

THE DELHI DIALOGUES

EDITION 4



In which we discussed

The Attributes of Marginalization

The Delhi Dialogues are born out of recognition that to progress the knowledge on development in India, we need people discussing, dissecting and debating the current gyaan that's available. And more often than not, there is not the people, not the space, and not the time to do so. The Delhi Dialogues attempt to provide all three. The Delhi Dialogues are intended to be an informal space where people in decision making positions interested and concerned about development in India can get together for a couple of hours to converse about a topic worth discussing. The topics of the Dialogues will not be strait jacketed into narrow domains, but rather be about an idea within development that is worth discussing in the specific and with the purpose of extending the current thinking around it.

A natural progression from our discussions on Equity in Delhi Dialogues 1-3 was to move on to examine marginalization and its attributes. The definitions of marginalization that we referred to were: 'Being marginalized refers to being separated from the rest of the society, forced to occupy the fringes and edges and not to be at the centre of things. Marginalized people are not considered to be a part of the society' (Arko Koley, 2010). Material deprivation is the most common result of marginalization ... Along with material deprivation; marginalized individuals are also excluded from services, programs, and policies (Young, 2000).

This Delhi Dialogues examined, does marginalization have a common face? What dissimilarities are there in the contexts of marginalized individuals and what similarities in that of various marginalized groups? A common thread of all sorts of marginalization is that it is based on social order, prejudice and inequality between groups. How is agency of the group affected by marginalisation - what political space do marginalised groups occupy? And finally what is the interplay between marginalisation and social instruments such as laws etc.?

Marginalization is unfair

Marginalization needs to be understood in terms of exclusion, both individual and group. Exclusion is sometimes implicit and those that perpetrate it are often unaware that they are doing so. One participant provided the following example from a study carried out by the Institute for Dalit Affairs which found that Muslims and Dalits were the least likely to get jobs in the urban labor market even when controlling for other social and professional attributes. In this regard, the concepts of fair and unfair exclusion and inclusion were brought up, as were the concept of individual and group exclusion and inclusion. Understanding individual exclusion is the key to understand group exclusion dynamics. An individual may not have certain attributes which are required for inclusion into certain opportunities, such as marks to get into a particular course etc. Such exclusion would be termed 'fair'. Marginalization makes people vulnerable to unfair exclusion/inclusion at an individual or group level.

Does the notion of marginalisation leave no room for anything but to see the marginalised as either victims or as heroes? Do the marginalized have any choice other than to be victims or heroes; but nothing in between?

Self-stigma among persons who are marginalised is part of the problem with marginalization. What causes this self stigma, what mores of society perpetuate these feelings? Marginalization is common in its effect, its impact. Marginalization acts as a barrier to inclusion into opportunities and may result in restricted individual aspirations and constrained group achievements. Exclusion may be so marked that those marginalized become invisible.

Government can have a role in eliminating the concept of group exclusion. The Jeevan Suraksha Yojana scheme for institutional delivery is directed equally at everyone, but in fact Muslim and Dalit women have to bring someone along as the upper caste nurse or helper refuse to clean babies of lower caste. So the indicators of marginalization have to revolve around fairness and justice. Should we not be looking at more programs that judge people on their attributes and skills rather than on personal information which identifies them for prejudice?

An alternate reality

It may also be important to question "who marginalizes?", "who decides that others are marginalized?", "who defines the marginalized?", "how are the marginalized defined? In which terms, or attributes?" By defining 'marginalized' or 'marginalization' does one implicitly, if not explicitly, define "the norm"? In both cases, defining the norm or marginalization are value-loaded, hence cultural, hence dynamic, hence transformable, and hence debatable.

What does 'marginalization' mean in an Indian context? An Indian context where, according to some calculations, about 40% of the population live below 1.25 USD per day per day, and 80% with 2.5 USD per day per person? At least that tends to indicate that poverty has not much to do with being 'marginalized' or being and living on the edge, on the fringe, or at the margin. The edge or margin of what? The experience of marginalization may not always be painful or experienced in the way that we think it is. Dalits or Other Backward Castes may not feel marginalized where they are in the majority and their aspirations may not be turned to social equality but to improved standards of living. The idea of being on the margins is a spatial one and one way to measure it may be to examine how many people who are on fringes could come into policy making. Another might be to track the rate of change of social indicators among marginalized communities *vis à vis* the others. Disaggregation of data by coverage and quality is very important to be able to identify systematic un-equalities between various groups that point to marginalization. Unusual but meaningful indicators may be suggested by those of the communities. Natural experiments such as those caused by the partitioning of a country or differences between states in a country may provide useful lessons.

