage the potential of migration, and to mitigate any negative impacts on the households, such as labour shortages, etc.?)
- 3.16 Coordination and synergies with other employment promotion and livelihoods schemes: Are there other social protection or livelihoods/employment/entrepreneurship programmes or focused activities in the communities of study? Which ones? Explain whether beneficiaries can access several of these programmes simultaneously. What are the government policy and design principles of these programmes regarding access to many programmes at once? In practice, what actually occurs? How do people in the community feel about this? What graduation strategies exist and what do beneficiaries know about them?

2.1. Community profiles in qualitative fieldwork

In addition to the research questions in Table 1, the case study will collect a minimum of information on the livelihoods and poverty status of the communities, first through preliminary desk research and then by implementing a fieldwork exercise with the use of qualitative tools.

The community profiles should include information on the following factors: location; agro-ecological context; agricultural context; livelihood zone; main economic and trade characteristics and activities; livelihood activities; population; share of households headed by women; poverty level; share of population experiencing food insecurity; nutrition levels; HIV prevalence; language; religion(s); cultural norms – particularly those that relate to gender; public services available; formal and informal employment opportunities available and general employment situation; informal/traditional leadership structures – including those that may be relatively specific to women and youth; social protection schemes available to the population; number of beneficiaries of the social protection scheme; and gender of transfer receivers; among others.

3. Overall research process

3.1. Introduction

This section provides a description of the overall research process: methodological orientation; preliminary data collection tasks; training; piloting; sampling; site and informant selection; and fieldwork itself, including a simple day-by-day roadmap.

The research will be implemented within an outlined structure, but with varying degrees of flexibility, to respond to contextual variation in each research district and community and to the variation in interview subjects and focus groups. However, to ensure a degree of commonality across countries and communities, a clear qualitative research process is described below.

3.2. Overall process

Mixed methods

The research strategy will ensure the participation of local people, programme and agency staff and decision-makers in the assessment process, particularly in defining indicators of overall “success” of social protection programmes in terms of decent rural employment. To achieve this, key informant interviews (KIIs) with key stakeholders and informants will include conversations about the meaning of social protection “success” with regard to decent rural employment and what this means to the programme and its future.

While the orientation of this research component is qualitative, it contributes to an overall mixed-methods approach which draws upon both qualitative and quantitative research tools. Mixed-methods approaches of this kind are designed to leverage the particular strengths of each approach; qualitative methods provide greater explanatory depth and nuanced understanding of the research areas, while quantitative approaches, based on larger randomized sampling, offer the ability to make better generalizations and comparisons at the population level.

Desk review and key informant interviews

As a first step and also as a preparation for fieldwork, the lead researcher will perform a desk review of relevant and recent sources on the labour impacts of social protection instruments, as well as the links between employment promotion interventions and the national social protection system – particularly the social protection scheme to be analysed.

A full description of the social protection scheme in question will be provided in the final fieldwork report and country case study report. The description will include motivation, objectives, theory of change, analysis of decent rural employment, key messages and conclusions from previous evaluations/studies of the programme, as well as some basic statistics in terms of current and future coverage. Data should be disaggregated by gender and main age groups, when possible.

The desk review is the preliminary step of the research, to be complemented with (semi-structured) KIIs with national officials, as well as programme designers and implementers when possible, covering the research questions outlined in Table 1. One of the goals of this process is to bring different stakeholders, especially from national level, into the analysis and to refine indicators of “success” and recommendations for the social protection scheme and the national system.

The findings of the desk review and initial KIIs will be incorporated into the case study of quantitative and qualitative data, and the final report of the country case study (introduction, analysis and conclusion). The core of the data collection is the fieldwork phase described below.

3.3. Training and piloting

Careful training of research teams is required for the effective application of the case study methodology.

Training for qualitative methods should include:

- (1) introduction to the motivation for this research;
- (2) overview of the social protection programme(s) to be examined – particularly concerning objectives, design, implementation arrangements and outcomes to date;
- (3) overview of the qualitative approach – the research and fieldwork “roadmap” – to inform researchers early in the training about the overall methodology and protocol of the fieldwork, i.e. sequencing of activities, specific methods (see Figure 1) as well as data collection and reporting processes, team briefings and analysis;
- (4) introduction and correct application (by simulation) of the qualitative tools;
- (5) pre-testing and refinement of the research methods (interviews and tools) during a training “pilot exercise”; and
- (6) discussion on ethical issues in research and any other relevant issues.

The training will take place immediately before research and data collection. The training will consist of four days, plus one or two days for the pre-testing (pilot exercise) of the qualitative tools in order to further refine and adapt these tools to the local context and enable the researchers to practice and get comfortable with the tools. If possible, a guest speaker from the programme under study will join the trainings to present the overall programme, progress to date, and perspectives – particularly concerning decent rural employment issues.

3.4. Sampling of research sites

The research will be conducted in two districts (Malawi) of the country. The selection of these districts will reflect important differences in agro-ecological context, livelihoods and vulnerability. Whenever possible, in a given country context or social protection programme, it is desirable that at least one district of the country selected for research is included in both the quantitative and qualitative fieldwork. This will maximize opportunities for cross-fertilization of study results through a mixed-method approach.

Sampling for qualitative research

The selection of communities for qualitative fieldwork consists of a three-stage cluster sampling of geographical areas:

- Stage 1: Geographic targeting. Two of the highest-level administrative units in the country are selected from among all those districts participating in the social protection programme. The purpose of this stage is to capture different livelihood and vulnerability contexts that are typical of those parts of the country.
- Stage 2: Administrative unit level. This is typically a single district or sub-district from each of the highest-level units identified in Stage 1 above (i.e. in Malawi, this is the district). The sub-district (in this case, Traditional Authority) is selected from among those that participate in the programme, as it is not always the case that every sub-district in a district is enrolled in the social protection programme. Again, the selection is intended to reflect the typical characteristics of the district as a whole, in terms of its livelihood and vulnerability contexts. One sub-district is selected per district.
- Stage 3: Selection of two community clusters (in Malawi, this is a unit of the SCT programme) within the selected TA of the District. . The community cluster (CC) (in the Malawi case) is the unit at which the implementation of the social protection programme is managed, and it generates a large enough sample of beneficiaries to enable the fieldwork to be conducted.

The two CCs are selected according to their level of market integration – defined by ease of access to markets, as determined by their proximity to a main road, and also by their relative distance to the district capital or another significant district town (boma). One well-connected CC and one more remote CC are identified. Within each CC, selection of a village is made representing the community with the median number of beneficiaries among all villages in the CC.

In addition, one community per district within the same TA will be selected as a “control” or “comparison” community. This should be a community where the social protection programme is not operating but that has relatively similar and comparable characteristics to the studied communities. The objective is to understand, through a “snapshot” assessment of the characteristics of communities not affected by the programme, what the programme’s effects have been, in terms of the areas of enquiry of this research.

Selection of respondents for focus group discussions and key informant interviews

Ideally, government desk officers for the social protection programme will provide lists of beneficiaries in the study communities, and introductions to the relevant committees. For comparison communities, they provide introductions to the relevant community development assistants at the local level. When these lists are not available, beneficiaries will be identified through local organizations and key informants.

The process for selection of respondents for FGDs and KIIs is as follows. Beneficiary lists are separated into lists of males and females. For each focus group with beneficiaries, wherever possible, the team makes a random selection by picking every *n*th name on the list from within a single-sex group. Committees must inform the beneficiaries of the invitation to participate.

For non-beneficiaries, the team should seek assistance from committees or community development assistants (e.g. for control communities) to identify a wide range of persons from the community, such as members from different neighbourhoods, different occupational groups and so on. For the comparison community, informants should be from households living in fairly similar conditions to cash transfer beneficiaries.

Research teams can select key informants through consultation with the committees or community development assistants or else by “snowball” sampling through other local opinion leaders. A number of in-depth household case studies of social protection beneficiaries should be conducted if possible, arranged at the household in order to get a comprehensive and deep understanding of the impacts and experiences of the programme on households. If possible, it is strongly encouraged that at least one in-depth household case study be conducted in CC (for a total of four studies).

3.5. Fieldwork phase

The schedule for qualitative fieldwork covers an estimated 12 days, including: interviews with key informants at district and if relevant and possible TA levels; FGDs and KIIs at village level using at least 4-5 different qualitative tools; in-depth household case studies conducted in each CC ; and debriefing with beneficiary communities, district and national authorities. The fieldwork foresees daily team briefings, as well as allowing one day for team debriefing, synthesis and recording of findings following research in each district.

Fieldwork at village level will be conducted simultaneously in the two CCs. The daily debriefings will be conducted as a full team. The research teams will reunite in the comparison community for both fieldwork and debriefing. This modality will be repeated in each district.

Figure 1 illustrates a proposed roadmap schedule for qualitative fieldwork with a total of five days in each district. Consistency and systematic implementation are of high priority for the country case study; however, the schedule and the use and sequence of qualitative tools can be adapted, if needed, to the country and local context.

Figure 1 Schedule for qualitative fieldwork per district

	District Level Interviews with Key Informants	
DAY 1	Community Cluster 1 (sub-team 1) Introductions with TA/village leaders FGD with key informants- opinion leaders/programme committee (community wellbeing tool) 1 KII Discuss plan and respondents required for next three days Daily debrief	Community Cluster 2 (sub-team 2) Introductions with TA/village leaders FGD with key informants-opinion leaders/programme committee (community wellbeing tool) 1 KII Discuss plan and respondents required for next three days Daily debrief
DAY 2	1 FGD with male beneficiaries, livelihoods matrix tool 1 FGD with female beneficiaries, livelihoods matrix tool 1 KII Daily debrief	1 FGD with male beneficiaries, livelihoods matrix tool 1 FGD with female beneficiaries, livelihoods matrix tool 1 KII Daily debrief
DAY 3	1 FGD with male non-beneficiaries, livelihoods matrix tool 1 FGD with female non-beneficiaries, livelihoods matrix tool 1KII Daily debrief	1 FGD with male non-beneficiaries, livelihoods matrix tool 1 FGD with female non-beneficiaries, livelihoods matrix tool 1 KII Daily debrief
DAY 4	1 FGD (youth), livelihoods matrix 1 FGD, male beneficiaries or FGD of choice (but different from previous FGDs) Seasonal calendar Community feedback session Daily debrief	1 FGD (youth), livelihoods matrix 1 FGD, female beneficiaries or FGD of choice (but different from previous FGDs) Seasonal calendar Community feedback session Daily debrief
DAY 5	Comparison Community 1 FGD with opinion leaders 2 FGDs with people typical of social protection programme beneficiaries (male group and female group) (Suggested tool: community well-being)	
	District Level Feedback District Level Daily debrief	
DAY 6	Team consolidation and synthesis	

Source: Adaptation from PtoP/OPM studies. Note: The precise order of FGDs and KIIs may vary slightly between communities. FGDs will be with women and men (beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries) and there will be also FGDs with youth (beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries). The latter will be mixed in terms of gender composition. Other groups of informants may also be identified to interview during fieldwork period.

