

Access to Livelihood Resources: Inclusion, Exclusion, Privilege and Adverse Incorporation in Indian Cities

Part of the WOTRO Project: Using SII to Tackle Urban Inequalities in India
PhD Thesis: Tara van Dijk, UvA

Overview:

Unearthing the structural constraints or 'selectivities' at play in and around resource access and provision can be managed by seeing how providers and intermediaries classify households and areas of the city (both formally and in practice) and what correlative entitlements, services or disciplining are attached to them. This process allows us to map "profiles of provision" to match the "profiles of deprivation" produced using the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) (Baud et al 2008). Going on to include the spaces in the city where classifications and correlative entitlements etc can be secured or contested allows us to both see more of the process of provision and access as well as gauge the relative room to maneuver marginalized households and places have.

My work contributes to the project's overall research question: *How can urban governance networks more effectively tackle urban inequalities, spatial segregation, and household deprivations using SII* mainly by providing an idea of what kind of content can and should be generated at the local level in order for a SII to be more effective in these areas. Below I annotate my research questions in line with the projects main question.

Research Questions:

What are the profiles of privilege, inclusion, exclusion, and adverse incorporation regarding access to livelihood resources?

In order for an SII to better track and tackle inequalities requires that its conceptualization of urban inequalities be more dynamic and relational. The uneven geography of deprivation, wellbeing and privilege is not only the outcome of household activities and choices but is also a product of the larger institutional environment which informs household-provider relationships. Therefore, the interactions between households, providers and intermediaries within the institutional environment must be better conceptualized to account for the role structural constraints and biases play in the levels of household resources, agency and livelihood resilience across the geography of the city. The SII needs not only to record where deprivations etc are but what their correlative structural constraints and biases are if it is to lead to more just provisioning.

Sub-Questions:

1. What profiles of deprivation, wellbeing, and privilege emerge from quantitative analysis of secondary resources and how do these compare with qualitatively derived profiles?

The data collected and later analysis in regards to this question serves two purposes. It shows the value of mixed methods (Q-Squared) and it shows us and our partners the use of the various data reserves present plus the value of strengthening/questioning quantitative analysis with ethnographic and participatory data. The data inventory this question requires also serves at least 3 purposes. 1) We know about the data resources available to be leveraged for more up-to-date and comprehensive "indexes of multiple deprivations." 2) This inventory can be of project-wide use. 3) It allows us to be able to give something tangible back to our partners in our research cities.

2. What providers or intermediaries to livelihood resources are present and what are their: benchmarks, authoritative labeling processes, rules of entitlement practices, and service delivery modes?

This allows us to unpack the geography of deprivation/wellbeing the IMD produces. We can begin to understand to what degree this uneven geography of provision and wellbeing is due to: type and location of provision, institutional constraints and biases, absence or preponderance of provision, resource shortages, and/or bureaucratic error. The provider geography this produces can also allow us to look at to what extent provision is supply or

demand driven as well as whose spatial and social needs are over or underrepresented. In addition it provides “profiles of provision” to go with the profiles of deprivation, wellbeing, and privilege. We can see which collages of provision and institutional set-up/practices relate to different levels of well and ill-being... The broader and more comprehensive swath of underlying factors this analysis uncovers is of interest to those interested in an inequality reducing SII, in my opinion. Also, this level of detailed information on area providers would be something tangible we can share with our community and NGO partners.

3. How do households use their present resources, claims and entitlements to access & build-up livelihood resources within their institutional environment?

It stands to reason that those interested in reducing household deprivations need detailed information on the strategies and activities (both positive and problematic) households engage in when negotiating their institutional environment in order to secure or improve their resources. This will allow us to see which actions and strategies go with which sorts of profiles of provision and profiles of deprivation etc. Also, which providers, resources, political spaces, and entitlements are the most important and the least important in a given time and place should also come to light. In all this gives us a more street-level dynamic understanding of “demand.”

4. What opportunities for effective voice and exit does the political space of the cities allow for?

Tackling inequalities, segregation, and deprivations requires both robust information and knowledge of the political spaces in the city where households and social groups can question their classification and correlative rights, services, and responsibilities. So this question can relate to our overall goal by showing which political actors need to be part of the SII in order for it to be a resource to those attempting to secure better resources and services for the poor and marginalized in the city.