In the case of the Velugu project in Andhra Pradesh where a form of social engineering is happening, many marginalized communities have come out in the open. The greatest pace of change is being seen in Dalit and backward communities as compared to the higher classes. The article by Pundit that was circulated suggests that the notion of caste and a backward caste in India might well have been concretized by the affirmative actions of the policies that India has adopted.

Much of the discourse on marginalization is situated in the prevalent social structure. What may be required is a change in respect of the core assumptions of the structure rather than a discussion of how to move the groups at the fringes into the centre. Would looking at the world through the eyes

of a marginalized individual change the view of the world? Would this lead to a different discourse? How often does the Dalit woman Sarpanch hoist the flag on Republic Day? Is a Minister who says that he cannot oppose *khap panchayats* because they represent the voice of the majority, justified in saying so?

The groups' connectedness to the conversation in society determines their self-worth – just as an individual's does so as she grows up in a family. And it can be changed by inclusion into that conversation. Newer technology provides possibilities to do that. A sense of community can help to foster that possibility of connectedness.

Political agency and action

Marginalization is a result of the prejudices that we carry towards people or social institutions. The government is a common whipping boy for problems that we see in society. Yet governments are no more monolithic than other structures of society. People have different life trajectories and they have different experiences and they should not be approached with prejudice.

It is also important to recognize that communities, government and society at large will need to act in concert if deep-rooted discriminations are to be removed. After all, we cannot legislate that your mother must embrace you if you are HIV positive – this sort of behavior is outside the reach of legal and political frameworks. This must rely on establishing political agency through emergent communities, and ensuring that there is an appetite for political action in its regard.

Studying negative outliers is a common approach. Mining positive outliers such as the improving sex ratios in Bangladesh to try to discover social action and unbundle the social milieu in which those actions could take place could be an important initiative. Just as social norms change the political climate, political action such as on the Velugu program can result in social change. Isolated rural communities are often resistant to change, and political action can result in changing social norms. Agency needs to be strengthened to translate the intrinsic power of people into representation; empowerment is the agency of change.

Social and legal instruments

The framing of social instruments must be in tandem with execution and accountability so as to direct attention to those groups most denied opportunities and services.

One view is that laws are in fact, mores and customs solidified into social instruments; so the change has to come from within. The dominant discourse shapes the possibilities for enforcement of instruments as it shapes the interventions that we create. Realities exist in time, a social organization, and an extant body of knowledge; thus it leads to straitjacketed possibilities of behaviors. Framing of social instruments takes a long time in making but the key lies in developing them from within and reinforcing by means of an enforceable legal framework.

Thus a program of treatment of HIV must look to see if those at highest risk of contracting HIV are also receiving the treatment, or whether they are being systematically excluded on account of their personal choices. Also contributing to exclusion is the historical discrimination on basis of caste and religion in India. Racial and ethnic disparities are not only evident in health outcomes and in the social and economic conditions in which large proportions of minority and low income people live. What is less well understood is that these disparities appear in clinical, diagnostic and therapeutic

care of chronic diseases, preventive care and mental health services as well. Too often, when cultural, racial and ethnic differences are not taken into account, stereotyping and biased treatment may result. It has been seen that the access to public health services to socially excluded groups is discriminatory in nature. Inequity results in compromised opportunities for access to public health services because of innate social, culture, geographical, behavioural gender disparities rooted in our society.

Other forms of social instruments include mores and customs, each of which exert their own influence on individual and group behavior. Customary laws in India are often in direct contrast and confrontation with the legal system. Many of these are enforced with much more vigor in traditional communities than modern laws.