4. Step-by-step research process by community

4.1. Introduction of research and research team at district level and key informant interviews

The research team will introduce the research at district level and conduct KIIs with district level officials before reaching the CC villages. Key informants at district level may include members of programme sub-offices and officials of the ministry directly involved in programme implementation, as well as key programme staff including social workers. These interviews should also be used to obtain district-level data, including lists of villagers to be used to complement the snowball sampling.

4.2. Introduction of research and research team with village head/influential community members

In each community and on the first day of the fieldwork, the first contact will be with the village head/chief. After explaining who the team is working for and the purpose and process of the research, the team leader will request permission to conduct the research in their community.

After this initial meeting with the village chief, the research team will then proceed to conduct an FGD with the relevant programme committee members, followed by an FGD with community opinion leaders – both men and women – such as teachers, priests/imams, elders, etc. (see Table 1 above). This will provide an opportunity to find out more about the social context of the community and to start to identify specific groups of people with which to conduct FGDs and KIIs.

4.3. Community well-being analysis with key informants

The next step in the fieldwork process is to understand the social make-up of the community by identifying the social characteristics, social differences and distribution of well-being among its members. This should involve between six and ten people with a comprehensive knowledge of community members and their social situation. These may include, for example:

- local midwife;
- local nurse;
- local extension agent;
- local trader;
- schoolteacher or headmaster;
- member or leader of a community-based organization (CBO);
- youth leader;
- woman leader;
- religious leader;
- local programme committee member

This analysis will be conducted using the community well-being analysis. The detailed guidelines for using these two participatory tools are provided in Section 7. Subsequent to this initial analysis, the research team should remain open to identifying new groups or people that need to be included in the research. For instance, during discussion with one focus group, another important but marginalized group of people may be identified. The identification process will thus be multi-staged (in a “snowball” effect) and aided by:

- key informant opinions and triangulated outcomes of community well-being analysis;
- insights from FGDs;
- lists of community members or programme beneficiaries, if available.

4.4. Focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and in-depth beneficiary household case studies

Focus group discussions

FGDs are organized with specific goals, structures, time frames and procedures, and with a group of people with a common interest. The selection will be based on the social analysis conducted with key informants and through triangulation of information across different discussions throughout the research process.

FGDs will be conducted separately for men and women, as well as for youth, so purposive sampling must ensure an adequate number of participants in each group. For the qualitative research sample, FGDs will include 8-10 individuals each time, depending on the qualitative techniques.

In order to select programme beneficiaries for the focus groups, the beneficiary list will be obtained from programme officials, and focus group participants will be randomly drawn from this list.

When selecting non-beneficiaries for the focus groups, the research team should attempt to select participants randomly from a population census list. In the absence of such a list, the research team will select participants as randomly as possible using a local key informant to identify a total population – for example, of “nearly beneficiaries”, farmers or religious minorities – and then randomly selecting from that population. Selecting people randomly from different neighbourhoods can also be used for informant selection.

In all communities researched, at least four FGDs should be systematically conducted, which include the following categories of people:

- female programme beneficiaries;
- male programme beneficiaries;
- female non-beneficiaries;
- male non-beneficiaries.

According to the context and programme characteristics, these core FGDs can be further stratified – for example, to include old/young members and more/less socially excluded members. Additional FGDs should also be undertaken with key groups, according to context, including:

- farmers, including producer groups;
- casual labourers;
- local traders;
- ethnic minorities;
- young men and women;
- women’s income-generating groups or other associations;
- other marginalized community members.

The following core principles will apply to the selection of all FGDs:

- **Discussions will be conducted separately with men and women. They will also be held with a range of other groups based on social grouping and livelihood.** It is important to understand some of the basic social differences in each community before deciding which groups of people to select; therefore, the number and types of groups for FGDs will depend

on the particular community. The strategy also aims to involve groups of people who might not normally be asked their opinions, such as the poorest people, young women and minority ethnic or religious groups.

- **The selection of participants will be designed to ensure that social difference and diversity within the selected communities is adequately captured.** FGDs will also be held with participants from civil society organizations – for example, women’s organizations or livelihood group organizations. In some situations, group discussions with service providers may be difficult, in which case individual KIIs will be conducted.
- **Groups will be composed of approximately six to ten participants.** With larger groups it becomes difficult to ensure that all participants can contribute freely and meaningfully. With much smaller groups, on the other hand, one or two individuals may tend to dominate. As with in-depth interviews, triangulating the findings from one focus group with other discussions held with different participants from the same interest group will increase the trustworthiness of those findings.

Key informant interviews

The research team will conduct individual interviews with a variety of key informants, including community leaders, non-governmental organization workers, religious leaders, health workers, agricultural extension agents, teachers, elders, local traders, women leaders and farmers. Although the interviews should cover all three thematic areas, it is important that particular attention is paid to the thematic areas about which the informant is most familiar.

Table 2 provides indicative guidance on the priority key informants to be interviewed (with a tick next to the most important ones). Additional key informants may also be added (and some removed) according to the type of social protection programme, as well as country and community context.

Table 2 Suggested key informants

Informant	Probable location	Importance
Village chief/head	Community	✓
Village committee members	Community	✓
Leaders of minority groups	Community	✓
CBO leaders/members/religious leaders	Community	✓
Members of a specific social network	Community	✓
Extension workers	Community	✓
Local farmers/agricultural merchants	Community	
Community health workers	Community	
Schoolteacher/principal	Community	
Women leader(s)	Community	
Market traders	Will depend	
Local business owners (and/or employees)	Will depend	

In-depth beneficiary household case studies

A minimum of four in-depth household case studies (one per CC) should also be conducted as part of the qualitative research. The case studies will consist of one-to-one interviews (lasting approximately two hours) conducted at the beneficiary household to allow for closer personal contact and informality, using the key research questions as a guideline. The aim of the case studies will be to explore the three areas of investigation in depth and through the experience of the beneficiary in his/her household/family/community context. The key findings are typically captured

in text boxes that will be included in the final report, which will portray the beneficiary's "story" with the richness of qualitative insights, quotes and causal relations.

5. Research methods and approaches

The preceding sections of this guide have provided introductory material, background context and an overview of the research questions, orientations and methods. This section and those which follow will shift to a more practical and programmatic approach, describing in detail the steps which need to be taken to meet the research objectives, particularly at the field level.

5.1. General conduct during fieldwork

This section sets out some general norms of behaviour when working in a research area. Much of this material is obvious, but it is very important to ensure that the research is both ethical and accurate.

Conduct

Be clear about your role. Seek fully informed consent. Answer questions openly. Ensure confidentiality.

- Community members and research participants must not feel offended or demeaned by anything you do, say or ask, or by your behaviour in their community. You are in their community and must respect them accordingly.
- Expectations of community members and research participants must not be raised by anything you do or say during the research.
- Potential respondents must also feel under no explicit or implicit pressure to participate, either from the research team or from those who are asked to help us gather participants (such as village heads, community elders or leaders, etc.).
- The research will be more accurate if participants see no reason or pressure to adjust their responses in a particular way and if they feel comfortable during the interview.

You will be engaged in research that might appear very strange to many members of the community. It involves asking a number of personal questions and selecting many respondents at random. Even if this type of research has been conducted in the community before, it is likely that many people will ask questions about what you are doing. It is important to explain the research very clearly, and to answer questions patiently, clearly and honestly to each individual that asks.

5.2. Ethical considerations

Box 1 sets out some key ethical considerations to be made when carrying out participatory research.

Box 1 Ethical considerations for conducting participatory research

- Consider the following questions: How are participants being selected? Is there any deliberate exclusion on the basis of, for example, access or stigma? Have cultural and community norms been understood and considered in the selection process?
- Ensure that permission is sought for the focus groups to go ahead, through consultation with the local community.
- Set and communicate clear parameters for the focus group; this means clearly stating the purpose, the limits and what the follow-up will entail. It also means ensuring that demands on participants' time are not excessive (maximum 1.5-2 hours, for instance) and that participants are aware of their right to decline to participate or to withdraw at any time.
- Take care to make respondents aware that the research team is independent, with no direct associations with implementing agents.
- Set up FGDs and interviews at times and in places that are convenient for respondents (e.g. after labouring hours).
- Recognize that participants are possibly vulnerable and ensure that the exercise is carried out with full respect. Power differentials will exist between community members and researchers and these should be purposefully mitigated in planning and implementation.
- Ensure the safety and protection of participants; this means ensuring that the environment is physically safe and that there are at least two facilitators present at all times.
- Ensure that people understand what is happening at all times. Is appropriate language being used (language, dialect, community terminology, etc.)? This needs to be carefully planned.
- Ensure the right to privacy; this includes ensuring anonymity and confidentiality in record-keeping and report-writing and making sure participants understand that what they do and say in the group session will remain anonymous. In addition, respondents should be made to feel at ease and encouraged to ask questions of researchers.

5.3. Conducting a focus group discussion

Box 2 Introductions for a focus group discussion

Key elements of an introduction:

- Explain why you are doing the FGD
- Explain what you would like to do
- Explain about confidentiality
- Ask if there are any questions before starting
- Ask the participants to introduce themselves
- Suggested script:

“Thank you for coming. My name is _____, and I am with a team of independent researchers working with FAO. We are researching the implementation of [SCT] and are eager to collect your views to improve the way these programmes work.

We are not programme staff, and the answers and information you give will be completely confidential. In our report, we will explain what people in this community and others think, but we will not mention any names. Your personal contributions and views will not be shared with anyone else in a way that can identify you.

Also, you do not have to participate if you don't want to, and please interrupt me if you ever want to stop the discussion. The discussion will take about an hour and a half.

Do you have anything you want to ask me, or shall we begin?

Can we start by quickly introducing ourselves to each other?” [Give your name, where you are from and then ask everyone to give their name]

- *Introduce yourself and describe the purpose of the research and the discussion.*
- *Use the question and tool guides supplied to provide an overall direction for the discussion.* These guides lay out the topics and issues that should be covered at some time in the discussion with each particular focus group but they are not tightly structured nor do they suggest potential responses. Although each topic needs to be covered within the community, the guides are not like a survey instrument that must be followed strictly in order. Think of the subjects that need to be answered, and try to proceed logically from topic to topic. If a topic comes up in the discussion, you may decide to explore it then and not later, or you may ask the participants if you can talk about it later.
- *Questions should be open-ended (as much as possible), short and clear.* Closed questions should be avoided generally, and followed by further probing questions. Keep in mind, as well, that the order might need to be changed during the discussion, and be flexible about this.
- *Probe, probe and probe.* This technique cannot be overemphasized and should be used

actively by team members to collect more accurate, deeper and richer information from informants, as well as to validate information. Techniques such as “echoing back” are helpful to confirm that the information is accurate. The first replies may not always be fully accurate or comprehensive and much more probing and questioning is often required to provide a fuller and even different picture. Probing is vital! The questions provided in the guides can also be used in conjunction with the tools to help probe into issues when useful and appropriate.

- *Answers and responses should be illustrated with examples whenever possible.* Ask for examples, as these are critical for collecting data and using actual stories as findings. Gather actual quotations of what people say that are particularly illustrative of the information and experiences they are sharing.
- *Where possible it is sensible to include the most important research questions earlier in the discussion.* Use the guide questions to help ask the broad, open-ended questions and give the participants enough time and opportunity to talk about their opinions and experiences.
- *Try to keep the discussion focused on the subject, but allow the participants to lead the discussion in new directions if they arise and are relevant to the subject.* This may highlight new information that can be incorporated into question guides for future focus groups.
- *Rise to the challenge of bringing out the views of quieter members of groups.* This can be addressed in various potential ways, such as:
 - Writing down everyone’s name and using their names to address them directly;
 - Ensuring that there are no tasks that make people feel embarrassed because they cannot do them – such as writing or reading;
 - Having group incentives to encourage everyone to speak;
 - Asking quieter members for their opinion;
 - Explaining in advance to the group that you would like a conversation that includes them all, and that you want to hear everyone’s views;
 - Explaining that there is no correct answer to the questions – and that you are interested in hearing many different views and opinions.
- *When the discussion comes to a natural end – or after about an hour and a half – ask whether there is anything else that the participants wish to share or discuss.* Check again that the participants know what the information will be used for. Thank them for their time and effort.
- *Review the guide after the discussion and make any changes to content or order that will improve it for the next discussion.* Any changes made by researchers will be discussed with the wider team during the daily debrief.

Using participatory tools within the focus group discussions

Different qualitative instruments will be used to answer the questions outlined in Table 1. Table 3 suggests various proposed **qualitative research tools** that will be adapted based on the social protection programme and context to be analysed in the case study.

Table 3 Qualitative field techniques

Qualitative tool	KII and FGD	Focus
Community well-being analysis	Small FGD: Opinion leaders (gender-balanced)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the socio-economic status of the community (characterized by wealth groups) and perceptions of differences among different wealth groups, with a special focus on gender, age, employment status; • Elicit estimates of the distribution of wealth; • Understand perceptions of the characteristics of different community members, paying specific attention to the most vulnerable; • Understand perceptions of the targeting effectiveness of the social protection programme; and • Prompt broader discussion on the three research themes (rural employment dynamics, household labour allocation, and operational issues).
Social mapping	Small FGD: Opinion leaders (gender-balanced)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the characteristics of well-being in the community and perceptions of differences in well-being among members of the population; • Understand perceptions of the characteristics of the most vulnerable in the community; and • Prompt broader discussion on the three research themes
Livelihoods matrix analysis	Small FGD: Opinion leaders (gender-balanced)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the range and value of different livelihoods within the community, including changes in aspirations (e.g., how working-age household members earn a living in their community, and the relative merits of different options; learning how youth earn a living in their communities.); • Understand the impacts of the programme on labour allocation/choices for men and women, youth and children (including by determining incidence of child labour, and any alternatives that arise through the impact of the programme); and • Understand the contribution of the cash transfer benefit to the local economy (markets, prices and employment).
Seasonal calendar and household division of labour	FGDs: Beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn about seasonal variations that affect the labour patterns throughout the year, in terms of the main agricultural and non-agricultural activities and the division of tasks among family members, with particular attention to gender; and • Prompt thematic discussions on workloads and use of time within the household (women/men/youth/children), as well as income sources, their diversity and household resilience; and • Explore the incidence and nature of seasonal migration.

Decision-making matrix	FGDs: Beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine who participates in economic decision-making within the household, by analysing decision-making on own and household income, and income from the social protection scheme, and looking at relevant gender differences; • Learn about decision-making power of youth about own and household income, and income from the social protection scheme; and • Prompt thematic discussions on workloads and use of time within the household (women/men/youth/children), as well as income sources, their diversity and household resilience.
Wealth Ranking	FGDs: Non-beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the main socio-economic groups in the community and their livelihood characteristics (reviewing the distribution of households among the groups, and identifying factors associated with movement between groups; and • Discuss the causes and effects of poverty; as well as stability of household income streams, nutritional levels, resources allocated to food and other items, assets, access to services and opportunities and networks – all defined according to wealth category; • Discuss about the role of youth and differences between migrant vs non-migrant households, in order to capture any relevant differences across main socio-economic groups.

*Note: FGDs will be divided into men-only and women-only, unless otherwise indicated. FGDs with youth should also be organized.

The use of a variety of participatory tools within the FGDs ensures that analysis is focused on the research themes and that graphical or visual materials are produced. It is suggested that each research team uses the same participatory tools, which are thought to be efficient at eliciting the relevant information under the three research themes. To ensure a common approach across all case study communities and countries, guidance is provided on six main participatory tools that can be used specifically with FGDs (details are in Section 7 and will be provided during training).

It is important to stress that, given the time-intensive nature of these participatory tools, only one tool will be used per focus group. As outlined in Figure 1, on the fourth and last day in the treatment community, no tool will be used, or use will be optional if the team feels a particular tool would bring value to the discussion. While each tool can provide an entry point to explore a particular question/thematic area, it is important to remember that the data from one tool may also be relevant to a number of thematic areas. As such, that tool should provide a helpful guide to researchers when asking questions under other thematic areas. Most important, it is critical to understand that the discussions and sharing involved in conducting the tool itself are as important, if not more important, than the results of the tool. This interaction, debate and/or consensus must be explored, given time and recorded, as this will bring rich data to the study.

5.4. Data handling

Each sub-team will be composed of two national researchers who will work in pairs, with one researcher primarily taking the role of facilitator of the group discussion and the other having the primary role of note-taker. Where possible, it is recommended that national researchers rotate to cover both positions, to avoid boredom and repetition of tasks. All interviews and FGDs will be documented by taking comprehensive field notes (the key responsibility of the note-taker) and accurately recording the diagrams produced by participants, by digital photograph if appropriate (a responsibility which can be shared between the note-taker and the facilitator). Outputs that researchers need to produce from the FGDs for use in analysis will be:

- notes of the discussions;
- flip sheets from group activities (typically also photographed);
- transcriptions of flip sheets/tools into Microsoft Word documents, based on templates that the country lead researcher will provide to national researchers (template optional method).

The note-taker will note the discussion among the participants as they speak, using the words they use and noting occasions when participants disagree or when one participant's opinion is particularly strong. Where possible, the note-taker will also include any thoughts on why differences are emerging (often a reflection of the personal experiences, aspirations and world views of the different participants). The notes need to record the discussions taking place within the group and why the group came to a decision, answer or agreement. These issues will be discussed during the daily debriefs (see Section 5.5).

Direct quotations will be recorded when they illustrate or clearly express an important point, as mentioned earlier. Researchers should always probe for examples where necessary and also mention them during the daily debriefs. Direct quotes and actual case scenarios are tremendously useful evidence for qualitative research and should be particularly emphasized. In addition, household case studies provide rich examples that contribute to depth and understanding of the context within overall research findings.

Certain standard information needs to be collected and recorded at each discussion or interview. This information should be recorded on all maps, timelines or diagrams produced, as well as on templates and all notes taken during discussions and interviews. The standard information to be recorded includes:

- Location (district, TA, CC, community/village)
- Date
- Time started/time finished
- Type of method and tool used (FGD or KII)
- Place of interview
- Respondent information (age, gender, beneficiary/non-beneficiary)
- Key informant information: name (if possible), position or occupation
- FGD participant information: characteristics of the social group in terms of gender, social status (e.g. elders, community leaders), occupation (e.g. farmers, traders), age range, ethnicity, clan
- Any other important general observations.

5.5. Daily debriefs summarizing and analysing findings

As a key part of the process, teams will start the initial data synthesis and analysis in the field. This begins at the level of the FGD or interview, with a check on data collected, but occurs most significantly during the daily debrief. This daily meeting focuses on synthesizing the findings from the day's qualitative data collection. Given sufficient time during the daily debriefs and fieldwork processes, the research team will refer to the findings from the quantitative survey, when available, to cross-check the evidence and identify patterns and disparities.

Discussion/interview data check

After an FGD is finished, each team should take time to make sure they have an accurate picture or record of any visual outputs. They should also check that the notes taken by the note-taker provide an accurate record of the discussion, including any important quotes and comments on overall respondents. Researchers should confer with each other on the highlights for each thematic area and on the major points and issues raised during the FGDs. Such discussion will form the basis of the daily team debrief.

Daily debrief

At the end of each day, it is essential that the team conducts a debriefing session. This is a key stage of analysis and will be used to develop the feedback sessions for the community at the end of the research, as well as to contribute to the two consolidation and synthesis team days. The main purpose is to bring out the main findings of the day, recalling stories, discussing information and identifying trends. The debrief will also reveal research gaps which should be addressed in the next day of fieldwork. The team needs to think about how each interview and FGD adds to overall understanding of the hypotheses. Are there pieces of information that are still not clear or groups that are still missing from the discussion? If possible, and if time permits, researchers should compare and contrast findings with those already known from the quantitative component of the research, especially those that would particularly benefit from further deepening and explanation. Sorting through all the information collected will help in planning the next FGD, in terms of determining issues on which to concentrate and other issues about which researchers feel they already have a good idea.

For the daily debriefs the team will:

- Take around 30 minutes to prepare and organize their data from the day's fieldwork around the three main thematic areas of the research and related key questions outlined in Section 2. This makes it easier to draw general conclusions and reduces the risk of losing or misplacing critical information. It also facilitates writing final reports;
- Present and hear highlights and key analysis from each sub-team for about 20 minutes;
- Hold a discussion among members of the entire team, facilitated by the lead researcher, about emerging findings that help to answer the key research questions and hypothesis. All team members should be "actively listening" and probing the presenter during debriefs to sharpen information and gain greater clarity on initial summary findings. It is essential that all team members participate actively in debriefs.