The notion of community, albeit an imagined one, yields the possibility of group agency and political choices. On the other hand, social traditions and customs can ostracize persons and marginalize people. Legal frameworks and more formal social instruments must be enforced to be of use to change social cultures. Media can be an important ally in this fight. The question is what mix of formal and informal social action is necessary to yield a reasonable rate of progress on what is clearly unacceptable in the light of human rights. More research in this area is clearly needed. It is indeed difficult to measure societal change, acceptance, sense of community, and sense of belonging.

An important issue that needs to be tackled is the quality of services made available to the entire population and to marginalized groups. Two contrasting views were aired during the discussion – one view was that by paying attention to the quality of services overall, it would lead inevitably to an improvement for all and hence for those presently marginalized. On the other hand, there were those who felt that this alone would not suffice, and that specific attention needs to be made to services for the marginalized. Would the differences in coverage or quality be tolerable should no particular attention be paid to ensure that the marginalized were somehow included?

From the point of view of the government and its prejudices on marginalization; these often translate into inequity at the operational and individual levels. It becomes imperative to moderate these frameworks to the lens of individual and group behavior, preferences and economics. Although intended to achieve equity, political budgets reflect the intention to create a prejudicial social order. The crux is that the policy makers are the same people as us and so act the way we all do. The questioning has to start at individual level about innate social structures and the core has to be changed in order to get the momentous change that we aim for.



Participants

Nidhi Sadana Sabharwal is a first timer at the Delhi Dialogues. She works at the Indian Institute of Dalit Studies and writes extensively on issues of marginalisation.

P Shailaja is currently with the Public Health Foundation of India where she supports the transition of the Avahan program to the government. Shailaja has a background in women's issues.

Usha Ravelia is a journalist and works with three newspapers. She works on development communication issues and writes for the women's feature service.

and **Katherine Hay, Laurent Le Danois, Mariam Claeson, Richard Cash, Ron Waldman, Shubh Kumar-Range, Suneeta Singh.**

THE DELHI DIALOGUES

EDITION 5



In which we discussed

The Policy Implications of Marginalization

The Delhi Dialogues are born out of recognition that to progress the knowledge on development in India, we need people discussing, dissecting and debating the current gyaan that's available. And more often than not, there is not the people, not the space, and not the time to do so. The Delhi Dialogues attempt to provide all three. The Delhi Dialogues are intended to be an informal space where people in decision making positions interested and concerned about development in India can get together for a couple of hours to converse about a topic worth discussing. The topics of the Dialogues will not be strait jacketed into narrow domains, but rather be about an idea within development that is worth discussing in the specific and with the purpose of extending the current thinking around it.

Following the last Delhi Dialogues in which we discussed the attributes of marginalization, Delhi Dialogues 5 was a discussion of the implications that marginalization might have on policy. Some questions that were addressed were:

- What is it that a marginalized group or an individual requires from society?
- Is affirmative action for marginalization a valid option? Does it exacerbate marginalization?
- Should development action concentrate improving conditions generally; or should it concentrate on bringing those marginalized into the mainstream?
- Could a dashboard of indicators that measures both services and outcomes lead to a change in the way that services are delivered?
- What kind of architecture will be needed to deliver the desired outcomes?

Marginalization is the systematic denial of equality and is hence an expression of distributive reality.

Affirmative action

Equity or rather, inequity plays out in real life as 'marginalization'. Material deprivation is the most visible result of marginalization; two less visible dimensions are poor access to services resulting from discrimination, and poor self-esteem resulting from stigma.

The notions of equity and equality were revisited. One view that was proffered was that stigma results not only in poor self-esteem, but also colors (and is perhaps caused by) the way in which society looks at different groups within it. True equality ensures pluralism and diversity; it does not mean homogeneity and needs to be addressed in any discussion of marginalization. Given our previous discussions on equity - this closely approximates the definition of equity that the group had agreed; so it is clear that all were speaking of the same notion.

A linked question was 'should we be putting our energy in improving the services overall or should we bring the marginalized into the existing services which may not be of such good quality'? Could poverty be the proxy of marginalization? Does the provision of services to 'special groups' set them apart? Do we *de facto* create stigma when trying to be sensitive to special needs?

A recent book '*Why Nations Fail*', deals with the drivers that cause nations to fail to become inclusive and instead, remain extractive societies. Several structural factors are often at play, and political systems to back up these extractive interests are created. The debate is about whether services for marginalized segments should reflect 'affirmative action' or should such segments be required to avail themselves of mainstreamed services; both points of view have strong support from academics and the communities themselves. Does the setting up of organizations that deal particularly with the marginalized lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy of continued marginalization as those organizations fail to deliver high quality services? The book would answer yes; and following that direction, it would seem that the mainstreaming of marginalized groups into a broad based response like the National Rural Health Mission would be rather better than say, setting up interventions for injecting drug users under the National AIDS Control Program.

Practical issues

The practical application of the concept of affirmative action or indeed of mainstreaming poses challenges. In the case of affirmative action, practical difficulties could be decisions about 'when to stop extending special privileges'; while in the case of mainstreaming, it could be about 'when to begin treating a marginalized group as mainstream'.

A conundrum arises when the gradation of marginalization is not steep: i.e., when the line that divides those marginalized from those not marginalized is less distinct. Some societies have much more gradual gradation as we move out towards the margins. In some groups, there exists a clear drop from what is considered mainstream to what is marginalized. The book '*Ghost Map*' by Steven Johnson based on the seminal study by John Snow, is pertinent. The book describes the gradations of people who worked on human feces in the London of those times. Do persons who belong to different layers of marginalization require different treatment?

If material deprivation is the result of marginalization, would addressing poverty address all marginalization? Is the answer to addressing marginalization a matter of allocation of resources? Can resources that are not backed by a (informed) demand for quality, provide quality services? One view was that the Targeted PDS (Public Distribution System) would not work, without the clout of the middle class for it to work. Schools would not work, without parents that demand quality. So the real question is how to design a system so that its coverage is universal, and yet it has the flexibility to pay especial attention to certain groups.

An example that was given was whether an HIV prevention program should focus exclusively on prevention among sex workers, or provide services for slum dwellers living in and around brothel areas such as Sonagachi or Kamathipura. Another example from ICDS: because most children live in the densest and central part of the village, it may be perfectly logical to locate the anganwadi there. But because the poor and marginalized are likely to live away from the centre, it would be necessary to ensure that the supervisor monitors whether particular groups of interest are being 'captured'.

Progress of equity

Social ostracization over long periods of time can lead to a self-perpetuating marginalization because communities do not feel confident to approach service providers. How do we know when to stop an

affirmative action? What is the measure? Does the fact that the US has a black President indicate that blacks in America have arrived? Or does it indicate that he is one who has made it, an inspiration for others to emulate?

A prerequisite for framing policies for marginalized groups is to craft a dashboard of indicators for action that actually makes a difference. These indicators can act as scorecards to decide what constituted a good society. Scorecards such as the Millennium Development Goals which define health profiles exist. But what is needed is a set of 'equalizing measures' which come pre-loaded with a tipping point which tells you that 'enough' has been done on a particular aspect. Tata Tea provides an example of using new and innovative scorecards. They have created a Social Welfare Index which includes parameters such as percentage of mothers who delivered in the hospital, immunization rate, water and sanitation rate etc. they evaluate different parameters on a scale and then ranks and prioritizes the gardens accordingly. Albeit that the Index is used only over a small population of 80,000, it makes for an interesting study for how measurement can be used to create outcomes.

We have the Gross National Happiness index in which Bhutan famously came in 8th and was the only country of the top 20 to have a low GDP. But we still don't know the 5 or 10 things that must have occurred to make the best society. How do we create equal opportunities – do we do so through tax measures, or through school measures? Knowing that would be a quantum leap forward. If a country has been particularly effective in moving forward on a particular front for example, Bangladesh on infant mortality, what lessons are there in that for other countries and other development workers?

Designing programs

There is much more than services and money that determines social outcomes. Empowerment can happen along several different causal chains. One participant described a comparative study between rural quarry workers in Uttar Pradesh and urban construction workers in Tamil Nadu in which the two groups differed greatly in respect of their situation. Expectedly, maternal and childhood mortality was much higher in UP, and adult deaths were higher in Chennai. Interestingly, in a counterintuitive observation, alcoholism was absent in UP group that was studied. The researchers believe that what is causing this to happen is the sense of hope among Dalits in UP today. Young girls have a Mayavati-like body language. The community had taken a decision not to consume alcohol and no alcohol was being consumed. But policies and programs of 'community participation' are breaking up natural social collectives and cohesions. On the other hand, domestic violence was much higher in Chennai – the environment in the Chennai slums was much harsher, palpably harsher. Policies and programs create fractures in society in the way that they are set up.