The output of these debriefs will be a live Microsoft Word field notes document, organized around the three research themes and related research questions and compiled by the lead country researcher, in which key findings and gaps (under each area or question) emerging from the discussion will be captured.

In addition to the above, in each daily debrief, researchers will also take some time to ask each other the following questions:

- What went well, and why?
- What didn't work so well, and why?
- What information needs further probing/exploring – and how best to do that? With whom and with which tools?
- What can we do differently tomorrow?
- How can we adapt the research tools and plan to best capture important issues?

Team consolidation and synthesis workshop

The daily debriefs will feed directly into a full-day brainstorming session attended by all research team members after completing fieldwork in each district (i.e. two synthesis days are planned). The country team leader will be responsible for leading and moderating the discussion to systematically analyse, consolidate and synthesize findings from the previous five days of fieldwork, based on the live document that has been compiled, as well as to brainstorm ideas and suggestions for preliminary recommendations. Once qualitative findings have been adequately synthesized and analysed to develop the story for each theory of change, then findings from the quantitative surveys – when available as part of the case study research programme – should be analysed and compared to the qualitative results. Examination of the various findings according to each theory of change should be conducted, leading to preliminary conclusions from the mixed-method research – which may include both parallel findings and differences. This full day of discussion will provide the opportunity to build on the daily debriefs and delve deeper into the findings for each research question (such as thinking about linkages with other questions and findings, or differences and similarities between sites and between respondents – e.g., men/women or beneficiaries/non-beneficiaries) including capturing quotes, examples and case stories that may not have emerged during the daily debriefs.

Providing feedback and facilitating discussion of synthesized findings with community members and district level officials

At the end of the four days of fieldwork in each beneficiary community, each sub-team will run a community debrief session to report back to FGD participants and key informants on the preliminary findings. This feedback session is a critical part of an ethical approach to the research and will also be used to validate findings and preliminary conclusions, and to offer community members an opportunity to add any last critical points as needed. Findings from the preliminary synthesis and analysis of data should be used to facilitate discussion. This enables ownership and sharing with the community, reducing the “extractive” nature of the research by ensuring that community members and respondents are informed of the initial analysis and have the opportunity to comment on or correct our analysis and feed into the next stage of analysis.

In addition, at the end of fieldwork, the country lead researcher and FAO – with support from national researchers – will run a debrief session at district level to report key findings and preliminary conclusions to district level officials. This debrief session will also be used to clarify issues as needed and to gather the reactions, insights and views of district officials on the preliminary analysis, particularly concerning programme operations.

Finally, at the end of fieldwork, a debriefing will be held at national level with key stakeholders from government, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), FAO and other organizations, in order to share preliminary findings and analysis and provide recommendations. An important aim

of this meeting is to explain early results from the fieldwork, which will later be developed in the full report (to be shared with government and other partners) and to ensure “buy-in” and consensus around recommendations that emerge.

5.6. Reporting guidelines

Fieldwork Report (8-10 pages)

Acknowledgments

Contents

Tables and Figures

Abbreviations and Acronyms

Executive Summary

1. Introduction
 - a. Overview of study on social protection and decent rural employment
 - b. Discussion of the primary functions and role of the research institution
2. Organization of Fieldwork
 - a. Training of qualitative research teams
 - b. Identification of qualitative research communities
 - c. Identification of interviewees
 - d. Fieldwork schedule
3. Qualitative Fieldwork Implementation
 - a. Tools
 - b. Issues and resolution of problems
4. Conclusion and Lessons Learned

Synthesis Qualitative Report (about 30 pages)

Preface

Acknowledgments

Contents

Tables and Figures

Abbreviations and Acronyms

Executive Summary

PART A: CONTEXT

1. Introduction to the Study
 - a. FAO/PtoP research programme on social protection and decent rural employment
 - b. The research hypotheses (three areas of inquiry)
2. The Social Protection Programme in the Country
 - a. Background
 - b. Theory of change with regard to rural labour/decent rural employment
 - c. Institutional set-up of the programme

- d. Operational arrangements
- 3. Research Method
 - a. Selection of study communities
 - b. Qualitative tools and techniques
 - c. Fieldwork implementation
- 4. District/TA Profiles
 - a. One
 - b. Two
- 5. The Study Communities
 - a. One
 - b. Two

PART B: RESEARCH FINDINGS

- 6. Social Protection and Rural Labour Dynamics
- 7. Social Protection and Household Labour Allocation
- 8. Operational Issues in Social Protection Schemes that Relate to Rural Labour Dynamics

PART C: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9. Conclusions
- 10. Recommendations

References

Annex

6. Question guide

This section presents the more specific set of questions and probes derived from the three research hypotheses and key research questions described in Section 2 of this document. Field teams are expected to use these questions and probes to help guide the interview process; they are not designed to be read out loud as a set of questionnaire questions. The questions and probes suggested here will need to be put into your own words, and at times rephrased appropriately according to the context and the particular informant. Note that questions in green text are specifically for beneficiaries, questions in red text are for non-beneficiaries, and questions in black text are for informants from both groups.

Table 4 Specific questions derived from key research questions

Hypotheses and key research questions	Specific questions and probes
<p>Hypothesis 1: Social protection schemes affect rural employment dynamics through creating changes in labour participation and intensity in agriculture and non-agriculture activities, generating shifts from more vulnerable/precarious forms of employment, such as daily piecework, to less precarious employment, self-employment or formal/fulltime agricultural wage employment. Social protection schemes also affect migration by reducing liquidity constraints. This may result in either a reduction of distress migration or an increase in outflows as a consequence of reduced migration costs. All these changes are expected to be shaped by gender, age, household assets and other contextual drivers.</p>	
<p>1.1 Sources of income and roles of household member in income generation (women/men/youth/children):¹⁰ What are the existing sources of income available (including income generated through agriculture, agriculture and non-agriculture wage employment, and public transfers, remittances, gift-giving, etc.)? Have the sources of income available changed with the implementation of the social protection programme? How? What is their relative share of importance? What are men/women’s traditional roles in income generation? Does the household suffer from any labour shortage?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where does your household obtain income? • What is your main source of income? • Does income come from selling agricultural produce? • Does income come from wages in agriculture, or in non-agricultural employment? • Are any of these income-generating activities traditionally done by men? Or by women? Or youth? Or children? • Does your household receive any remittances or gifts? • Does your household receive any cash transfers? • Have sources of income in your household changed since you began to receive the social cash transfer? In what way? What are your views about this change?
<p>1.2 Employment situation: What types of activities/employment do household members perform and spend most hours in? Does the household employ non-family workers? For what? Under what work arrangements? Are any members in the household involved in wage or in kind employment? How</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please tell us what activities or employment the members of your household perform. On which ones do they spend the most time? • Does your household employ anyone outside the family? If so, what are they employed to do? Please tell us about these arrangements. • Does anyone in your household work for a wage?

¹⁰ “Household” and “family” will need to be carefully defined depending on local understandings and delineations.

<p>does the household decide who is to engage in wage employment? How are wage employment opportunities identified? Is the individual worker negotiating for the pay him/herself or are there intermediaries (household members/social networks/private agents)? Have these practices changed with the implementation of the social protection programme? Explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If so, please tell us how it was decided who should work for a wage. • How do you find wage employment? • Is the wage employment nearby or far away (how far)? • Does the person working for a wage negotiate the pay himself or herself? Or is this done by someone else? If the negotiation is done by someone else, who is that person? • Have any of these practices changed since your household began to receive the cash transfers? If so, how have they changed? Please explain the process.
<p>1.3 Youth employment: What are the opportunities for youth to earn incomes? Describe this situation. Has this changed with the social protection programme? How? Why? Explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there opportunities for young people to earn incomes? • What kinds of opportunities exist? • Does this differ for young men versus women? If yes, explain. • What kinds of conditions do young people work under? • Has this situation changed since the cash transfer programme arrived? How? Why? Can you give concrete examples?
<p>1.4 Migration: Are there household members who have migrated for the purposes of employment? Who/Why/Where? What type of migration (seasonal, temporary, permanent)? Does the household suffer from labour shortages (or other problems) as a result? Do migrant family members send remittances? How? For what are remittances used? Have migration patterns and remittances receipts/use changed with the social protection programme? How? For whom?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has anyone in your household left the area to be employed somewhere else? If so, please tell us who has left, where they have gone, for how long (since when?) and why. • Has this person gone away for seasonal work? Are they coming back? • Does this person's departure mean that the household has problems with not having enough people to work? Or has it caused the household any other problems? Please describe. • Does anyone who has gone away send money or food or goods home? How are they sent? What are they used for? • Have any of these factors related to people going away to work changed since starting to receive the cash transfers? How? Who is affected? Explain. What are your views of this change?
<p>1.5 Resilience: What shocks effect households in this community? How? When/how often do these shocks happen (e.g. every year, rainy season)? In the event of a shock, how does the household decide on what coping strategy to adopt? Does the household increase work hours or engage in other types of work activities? Are children withdrawn from school, for example? Do children</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the household experiences something unfortunate, such as a bad harvest, ill health, or loss of a job or income source, how does the household cope? • Do household members need to work more, or change their work? • Are children taken out of school? • How does the household decide what action to take under such circumstances (e.g. asset disinvestment)?