Delivery mechanisms

If society has to reduce inequities, an important step is to reduce inequalities. A person who experiences in a society which is otherwise well off, will feel the poverty more acutely. The relative experience of poverty is disempowering. Countries such as Sweden, Norway have taxed the rich heavily. If countries in the developing world could balance the amount of subsidy that certain industries get, that would contribute to reducing inequalities. The *Gini* coefficient may be the best indicator to assess the extent to which the rich are better off than the poor. There are a limited set of mechanisms that are available to achieve the ends we wish to achieve. There are government, non government and private sector mechanisms. So basically, we have these three modes of delivery that are intended to serve certain

purposes and we have to decide on to where to put in the investments and the efforts so as to achieve the goals that we've defined. There are checks and controls, but persons who wish to circumvent these can do so. Malafide intentions can lead to abuse of rules and regulations due to failure of the checks and controls.

Measures of happiness

Happiness achieved through the attainment of material benefits has been shown to be ephemeral, by the 2002 Nobel laureate David Kahneman. He is notable for his work on the psychology of judgment and decision-making. He has shown that say a person wants a Mercedes. That person is likely to find that having gotten one; he is back to where he was in terms of satisfaction before he got the Mercedes. We grossly overestimate the happiness that material benefits are going to get us.

As has been shown through the case of Bhutan it appears not to be linked to the GDP – Bhutan was one of the top ten countries to have the highest Gross National Happiness Index based on the nine domains of: psychological wellbeing, health, education, time use, cultural diversity and resilience, good governance, community vitality, ecological diversity and resilience, and living standards. Research has shown that in happiness is both internal and external, research has shown. The U.N. report lists income, work, community and governance, and people's values and religion as external sources of happiness or misery. Personal factors that are more internal include mental and physical health, family experience, education, gender and age.

Many other countries on the list had high GDP. As reported in April 2012 by LiveScience, 'Inspired in part by Bhutan's efforts to measure 'Gross National Happiness', the (Helliwell) report reviewed several decades of happiness research. One focus of the report is the link between economic growth and happiness. Since the 1960s, U.S. gross national product per capita has tripled, Helliwell and his co-authors point out, but average happiness has remained unchanged'.

Results showed that while rich individuals tend to be happier than poor people, higher average incomes aren't always followed by gains in happiness, a seeming contradiction first noted by University of Southern California economist Richard Easterlin. Known as the 'Easterlin Paradox', this fact is illustrated by American economic growth. Easterlin has theorized that as a country becomes richer, people still compare themselves with their neighbors and thus don't feel any more satisfied with their lives. In other words, it's relative income, not absolute income that matters.

In the end, the decisions about what the marginalized want and need to be treated equally, without stigma and discrimination must rest with the communities themselves.



Participants

Ritu Priya is a first timer at the Delhi Dialogues. She is Professor and Chair of the Center for Social Medicine and Community Health at Jawaharlal Nehru University.
and **Mariam Claeson, Richard Cash, Ron Waldman, Suneeta Singh**



THE DELHI DIALOGUES

EDITION 6



In which we discussed

Marginalization Experiences at the Grassroots

The Delhi Dialogues are born out of recognition that to progress the knowledge on development in India, we need people discussing, dissecting and debating the current gyaan that's available. And more often than not, there is not the people, not the space, and not the time to do so. The Delhi Dialogues attempt to provide all three. The Delhi Dialogues are intended to be an informal space where people in decision making positions interested and concerned about development in India can get together for a couple of hours to converse about a topic worth discussing. The topics of the Dialogues will not be strait jacketed into narrow domains, but rather be about an idea within development that is worth discussing in the specific and with the purpose of extending the current thinking around it.

In continuation of the last Delhi Dialogues in which we discussed the policy implications of marginalization, Delhi Dialogue 6 was a discussion of the marginalisation experiences at the grassroots. Some questions that were addressed were:

- What does marginalisation look like at ground zero?
- What are the approaches that have been adopted to tackle marginalization?
- What drives the marginalized to take action?
- What are the ways to measure work around marginalization/ social inclusion?