<p>work more? Did the programme create changes in these coping strategies in terms of labour allocation in the event of a crisis (harvest failure, sickness, income instability, job loss, work-related injury, etc.)? Explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the cash transfer programme create changes in these coping strategies in terms of work patterns or other strategies generally in the event of such circumstances? Please explain.
<p>1.6 <u>Education and skills</u>: What is the level of education for men/women? What skills are most relevant/necessary to gain access to higher-return income-generating activities and more gainful employment opportunities? Has access to skills development changed for women/men/youth with the social protection programme? How? Which type of skills (agricultural, entrepreneurship/business, managerial, leadership)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please tell us about the level of education of the women in your household. • What is the educational level of men in your household? • What kinds of skills do you think people need if they want to have better paid jobs? Explain. • Since the cash transfer programme, have there been changes in opportunities to gain or develop these kinds of skills? If so, please describe. How has the situation changed? What kinds/types of skills can people learn/access now?
<p>1.7 <u>Access to financial services</u>: Are credit, savings and insurance services accessible to all household members? What services (formal, informal, etc.) are used to finance self-employment/household enterprises? Has this changed after the social protection programme? How? Are there differences between agriculture-related and non-agriculture-related activities? Explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can any adult in your household obtain access to credit? Or savings services? Or insurance? If not, why not? • How do people acquire start-up capital to pay for development of small enterprises or businesses? • Are there differences between agricultural and non-agricultural activities? • Is this situation different for women and men? • Are there any changes in this situation the household began to receive the cash transfers? If so, please explain.
<p>Hypothesis 2: Social protection programmes in rural areas leads to changes in labour allocation within the household as well as decision-making over related earned profits. Likewise, social protection programmes will influence changes in perceptions and aspirations regarding labour allocation and decision-making over income.</p>	
<p>2.1 <u>Decision-making and control of the use of income</u>: How are decisions made over cash expenditure in the household? Does this depend on sources of income? Does it change according to whom in the household is receiving the transfer? What is the ownership and control structure over household cash income? Who in the household usually saves or keeps cash aside? What is the ownership and control structure among household members over household and productive assets? How does this vary according to type of household structure (female-headed, male-headed, grandparent-headed or child-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who in your household (or, if it is the case, outside the household) decides how cash is spent? • Does this depend on the source of the cash or what it is being spent on? • Does cash belong to individuals (who earned it, for example) or is it controlled by another person? Or is it pooled? • Does anyone in the household put cash aside or save it? Explain (Who? Why?) • Are household or productive assets controlled by one person? Or by the whole household? Who decides on whether to sell or use them? • Have these structures or dynamics changed since the household began to receive the cash transfers? Explain – in what ways, and why?

<p>headed)? Have these structures changed after the social protection programme started? In what way? Why?</p>	
<p>2.2 <u>Control and decision-making about transfers and new income from the social protection scheme</u>: Is the income from the cash transfer differentiated from the overall household income? How was the income from the cash transfer used? Was this additional income from the cash transfer invested in any business activity (agriculture or non-agriculture)? Was additional income from social protection programmes dedicated to hire non-family workers? Was additional income dedicated to pay out-migration of some family member? Who made the decisions for the use of the cash transfer and type of choice?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How is the cash transfer income used? ● Is any of the cash transfer invested in either agricultural or non-agricultural income-generating activities? ● Is any of the cash transfer used to hire non-family workers? ● Is any of the cash transfer used to pay for anyone to go away for work? If so, please tell us about it. ● Who makes these kinds of decisions in the household? ● Have household decision-making processes on household income changed at all since the cash transfer programme arrived?
<p>2.3 <u>Youth aspirations</u>: What are the general views about the future for youth in agriculture and rural areas? What are the aspirations of youth themselves? Have these views and aspirations changed as a result of the programme? How? Explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What future role do you think young people have in agriculture in areas like this? ● What do young people hope to do in the future? ● Does this differ at all between men and women? ● What type of skills will required for young people to access better jobs? ● Have these views changed since receiving the cash transfers?
<p>2.4 <u>Children’s education and economic activities</u>: What is the general/community view on children with regard to schooling? What contributions do children make to household activities? What outside-of-household economic activities do children engage in? Explain. What activities are considered to be child labour in this community? Have child labour practices changed with the implementation of the social protection programme? How (more/less work, changes in type of tasks)? Why? Explain. What are people’s views of these changes? Are there other programmes that have changed child labour practices in this community?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In this community, what do people think about children’s schooling? ● What contributions do children make to household activities? ● What economic activities/work do children participate in outside the household? What is most important? Please explain your answers. ● What activities are considered to be child labour in this community? ● Have there been changes in child labour since receiving the transfers? Do children work more, or work less? Does this vary between girls and boys? Do they do different tasks? Explain these differences. ● What do people think about these changes?

<p>2.5 <u>Women’s time use (productive and reproductive & care work):</u> What is the general/community view on women’s participation in employment/income-generating activities? What are the general/community views about women’s time burdens regarding labour participation vs reproductive & care work? Have these views changed after the social protection programme? How? Explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What kind of work do women do in this community (include productive and reproductive & care/domestic work)? • What do people in this community think about women earning an income? • What do people in this community think about women balancing child care and domestic or marital duties with working for wages? • Have these views changed since the cash transfer programme arrived? If so, please explain.
<p>2.6 <u>Social engagement:</u> Do household members participate in producers’ organizations/ cooperatives and rural workers’ organizations/trade unions? (List all important ones.) Do men/women/youth engage in separate groups? Explain. Has this situation changed due to the social protection programme? Explain. What are people’s views of these changes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please list all the work-related organizations in which members of your household participate (e.g. producers’ cooperatives and organizations, rural workers’ organizations, trade unions, village savings). • Do men/women/youth participate in different groups? If so, please explain. • If they participate in the same groups, do women hold positions of leadership in any of these groups? • Has this situation of participation changed since the cash transfer programme arrived? How? Why? • What do people think about these changes?
<p>2.7 <u>Knowledge about labour rights and access to legal counselling:</u> What mechanisms exist for conflict resolution in the community for the purposes of employment or commercial activities? Who in the household has access to such services? Who in the household has access to job/business counselling and support, when needed? Are members of beneficiary households (especially if employed as wage labourers or if they hire labour) aware of labour rights¹¹? Has this changed after the social protection programme? How? Why? Explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are you aware of your labour rights and entitlements? • Are there any systems in this community for dealing with disputes or conflicts over employment or business activities (formal or informal)? Explain. • Does anyone in your household have access to these services? • Does anyone in the household have access to job or business support or advice when they need it? Explain. • Has this situation changed since the cash transfer programme arrived? If so, how and why?

¹¹ The core labour standards include: freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour; the effective abolition of child labour; and the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

Hypothesis 3: Design and implementation of social protection programmes that facilitate linkages to employment opportunities and entrepreneurship promotion can result in greater impacts and contribute to more effective results in terms of poverty alleviation.

<p>3.1 <u>Social protection programmes:</u> What are all the social protection programmes available – formal and informal – in the community? (List all relevant ones.) Can households (members) benefit from more than one programme at the same time? Explain - if and why beneficiaries can access several programmes simultaneously. What are government policy and design principles of these programs regarding accessing many programs at once? What do people in the community feel about this?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please tell us about all the social protection programmes (note to researchers: you will need to find a good way of explaining “social protection programmes” in the field) available in this community. • Who in this household is a direct beneficiary of these schemes? • Can households (members) benefit from more than one programme at the same time? • What do people in the community think about this?
<p>3.2 <u>Targeting for social protection:</u> How did you find about this social protection programme? How were you or those selected chosen to become a beneficiary? Who makes these decisions in the community? Why? How? Do you perceive the decision-making process as fair? In your opinion, who should be a beneficiary of social protection programmes? To your understanding does your view comply with the actual programme targeting strategy? Do people (women/men/youth) understand why those receiving the transfer are selected and what its intended use should be? Explain how.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did you learn of the cash transfer programme? • Do you know why you were chosen to receive the transfer programme? [Do you know why you do not receive the transfer programme?] • Do you know who makes these decisions in the community? Why? • How are the decisions made? • Do you think this is a fair process? Why of why not? • Who do you think should be a beneficiary of this type of programme? • Do you think people understand why beneficiaries are selected and what they should spend the transfers on? Please explain how.
<p>3.3 <u>Obtaining cash or asset transfers:</u> How are transfers delivered to beneficiaries? Describe the process, from notification to travel to receiving the transfer and use of the cash. How are you informed when it is time to get transfers? What is the distance travelled to collect these transfers? How do you travel this distance? Are there implications for your employment activities (work time, employer permissions, etc.)? Are any events/activities organized around payment points? Explain.¹²</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do people receive their cash transfers? Please describe the whole process, from knowing when to pick it up to travel arrangements and spending the cash. • How are you told when to pick up the transfer? • How far must you travel? How do you travel and how much does it cost? • Do transfers arrive when they are supposed to? • Does picking up the transfer cause any kind of problems with your work activities? • Are there any events or activities organized on paydays at pay points? Please describe.

¹² In case of e-payments, a short and distinct set of questions can be asked:

1. Which payment system do you prefer and why?

<p>3.4 <u>Accessing employment through public works</u>: Are there public works programmes? If yes, explain the process of how access to these opportunities is decided? For whom? Who in the household participates in public works? Why? What is the process for accessing/implementing public works, from request/notification to transport to payment? Do the public works sites fulfil basic labour standards, in terms of safety in the workplace, decent pay, gender equality, child care facilities, working hours, etc.? How long does it take for participants to reach work sites? Do participants make reference to wage/pay rates for public works to bargain wages for other labour activities (e.g. wage employment, contract farming)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is employment on public works programmes available to your community? What kind? • How do you get employed on public works? • Does anyone in your household participate in public works? If so, who? Why? • If anyone has participated in public works programmes, please describe the process, from getting the job through transportation and payment. • Please tell us about the conditions in public works programmes: pay, safety, gender equality, child care facilities, working hours. • How far do people have to travel to work places? • What are your views of your experience if you have participated in public works? If you have not, would you like to or not? Explain. • Is pay in public works ever used to bargain for better wages in other jobs, such as agricultural employment?
<p>3.5 <u>Skills development in social protection programmes</u>: Are there skills development trainings as part of the social protection programmes? What skills are developed through such trainings (technical, business, life skills)? For what purpose? Who in the household receives this training? Why? What benefits, opportunities have accrued due to these skills?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any skills development or training programmes available? Are these related to the cash transfer or other social protection programme? Explain. • If so, what skills are offered to be learned or developed? What for? • Who in the household can receive this training? Why? • Are there benefits from the training? What kinds of benefits? • Have you actually accessed this training? Explain. If not, why not?
<p>3.6 <u>Participation in rural livelihoods programmes and/or micro-entrepreneurship development programmes</u>: Are there micro-entrepreneurship development programmes? If so, who in the household participates? Why? What is the process for accessing such programmes, from request/notification to transport, payment and storage of payment? Is there any conditionality? Is there any linkage or intentional coordination</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any micro-enterprise schemes available in this area? • Are these in any way directly linked with the social protection programme(s)? Explain. • If they exist, does anyone in the household participate in them? Why? • Please tell us about the whole process, from application through notification, transport, payment and how the payment is stored. • Are there any special conditions? Please explain.

-
2. Has e-payment created any effects/impacts different than manual payment for you?
 3. Do you access your transfer differently with e-payment or the same? – Explain (e.g., All at once? Small quantities? Do you save some?)
 4. Does e-payment provide different labour opportunities? Explain

<p>between these programmes and the social protection programme? Explain.</p>	
<p>3.7 <u>Participation in youth in agriculture/youth employment programmes:</u> Are there youth development programmes? If yes, do youth in the household participate? Why? What is the process for accessing such programmes, from request/notification to transport and participation? Is there any conditionality? Explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there programmes in this community for young people’s development or training? • Are these in any way directly linked to the social protection programmes? • If programmes do exist, do any of the youth in your household participate? Why or why not? • Please tell us about the whole process, from application through notification, transport and participation. • Are there any special conditions? Please explain.
<p>3.8 <u>Implementation and communication mechanisms of the social protection programme:</u></p> <p>How do the implementation mechanisms of the cash transfer programme operate at the local level? How is the composition of the implementation committee decided? Explain. How does the implementation compare to the actual programme design?</p> <p>Are the main programme features communicated adequately to the beneficiaries? If yes, how - Through which channels (formal/informal)? What is the process of getting information - from whom/where? If no, why not? In either case, what do beneficiaries know about main aspects of cash transfer programmes or other interventions that affect them? What are the main constraints to effective communication and why?</p> <p>Does the cash transfer programme foresee a grievance mechanism or complaint processes? How do these work and at what level? Are beneficiaries informed of this? How do beneficiaries make their voices heard and claim their rights? Explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the local level, how is the cash transfer programme run? Are there any local committees which participate in the running of the cash transfer programme? If so, please explain – e.g., who is on the committee, how are they selected • What is their role, do they perform their functions properly? • If there are any public works programmes, or livelihoods or micro-enterprise or youth programmes, please also ask these questions about those programmes and about any linkages among these programmes. • Do you receive messages and communication about the programme? From whom? How? When? About what? • Are there any “events” or specific activities planned or informal during the paydays? Explain. • Have you ever made a complaint about the cash transfer programme? Explain the process and results. If not, why not? • Has anyone explained how you can complain? • If there are any public works programmes, or livelihoods or micro-enterprise programmes or youth programmes, please also answer the same questions about those programmes.
<p>3.9 <u>Exiting the programme / graduation:</u> Do beneficiaries exit the programme? When? Why? Who decides? Explain. What do beneficiaries know about</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you know if people are removed or exit from the programme? Why? • When do people stop receiving the cash transfer? Why?

<p>why they exit the programme? Is a graduation strategy part of the design of the programme? Is it being implemented? Explain.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you know what are the conditions for which beneficiaries exit the programme?
<p>Secondary Data and Key Informants:</p> <p>3.12 <u>Targeting</u>: Why did the social protection scheme adopt its particular type of targeting? What are the goals to be achieved by targeting in this way?</p> <p>3.13 <u>Gender-sensitive design</u>: Was gender analysis conducted in order to inform the design of the social protection scheme? How are gender inequalities related to employment/labour market participation addressed in programme design? Does the social protection scheme have special features? Which ones?</p> <p>3.14 <u>Youth inclusion</u>: Does the programme address youth in any way (e.g. opportunities for income generation for rural youth)? How? Explain. Are there features in place in order to meet this objective? Are youth challenges and aspirations taken into account in the programme? If so, what impacts have been observed? What are the current limitations and how might these be overcome?</p> <p>3.15 <u>Child labour reduction and prevention</u>: Are there any features in place to meet the objective of preventing child labour, especially in its most hazardous forms? Explain. What are the impacts to date? How could these be further strengthened?</p> <p>3.16 <u>Migration</u>: Were migration patterns (permanent/seasonal) considered during the design of the social protection scheme? How are the implications of migration addressed in programme design? Does the social protection scheme have special features to address migration issues? Which ones? (Does the programme take into account how migration can affect its implementation and impacts? How could the programme design be adapted to leverage the potential of migration, and to mitigate any negative impacts on the households, such as labour shortages, etc.?)</p> <p>3.17 <u>Coordination and synergies with other employment promotion and livelihoods schemes</u>: Are there other social protection or livelihoods/employment/entrepreneurship programmes or focused activities in the communities of study? Which ones? Explain whether beneficiaries can access several of these programmes simultaneously. What are the government policy and design principles of these programmes regarding access to many programmes at once? In practice, what actually occurs? How do people in the community feel about this? What graduation strategies exist and what do beneficiaries know about them?</p>	

7. Participatory tools

7.1. Community well-being analysis (using 10 seeds proportional piling)

This is a group activity.

Objectives: (i) To understand the characteristics of well-being in the community and perceptions of differences in well-being among members of the population; (ii) to elicit estimates of the distribution of well-being; (iii) to understand perceptions of the characteristics of the most vulnerable in the community; (iv) to understand perceptions of the targeting effectiveness of the cash transfer; and (v) to prompt broader discussion on the three research themes of the study.

Materials: flip chart paper, pens, seeds.

Step-by-step guidance: After introducing the purpose of the research and explaining your presence in the community, proceed broadly along the following steps, using your own best judgement at all times. Work in pairs, with one facilitator and one note-taker.

Step 1: Working with your group (e.g. a group of key informants), place a piece of flip chart paper on the floor with drawings of three faces: a smiley face, a sad face and a sad face (see Figure 2). Place a pile of 10 seeds on the flip sheet. Explain the significance of the three groups (non-poor, poor and better off) and ask the group to estimate the proportion of seeds for each group. Don't worry too much about the accuracy of their estimation at this point.

Figure 2 Introducing three well-being categories and encouraging an initial allocation of seeds, Agona Abrim community, Central Region, Ghana



Step 2: Ask the participants to list the characteristics of all groups. Probe and seek clarification and group consensus. Make careful notes. Note any controversial characteristics that the group cannot agree on. Prompt for input on unmentioned issues (e.g. access to land, access to credit) only after the group has completed its listing.

Step 3: Ask the groups to identify to which group the beneficiaries belong – place a percent.

Step 4: Ask the group to revisit and confirm their proportional estimates for each wealth category and for the beneficiaries. Expect to see the participants debating and moving seeds before a consensus is reached. Make a note of any dissenting opinions. You should end up with several clusters of seeds.

You can later convert your notes into a community well-being analysis matrix (see Table 5, for example), with allocated seeds listed as percentages in the second column.

Table 5 Community well-being analysis, conducted by a group of female potential beneficiaries, Agona Abrim community, Central Region, Ghana

Wealth category	%	Characteristics	Beneficiaries %
Ultra-poor (NB: group estimated that one-half of these households are now LEAP beneficiaries)	18	<i>Ohianaminami</i> ('from here you are dying') Known locally as 'bottles' (i.e. you scratch them and nothing comes off) 'God is their only help' Physically frail or ill, so having no strength to work Not mentally sound, so unemployable So poor that 'if you throw away rubbish they would want to keep it' They beg No one to depend on, 'just roaming the world' They live off other people's leftovers No land or property Live in a family house (sometimes abandoned)	
Nearly poor	22	Nearly <i>Ohianaminami</i> Still weak but able to work They hire labour, when possible, to work on land Subsistence, no selling Cannot borrow or use credit because they cannot pay back Children not working or have died	
A little better than the poor	29	<i>Autoahiaafo</i> ('a little better than the poor') They have strength to work With a little working capital they can work better	20

		Engage in farming and small trading Don't get credit but can borrow Don't own land but sharecrop (<i>Abuna</i> or <i>Abusua</i>)	
Non-poor	31	Landowners (inherited or acquired) Hire out land Benefit from family remittances Invest in their children's education Have better-off children Sometimes own a car Build and rent out houses Lease land for rubber plantations (new trend) Go outside community to buy wholesale and sell inside the community Don't provide credit Lend among themselves	80
TOTAL	100		100

Step 7: Ask some follow-up questions to encourage further analytical discussions around the three research themes:

- Ask about the community poverty profile, including: income streams; livelihood strategies; expenditures and assets; socio-economic characteristics (e.g. credit, health status, schooling, household conditions); gender; and labour markets.
- Ask about patterns: Are there particular household types or distinct social, ethnic or religious groups in these categories? Which groups are in which categories and why?
- Ask about trends in the community: Has the distribution of wealth changed in recent years? If so, why? If not, why not? As part of this discussion, ask what proportion of the community has moved from ineligible to eligible status (e.g. through becoming orphaned or becoming extremely vulnerable) since the last round of targeting was conducted.
- Ask about the targeting of the beneficiary transfer: Has it reached the very poorest households? Are there households that should be excluded or included?
- Ask about the circumstances (household economy/labour allocation and roles) of the beneficiary households: Has the cash transfer benefit changed their well-being? How? Has it reduced risk? Has it enabled them to spend more or spend differently? Can they save? Can they avoid indebtedness?
- Ask about the impact of the cash benefit on the local economy/ rural employment dynamics: Has it increased overall spending power? Have local prices changed? Is there more diversity in what is being traded? Are beneficiaries using their income as working capital (hiring labour, buying productive inputs)?
- Ask about labour opportunities: Has the cash transfer changed people's opportunities for work? Has this affected some households more than others? Has it affected some groups (men, women, youth or children) more than others? Why? Are people doing different kinds of work than before?

- Has the cash transfer programme offered any formal linkages to economic development opportunities, either through training schemes, or through access to micro-enterprise or livelihoods programmes?
- Ask about working conditions: Have these changed as a result of the cash transfer? Have they changed for all people or only for some? Who?
- Ask about migration: Has the cash transfer changed migration patterns (seasonal, temporary or permanent) in the community?
- Ask about children: Has the transfer changed children's work/school balance?
- Ask about youth: Are there any more opportunities for youth development than before? Have youth aspirations changed?
- Ask about the impact of the cash benefit on the relationships (social networks) between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries: How has the cash benefit changed their access to social/economic networks?
- Ask about the cash benefit programme: How might this be improved so as to have a better and more lasting impact on well-being in the community?
- Ask what the participants have learned from their analysis. Ask them what they themselves can do to change the situation in their community, based on their analysis.

Step 8: Thank the group, distribute drinks/snacks and close the session.

7.2. Social mapping

This is a group activity.

Objectives: (i) To understand the characteristics of well-being in the community and perceptions of differences in well-being among members of the population; (ii) to understand perceptions of the characteristics of the most vulnerable in the community; and (iii) to prompt broader discussion on the three research themes

Materials: flip chart paper, pens.

Step-by-step guidance: After introducing the purpose of the research and explaining your presence in the community, proceed broadly along the following steps, using your own best judgement at all times. Work in pairs, with one facilitator and one note-taker.

Step 1: Working with your group, first decide what area the map will show to delineate the "community". In small villages this may cover the entire village. In larger communities it may cover a particular neighbourhood that the group participants know well. Social maps begin as physical maps of the residential area of a community.

Ask the local participants to start by preparing the outline or boundary of the map. Another option is to ask them to draw a simple village map showing some features such as roads, paths and watercourses for orientation.