Marginalization at ground zero

Marginalization or social exclusion is a concept that refers to being in a disadvantaged position. It is a process in which individuals or entire communities of people are systematically blocked off from rights, opportunities and resources (e.g. housing, employment, healthcare, civic engagement, democratic participation and due process) that are routinely available to members of the society and the enjoyment of which is key to social integration. Their exclusion may be because they speak a different language, follow different customs or belong to a different caste or religious group, from the majority community. Anyone who deviates in any perceived way from the norm of a population may become subject to coarse or subtle forms of social exclusion.

Different communities may have different experiences of being excluded. That is to say that marginalisation is seldom experienced in one sphere by all communities/individuals. Economic, social, cultural and political factors work together to make certain groups in society feel marginalised. Examples from Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu were drawn to describe marginalization based on caste. Some other types of marginalization were also mentioned related to disabilities, alternative sexuality, and HIV.

An unusual take about the marginalised was presented. It was noted that sometimes when the marginalised form closed groups, they tend to unknowingly promote social exclusion and denial of access to resources. Because they prevent cross-fertilisation by not allowing people with other

resources and experiences to be a part of the group, their access to resources declines further. The opportunity to harness the requisite assistance from those who are able to provide them is curtailed to a great degree. However, experiences in the west have shown that marginalised groups can enhance their access to goods and services and mitigate discrimination if they include individuals from the environment outside, and who are not in a similar situation. This was explained through an example of how having contact with lawyers not otherwise in the group meant say, for HIV positive people, might prove to be helpful when there are obstacles that are legal in nature. Similarly, proactive effort to map and connect with households and organisations (like churches, etc.) that could provide food in times of need, might provide workable coping strategy.

Approaches to tackle marginalization

The discussion on approaches to tackle marginalization touched upon several ideas. Affirmative action was revisited. One view was that affirmative action may not be enough to address problems of marginalization. Firstly, it may not take into consideration the highly marginalized among the marginalized. And if the focus is not on the most marginalized, desirable outcomes may not be achieved. Secondly, just taking affirmative action may not guarantee privileges to the excluded populations since governance also plays an important role in actual delivery of goods and services. Hence in states like Uttar Pradesh, where governance is weak, affirmative action perhaps remains more of an academic response.

Yet, some felt that affirmative action can and does help to mitigate marginalization. It not only makes it possible to identify marginalized groups, it also leads to institutionalization of the process of identification and measuring program outcomes, which can then be perpetuated as an integral part of the system. However, it is possible that in so doing, it may fail to attend to the larger structural problem and therefore may not take the holistic course. Nonetheless, it was agreed that affirmative action or any kind of focused action may have a positive impact on marginalization as it helps to bring socially excluded people into a space, which they may never have aspired to be a part of.

It was suggested that an open ended approach might be a useful method to mitigate the marginalization of populations. Many donor organisations take a (too) focused approach to development, in which the outcomes are pre-defined by them, and not the beneficiaries. However, increasingly it is being recognised that it might be wiser to provide and empower the groups to identify their own problems, and support them to develop the tools to address the issues that cause them concern. It may well be that the groups identify a different issue from the one that a donor might do. It might seem rather time consuming in the short term, but in the long term it may prove to be a more sustainable strategy with community ownership at the core. One participant provided an example from Bangladesh wherein a donor agency (the Swiss Development Cooperation) agreed to fund a concept instead of a pre-defined set of (supposedly logical) expected outputs and outcomes. The concept was simply to support small farmers so that they can respond to emerging needs and have more viable farming enterprises. This was based on a belief that not all needs and requirements could be anticipated, planned or detailed by farmers themselves at the time of submitting the funding request.

The enhancement of social capital is perhaps at the core of approaches to address marginalization. Social capital refers to the institutions, relationships, and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society's social interactions. Evidence shows that social cohesion is critical for societies to prosper economically and for development to be sustainable. Social capital is not just the sum of the institutions which underpin a society – it is the glue that holds them together. The general view was that when safe spaces are made available to marginalized communities, where people can convene and exchange information, they can begin to organise themselves, which may mark the beginnings of creating a social capital. Examples from Scandinavian countries were discussed in relation to building social capital. It was acknowledged that social capital could either be generated by the community itself or facilitated by the government or an external agent or both. Creation of self help groups in India was cited as an example.