Ask the participants to identify and draw on the map other institutions and landmarks that are important to them. Ask about services or facilities such as irrigation, electricity, water, gas, telephone and so on, and mark these on the map. It is not necessary to develop an absolutely accurate map—the goal is to get useful information about local perceptions of resources.

Then ask participants to mark the location of each house in the community as a small empty square. An alternative method is to focus on clusters of houses or areas, particularly where there are many households in the community or if it is not necessary to identify individual households.

Ask participants to mark the houses or groups of houses in different colours to indicate households of different well-being categories (such as rich, better-off, poor and very poor). Ensure that the criteria used by local participants to distinguish different well-being criteria are noted on the map and that participants all have the same understanding of the criteria and characteristics.

The map can also be used to identify houses that belong to people from different social categories (such as ethnicity, female-headed households or large households); people with special functions (such as a village chief); households with shops or other small businesses; and households with relatives abroad. These categories can all be identified by particular symbols, which should then be explained in a legend.

Step 2: Analyse the Social Map. As the map is being produced (or after it has been completed), facilitate a group discussion on the social characteristics and differences in the community, including differences in entitlements and access to resources and social networks. Ask prompting questions to encourage analytical discussions around the four research themes:

- Ask about the community poverty profile including: income streams; livelihood strategies; expenditures and assets; socio-economic characteristics (e.g. credit, health status, schooling, household conditions); gender; and labour markets.
- Ask about patterns: Are there particular household types or distinct social, ethnic or religious groups with different access to resources, assets, income and power? Which groups are wealthier than others and why?
- Ask about trends in the community: Has the distribution of wealth changed in recent years? If so, why? If not, why not?
- Ask about the targeting of the beneficiary transfer: Has it reached the very poorest households? Are there households that should be excluded or included?
- Ask about the circumstances (household economy/ employment dynamics) of the beneficiary households. Has the cash transfer benefit changed their well-being? How? Has it reduced risk? Has it enabled them to spend more or spend differently? Can they save? Can they avoid indebtedness?
- Ask about the impact of the cash benefit on the local economy/rural employment: Has it increased overall spending power? Have local prices changed? Is there more diversity in what is being traded? Are beneficiaries using their income as working capital (hiring labour, buying productive inputs)?
- Ask about labour opportunities: Has the cash transfer changed people's opportunities for work? Has this affected some households more than others? Has it affected some groups (men, women, youth or children) more than others? Why? Are people doing different kinds of work than before? What about changes in wage rates?
- Has the cash transfer programme offered any formal linkages to economic development opportunities, either through training schemes or through access to micro-enterprise or livelihoods programmes?
- Ask about working conditions: Have these changed as a result of the cash transfer? Have they changed for all people or only some? Who?

- Ask about migration: Has the cash transfer changed migration patterns (seasonal, temporary or permanent) in the community?
- Ask about children: Has the transfer changed children's work/school balance?
- Ask about youth: Are there any more opportunities for youth development than before? Have youth aspirations changed?
- Ask about the impact of the cash benefit on the relationships (social networks) between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries: How has the cash benefit changed their access to social/economic networks?
- Ask about the cash benefit programme: How might this be improved so as to have a better and more lasting impact on well-being in the community?
- Ask what the participants have learned from their analysis. Ask them what they themselves can do to change the situation in their community, based on their analysis.

7.3. Livelihood matrix analysis

This is a group activity that is well suited to analysis by a particular livelihood group (e.g. male farmers, female market traders). It can also be conducted by a generic focus group of beneficiaries or non-beneficiaries.

Objectives: (i) To understand the range and value of different livelihoods within the community; and (ii) to understand the contribution of the cash transfer benefit to the local economy (markets, prices and employment).

Materials: flip chart paper, pens, seeds.

Step-by-step guidance: After introducing the purpose of the research and explaining your presence in the community, proceed broadly along the following steps, using your own best judgement at all times. Work in pairs, with one facilitator and one note-taker.

Step 1: Working with your group, produce a Livelihood Matrix. Ask participants to draw a matrix on a large sheet of paper or on the ground. Ask them to list all of their main livelihood options and write these in the first column (see Table 6, for example). Symbols can be used as well as – or instead of – words if necessary or if the participants prefer. This option might help to ensure that all of the group members can follow the matrix, which is a necessity.

Step 2: Ask the participants to allocate 10 seeds across the livelihood types to estimate the proportion of women (if it is a female group) in each type of livelihood *in their whole community*. Prompt for additional, overlooked livelihoods and add these to the list. The seed counts can be transposed onto a matrix in your notes as a percentage in Column 2.

Step 3: Ask the participants to score their preference for each livelihood against the criterion of overall preference and any other additional criteria that emerges out of your discussion, such as risk and timeliness. Use an ordinal score, for example 1-4 (where 1=high preference and 4=low preference) rather than ranking.

Table 6 Livelihoods analysis (women) conducted by group of female market traders, Agona Abrim community, Komenda district, Central Region, Ghana

Occupation	%	Average monthly income for household (Cedis) ¹³	Risk ¹⁴ (Scale 1-4) (1=low)	Reliability ¹⁵ (Scale 1-4) (1=high)	Overall preference (Scale 1-4) (1=high)
Farming	40	C33	1	4	1
Fish-selling	12	C10-20	2	1	3
Food-selling (including cooked food)	27	C30	3	2	2
Small services (hairdressing, weaving)	21	C50	4	3	4

Step 4: Analyse the Livelihood Matrix. Encourage participants to justify and explain their estimations of the proportion of people in different livelihoods and the preference scores for different attributes of those livelihoods.

Step 5: Once the individual analysis has been completed, ask some follow-up questions to the entire group to encourage further analytical discussions around the four research themes.

- Ask about beneficiary livelihoods before and after the cash benefit: From the perspective of this livelihood group, has there been any change in livelihood activity among beneficiary households since the introduction of the cash benefit? What types of livelihoods? Which types of beneficiary household? How have they managed this?
- Ask about the impact of the cash benefit on the social/economic and labour networks: How has it affected the ability of beneficiaries to enter into social/economic networks, such as labour groups or credit/saving associations? Do participants see beneficiaries as being better able now to buy on credit and invest in working capital?
- Ask about the impact of the cash benefit on the local economy/rural employment: Have changes in beneficiary household expenditure had an impact on the local economy and increased or diversified livelihoods? Have local prices changed? Is there more diversity in what is being traded?
- Ask about labour opportunities: Has the cash transfer changed people's opportunities for work? Has this affected some households more than others? Has it affected some groups (men, women, youth or children) more than others? Why? Are people doing different kinds of work than before? Have wages been effected by the cash transfer?

¹³ Amount per month for how many months.

¹⁴ Risk here refers to the likelihood of events or shocks that threaten livelihood.

¹⁵ Reliability here refers to the frequency and regularity of income source.

- Has the cash transfer programme offered any formal linkages to economic development opportunities, either through training schemes or through access to micro-enterprise or livelihoods programmes?
- Ask about working conditions: Have these changed as a result of the cash transfer? Have they changed for all people or only some? Who?
- Ask about migration: Has the cash transfer changed migration patterns (seasonal, temporary or permanent) in the community?
- Ask about children: Has the transfer changed children's work/school balance?
- Ask about youth: Are there any more opportunities for youth development than before? Have youth aspirations changed?
- Ask about recommendations for the cash benefit programme: How might this be improved so as to have a better and more lasting impact on well-being in beneficiary households?
- Ask what the participants have learned from their analysis. Ask them what they themselves can do to change the situation in their household and community, based on their analysis.

Step 6: Thank the group, distribute drinks/snacks and close the session.

7.4. Seasonal calendar, gender division of labour and household activities

Objectives: (i) To explore how seasonal variations affect the patterns of life throughout the year in terms of the main agricultural and non-agricultural activities and the division of tasks among family members, with particular attention to gender; and (ii) to prompt broader discussion on the three areas of inquiry and the respective issues (e.g., rural employment dynamics; perceptions, aspirations, household labour allocation; and operational issues).

Materials: flip sheet, markers, seeds.

Step-by-step guidance: After introducing the purpose of the research and explaining your presence in the community, proceed along the following steps, using your own best judgement at all times. Work in pairs, with one facilitator and one note-taker.

Step 1: Pattern of rainfall

1. Ask participants to identify rainy seasons and the local name for each season (the local names should be recorded on the template that will be provided);
2. Note the appropriate start of the year. It is not necessary to start with January; if the main rains start in October, and land preparation starts prior to the rains in September, list the months starting with September and finishing with August;
3. Note the months in which it rains (see Table 7).

Step 2: Livelihood activities and household activities

1. Record the main livelihood activities (farming and non-farming) in the left-hand column and related tasks (e.g. *Rainfed farming*: land clearance, land preparation, planting, fertilizing, weeding) as shown in Table 7, as well as the main household activities and related tasks (e.g. child care, food preparation, water and wood collection);
2. Note the timing of each activity (in terms of months) on the calendar.

Step 3: Gender division of labour at household level

In the right-hand column, note who performs each of the tasks listed in Step 2. Using ten seeds, ask the group to indicate the relative contribution of women and men to the performance of each task. For example, ten seeds for women and none for men indicates that women are entirely responsible for doing a particular task, while five seeds for each indicates that women and men share the task equally.

Step 4: Other activities

Other information with a seasonal dimension that may emerge during the discussion (e.g. food shortages, patterns of income and expenditure, diseases or workloads) should be recorded on the calendar.

Step 5: Analysis

One possible way to start asking the research questions and to proceed logically is to ask participants Question 1 of the Question Guide (see Section 6, above) in order to explore labour and household income, as well as to investigate any changes as a result of the programme. This follows on logically from the themes of Step 3 above. You could then proceed with the other questions under the first research area and then move on to the other two research areas. Again, remember that the tool/flip sheet is in front of you to help you to guide the discussion.

Table 7 Example of seasonal calendar and gender division of labour

Rainfall, livelihoods activities and related tasks	Months of the year – or season in groups												Gender division of labour		Notes
	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	Women	Men	
Rainfall			X	X	X	X	X	X							
Hunger season	X	X									X	X			
Rainfed farming															
Land preparation using oxen	X	X	X										1	9	
Land preparation by hand	X	X	X										5	5	
Planting			X	X	X								10	0	
Applying fertilizer				X	X								4	6	
Weeding				X	X	X	X	X					6	4	
Harvesting								X	X	X	X		5	5	
Transporting harvest								X	X	X	X		6	4	
Storage								X	X	X	X		10	0	

Marketing	X	X	X									X	0	10	
Livestock rearing															
Cattle grazing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	10	
Milking cows	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10	0	
Chicken rearing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9	1	
Casual labour															
Looking for casual labour	X	X	X							X	X	X	5	5	
Undertaking casual labour	X								X				5	5	
Household tasks	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9	1	
Migration	X								X						

7.5. Decision-making matrix

Objectives: (i) To examine the differences between men and women in terms of their participation in decision-making at household, group and community levels; and (ii) to prompt broader discussion on the three areas of inquiry and the respective issues (e.g., rural employment dynamics; perceptions, aspirations, household labour allocation; and operational issues).