Motivations for change

It is equally important to understand what drives the marginalized to take action. What is it that motivates them to bring about change? Many times, lack of information about special schemes can prevent communities from taking advantage of them to grow and develop. Creating awareness about mechanisms that help people to access subsidies for goods and services provides the opportunity to move ahead. This role may be played by the government or non government organisations and needs to be done at scale to have the desired impact.

The aspiration to lead a better life is another factor that drives the marginalized to take action. It is the hope to provide for greater opportunities for themselves and their children that acts as a catalyst in changing. It is therefore important that people's desire to improve themselves also be supported along with the provision of ample opportunities.

Sometimes past experiences of people in leadership position may drive changes in countries. The head of the state in Malawi had grown up in a family which had somehow been able to send her to college, while her peers in the village could not complete their education. Her other life experiences of an alcoholic husband and the risk of losing her life during childbirth assisted her to determine her priorities in development. This story was narrated to demonstrate that leaders who had an 'awareness' or personal experience of marginalisation could be the catalyst of change for countries.

Affirmative action could prove to be a motivating factor. It is set in the belief that marginalisation may be reduced by giving opportunities (quotas) to make progress and that these opportunities motivate people. Hence systems and laws are put in place to institutionalise the process. However, governance would play a key role in ensuring that such affirmative action is actualised and that communities benefit from the spirit and the act of affirmative action.

Another outlook involves investing in people by building their capacities. It believes that enhanced competence motivates individuals and it may ultimately push people to change the status quo. There were also discussions around providing opportunities for change to occur, the role that hope plays, and the fact of motivation as a leading characteristic that permits and supports change to take place.

One view was that providing opportunities may even be more crucial than building capacities. Migrants to urban areas are often marginalised and they arrive in urban areas to squalid living conditions in overcrowded settlements with unsanitary environments. However, Doug Sander's book, "Arrival City: How the Largest Migration in History Is Reshaping Our World" depicts a different picture. Having studied the shanty towns and slums on the outskirts of places such as Mumbai, Rio, London, Paris, Chongqing and Los Angeles, he presents these worlds not as fetid ghettos or pots of simmering radicalism. Instead, he argues, they are centres of reverberating energy and optimism where the world's rural downtrodden seek a foothold in the modern world. According to him, those people who have left behind small villages wish to receive the developed world's simplest yet most grace-filled sanction: a chance, through hard work, to enter the flowing middle class. He makes it plain that these arrival cities (as he names them) need nurturing, in the form of transportation (paved roads, bus terminals) security, sewage treatment, education and, vitally, citizenship for their people.

Measuring work around marginalization/ inclusion

Social inclusion is a complex and multidimensional concept that cannot be measured directly. To represent the state of social inclusion a number of different factors need to be taken into account, the selection of which may not be always obvious. Ideas about social inclusion may change over time and between different cultures. Objectives identified to improve social cohesion and the priorities set may change when those whose lives are at stake make these choices.

Measuring a complex concept such as social inclusion is always challenging as the concept may never coincide with the measure. This is true. Firstly, because the measures of social inclusion (e.g., poverty, employment, literacy, etc.) may be definable, but seldom represent the complexity of the concept. Secondly, because the measures we believe are most useful may not always be available. Therefore, measuring social inclusion may pose two major difficulties.

- In its definition: to define social cohesion and identify the dimensions comprehensively enough that it can provide a framework for the indicators to be used; and
- In its indicators: to identify the indicators for which data are available and that are able to represent relevant aspects of the different dimensions of social inclusion.

Development sector professionals have striven to devise dashboards and mechanisms that will enable them to measure the outcome. Although it may be possible to capture outputs (say increase in monthly income), outcomes (inclusion) may prove harder to measure. Process indicators (number of awareness campaigns held) may prove to be helpful, but are often considered unreliable. Lastly, there is a considerable time lag between input (subsidies or services provided) and outcome which increases the possibility of external influences (special schemes, additional resources) affecting impact.



Participants

Aparajita Ramakrishnan, Laurent Le Danois, Mariam Claeson, Richard Cash and Suneeta Singh.