Materials: flip sheet, markers, seeds.

Step-by-step guidance: After introducing the purpose of the research and explaining your presence in the community, proceed along the following steps, using your own best judgement at all times. Work in pairs, with one facilitator and one note-taker.

Step 1: Identifying decisions made at various levels

1. Ask group participants to identify the different types of decisions made at household, group and community levels;
2. Record the list in the left-hand column of the matrix (see Table 8).

Step 2: Decision-making by women and men

Using ten seeds, ask the group to indicate the relative contribution to decision-making by women and men. For example, ten seeds allocated to women and zero to men indicates that women exercise complete control over the decision, whereas five seeds to women and five to men indicates that they undertake the decision-making jointly. Two seeds allocated to women and eight to men indicates that men have more say than women in the decision.

Step 3: Analysis

One possible way to begin asking the research questions is to ask participants Question 2.1 of the Question Guide (see Section 6, above) in order to explore decision-making, as well as to investigate any changes as a result of the programme. This follows on logically from the themes

of Step 2 above. You could then proceed with the other questions under the second research area and then move on to the other two research areas. Again, remember that the tool/flip sheet is in front of you to help you to guide the discussion.

Table 8 Example of decision-making matrix

Types of decisions	Women	Men
At household level		
Household expenditure	6	4
Use of cash transfer/asset transfer	6	4
Purchasing of farm inputs	2	8
Household tasks	5	5
At group level		
In producer/trade organizations	5	5
In women's groups	10	0
In savings and credit groups	5	5
At community level		
To elect leaders	5	5
To voice concerns to authorities/leaders	2	8
To help decide on infrastructure	4	6
To help decide on other community matters	4	6

7.6. Wealth ranking

This should be carried out only with non-beneficiaries. The purpose of this activity is: (i) To identify the main socio-economic groups in the community and their characteristics; to review the distribution of households among the groups; (ii) to identify any factors associated with movement between groups; and (iii) to discuss the causes and effects of poverty.¹⁶

Step 1: Identification of socio-economic groups in the community and their characteristics

1. What terms do community members use to describe the different socio-economic groups?

Visualization: Note each term at the top of a column of a chart in the local language (with terms used to describe the “rich” in the left-hand column, moving down to those for the very poor in the right-hand column);

2. Ask for a description of each socio-economic group. Using the livelihood assets framework (i.e. human, natural, physical, financial and social), what criteria do community members use to distinguish between the different groups (e.g. land, livestock, labour, household composition, ability to send children to school or to buy medicine)? Which groups and organizations do women and men household members belong to and lead? Record their descriptions in the appropriate columns; try to avoid being too quantitative but simply record the qualitative ways in which they describe the households.

Visualization: Begin recording the information at the two extremes, of the “rich” and the very poor, then complete the middle columns.

3. What are the livelihood strategies (in terms of the balance between farm and off-farm work, coping mechanisms, other sources of support such as remittances) and the outcomes achieved

¹⁶ From FAO (2011). *Social analysis for agriculture and rural investment projects*.

(e.g. food security, standard of housing, savings)? Estimate the percentage contribution of farm and non-farm activities to household cash income; note the contribution of different farm enterprises independently.

4. How are decisions made regarding the enterprise mix, livelihood strategies and use of income for men, women, other people? Which decisions are made jointly?
5. What challenges, if any, does each group face in developing their livelihoods?
6. Are there any special relationships between the different groups? What do the poor do for the less poor? What do the less poor do for the poor and very poor?

Step 2: Distribution of households

1. Note the approximate total number of households in the community. Define a household to be the unit in which people eat together in the evening.
2. Use proportional piling to determine the distribution of total households across the socio-economic categories. Take a number of seeds or stones (about 10) and explain that this represents the total number of households in the community. Ask a volunteer to distribute the seeds among the different socio-economic groups. Allow other group members to adjust the distribution until all are satisfied with the result. Add the number of seeds in each group and divide by the total number of seeds in order to calculate the percentage distribution;
3. Note the approximate number of female-headed households in the community. Use proportional piling to determine the distribution of these households across the socio-economic categories.
4. Note the approximate number of male-headed households in the community. Use proportional piling to determine the distribution of these households across the socio-economic categories.
5. Note the approximate number of male and female youth who have left school in the community.

Step 3: Movement between groups

1. Are there any movements between the socio-economic groups?
2. Note any factors associated with households whose positions are improving, deteriorating or remaining stable.

Step 4: Identification of individual households

1. After the end of the community data collection process, ask one or two of the village leaders to select two or three households from each of the socio-economic groups in preparation for the individual household interviews. Ensure that female-headed households, male-headed households and households whose position is improving or deteriorating are included in the sample.

Annex - Proposed training schedule

This is a suggested training schedule. Section 3.3 outlines the overarching elements that need to be addressed during the training, and also indicates that the precise schedule may need to be adapted based on local factors and training needs. The schedule below is therefore indicative; it should always be adapted to the respective country context.

Day	Session	Topic
DAY 1	Morning 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions. • Brief overview of training, research process and logistics. • Ground rules. • Brief overview of the overall FAO research activity on decent rural employment and the qualitative research component. • Sharing experiences of qualitative research (including tools). • Introduction to the social protection programme, including objectives, design implementation, targeting and coverage.
	Break	
	Morning 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion around the programme theory of change.
	Lunch	
	Afternoon 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to and discussion around the three thematic areas, hypotheses, related key research questions and probing questions. (When available, findings from the quantitative surveys performed as part of the research programme or similar evidence should also be presented.)
	Break	
	Afternoon 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue discussion on the three thematic areas, hypotheses, related key research questions and probing questions.
DAY 2	Morning 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recap of Day 1 and plan for Day 2 – any issues to consider? • Fieldwork roadmap (including daily debriefs and team consolidation and synthesis workshops). • Entry into district (meeting the social protection programme implementing officials and other sub-national government officials). • Entry into community (meeting the TA/village head and social protection committees) and selecting beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries for focus groups. • Fieldwork protocol (personal conduct and general behaviour, ethical considerations, facilitating FGDs, questions that may be received, importance of probing).
	Break	
	Morning 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community well-being analysis and probing questions practice.
	Lunch	
	Afternoon 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to and control over household resources and probing questions practice.
	Break	
	Afternoon 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision-making matrix and probing questions practice.

DAY 3	Morning 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recap of Day 2 and plan for Day 3 – any issues? Seasonal calendar and gender division of labour and probing questions practice.
	Break	
	Morning 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization and group profiling (Venn diagram).
	Lunch	
	Afternoon 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue discussion on tools and questions practice as needed.
	Break	
	Afternoon 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue discussion on tools and questions practice as needed. Pilot day plan.
DAY 4	All day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whole-day pilot exercise in one treatment community which will not be included in the study.
DAY 5	Morning 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two-way reflection on the pilot exercise (from research team and country research lead + FAO staff). What went well? What were the key challenges? How can we address them? Analysis of data from pilot.
	Break	
	Morning 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue analysis as needed. Introduction of the social protection programme by speaker(s) from relevant donor or implementing agency, including opportunities and challenges, key findings from monitoring and evaluation exercises, things to keep in mind, etc. (note this timing may likely be determined by availability of guest speaker)
	Lunch	
	Afternoon 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas requiring revisions and practice and any outstanding issues as needed.
	Break	
	Afternoon 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final logistics and organization.

References

- Barca, V., Brook, S., Holland, J., Otulana, M. & Pozarny, P. 2015. *Qualitative research and analyses of the economic impact of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: Synthesis Report*. PtoP report. Rome, FAO. <http://bit.ly/1BepM5x>
- FAO. 2011. *Social analysis for agriculture and rural investment projects*. Rome: FAO.
- FAO. 2015. *Social protection and decent rural employment. Rural Transformation Series – Info Note N.3*. Rome, FAO. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4982e.pdf>
- Oxford Policy Management. 2013. *Qualitative research and analyses of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: A research guide for the From Protection to Production (PtoP) programme*. Rome, FAO.
- Oxford Policy Management. 2013. *Qualitative research and analyses of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: Ghana Country Case Study Report*. PtoP report. Rome, FAO. <http://bit.ly/1znbuwG>
- Oxford Policy Management. 2013. *Qualitative research and analyses of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: Zimbabwe Country Case Study Report*. PtoP report. Rome, FAO. <http://bit.ly/1eTLv92>
- Oxford Policy Management. 2014. *Qualitative research and analyses of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: Kenya Country Case Study Report*. PtoP report. Rome, FAO. <http://bit.ly/Pe0IZj>
- Oxford Policy Management. 2014. *Qualitative research and analyses of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: Lesotho Country Case Study Report*. PtoP report. Rome, FAO. <http://bit.ly/1djBfXz>
- Oxford Policy Management. 2014. *Qualitative research and analyses of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: Malawi Country Case Study Report*. PtoP report. Rome, FAO. <http://bit.ly/10NCv2e>
- Oxford Policy Management. 2014. *Qualitative research and analyses of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: Ethiopia Country Case Study Report*. PtoP report. Rome, FAO. <http://bit.ly/1CunNde>
- Pavanello, S., Pozarny, P. and de la O, A.P. 2015. *Qualitative study on women's economic empowerment and social protection: Qualitative research guide*. Rome, FAO. <http://bit.ly/1BPrtZ8>
- Roopnaraine, T., Pozarny, P. and Estruch, E. 2016. *Qualitative Study on Decent Rural Employment: Zambia Case Study*. Rome, FAO. Forthcoming.
- Samson, M., Nyokangi, E., Yang, M., Estruch, E. & Rapone, C. 2016. *Social Protection and Decent Rural Employment: Exploring the links*. Rome, FAO. Forthcoming.

Qualitative research on the impacts of social protection programmes on decent rural employment



The From Protection to Production (PtoP) programme is, jointly with the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), exploring the linkages and strengthening coordination between social protection, agriculture and rural development. PtoP is funded principally by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the European Union.

The programme is also part of a larger effort, the Transfer Project, together with UNICEF, Save the Children and the University of North Carolina, to support the implementation of impact evaluations of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa.

For more information, please visit the PtoP website: www.fao.org/economic/ptop