

RETHINKING POVERTY ANALYSIS, TOWARDS A MULTIDIMENSIONAL APPROACH TO DEPRIVATION

Abdelhamid Nechad

Professor at Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Morocco

Associate Professor at ESCA Casablanca

ABSTRACT

Inventors of quantitative estimation of national income, which received much attention, attempted to explain that their ultimate and main interest was the wealth of human existence, although what impressed were their indices, rather than their motivations. Yet, such deep and underlying motivation has often been ignored in economic analysis where means of existence are the center and fruit of research. It is, however, important not to confuse the means and ends. Therefore, one should not focus on the intrinsic importance of income, but rather assess it depending on what it builds, particularly lives that are worthy of living. Having a decent income helps to avoid early death. Such an enterprise depends also on other characteristics, namely the organization of society, including public health, medical care, the nature of education and educational system, the scope of social cohesion and harmony, etc. Considering only means of existence or directly observing the type of life people lead constitutes a real difference.¹ These observations and findings reveal a contrast between the approaches based on utility and resources and the approach based on capabilities, of which the initiator is Amartya Sen (Nobel Prize of economics in 1998). The capabilities approach, therefore, attempts to put things right by focusing on the possibility of effective ends concrete freedom of attaining reasoned ends, rather than focusing on means. The present paper falls into two parts. The first part will try to highlight the imperfection of traditional monetary indicators as well as the difficulties to measure the different dimensions of poverty, particularly in emerging countries, such as Morocco. We argue that poverty is not merely an idea of inadequacy of economic means of an individual, but rather a fundamental shortage that deprivation entails_ minimum adequate capability. The second part deals with a reorientation towards capabilities in order to explain the extent to which the latter (the capabilities approach) could serve as a basis for the assessment of the level of deprivation and not that of resources, which focuses on income and wealth.

Keywords: *Analysis, Deprivation, Multidimensional, Poverty*

1. INTRODUCTION

The nature of real existence has always been of interest to social thinkers over the centuries. If the current criteria of economic progress, reflected by a swarm of “turnkey” statistics, focused on growth of inanimate “comfort objects” (such as GNP and GDP at the heart of innumerable economic studies on development), this focus can only be justified, if at all, by the impact of the said objects on human lives that they directly or indirectly affect.. The interest of replacing them by direct indicators of the quality of life, wellness and freedom that human lives enjoy is more and more recognized. Even inventors of quantitative estimation of national income which attracted much attention and adherence tried to make it clear that the ultimate interest was the richness of human existence, although it is their indices, rather than their motivations which had a great impact. William Petty, for example, the pioneer of the measure of national income in 17th Century (He suggested means to assess it so much through the ‘income’ method as through that of expenses, as is said today) formulated his intention as follows: to examine

¹ SUDHIR A. and RAVALLION M (1993), “Human Development in poor countries: On the Role of Private Incomes and Public Services” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 7.

whether « *the subjects of the kind* » lived « *in as bad a condition as that of discontented people* ». Based on this, he explained the different determinants of people's conditions, including « *common safety*» and « *the particular happiness of every man*»². This underlying motivation was often ignored in economic analysis where means of existence were the centre and fruit of research. It is, however, important not to confuse the means and ends. Therefore, one should not focus on the intrinsic importance of income, but rather assess it depending on what it builds, particularly lives that are worthy of living. Having a decent income helps to avoid early death. Such an enterprise depends also on other characteristics, namely the organization of society, including public health, medical care, the nature of education and educational system, the scope of social cohesion and harmony, etc. Considering only means of existence or directly observing the type of life people lead constitutes a real difference. These observations and findings reveal a contrast between the approaches based on utility and resources and the approach based on capabilities, of which the initiator is Amartya Sen (Nobel Prize of economics in 1998). In his work entitled « *A New Economic Model*», Sen suggests that focus on means of existence should be abandoned in favor of concrete possibilities to live. This also results in a change with regard to means-oriented assessment methods, namely those laying emphasis on what John Rawls refers to as the « *primary goods* », which are general means, such as income, wealth, powers and prerogatives of functions, social bases for self-respect., etc. The capabilities approach, therefore, attempts to put things right by focusing on the possibility of effective ends and on concrete freedom of attaining reasoned ends, rather than focusing on means. Thus, the present paper is divided into two parts. The first part will try to highlight the imperfection of traditional monetary indicators as well as the difficulties to measure the different dimensions of poverty, particularly in emerging countries, such as Morocco. We argue that poverty is not merely an idea of inadequacy of economic means of an individual, but rather a fundamental shortage that deprivation entails_ minimum adequate capability. The second part deals with a reorientation towards capabilities in order to explain the extent to which the latter (the capabilities approach) could serve as a basis for the assessment of the level of deprivation and not that of resources, which focuses on income and wealth.

2. THE LIMITS OF TRADITIONAL INDICATORS

After World War II, economic growth was the centre in the fight against poverty. In fact, growth was considered as a means to achieve development. Thus, the growth of the GDP per capita became the only measure of poverty. Pigou was the first to rely on income to measure prosperity and welfare. He described economic prosperity as the measurable part of human wellness, the part that can be compared to money standard or benchmark. However, the production and distribution process impacts the income of individuals and households. Income is, then, is also an indicator of economic activity. Income nationwide, GNP, as it was referred to, was transformed into a measure of the activity of the total mass of produced goods and services, weighted by their respective quantities and prices, rather than a measure of individual welfare. GNP per capita is obtained by dividing GNP by the country's number of inhabitants. Consequently, a country's GNP may increase from one year to another, and its GNP per capita may decrease if the population of this country increases more rapidly than its production. For OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) countries, international trade relations are such that it was necessary to replace GNP by GDP, which is the sum of added values created within the borders, whatever the nationality of the people who create them. It is the criteria of residence that is prioritized. It should be noted that GNP or GDP indicate a « *production*» and not « *a living standard* ». According to certain stakeholders, in order to obtain a country's standard of living depending on its GNP, it is necessary to apply coefficients ranging from minus three to five as per the weight of capital in accumulated in the past, the country's

²HUL C.H. (1899), *The Economic Writings of Sir William Petty*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press,

political and economic systems, its geographical and climatic elements, the value of the currency and the weight of the informal sector. In any event, there exists a certain correlation between poverty and low income. Income is the source of purchasing or spending power, access to consumption and saving. In societies where market values are dominant, « *a low income restricts access to the market and can determine a less valorized social status; it is a factor of a more or less marked exclusion*»³. Nevertheless, one cannot put forward that there exists a high causality between a low GNP per capita and poverty. One cannot claim that a person dependent on a low income is automatically considered poor. On the one hand, income is but the monetary element of the allocation of each individual's resources. Various elements can intensify or attenuate the consequences of low income: self-subsistence, reciprocal counter-services, existence of property, constitution of family or extra-family solidarity networks, etc. On the other hand, income is not a necessarily determining component of a poverty condition. From the « *resources*», point of view, income level at a given time has no indication as to prospects of future income, which would undoubtedly be more legitimate. Moreover, as Amartya Sen, in his book « *A New Economic Model*» shows, the same income can have different meanings depending on age, status, aspirations, etc. The calculation of GNP per capita is subject to many statistical difficulties. In his work « *Towards a new measuring system*», elaborated jointly with Sen and Jean Paul Fitoussi, Joseph Stiglitz raises the following question: « *What significance does the calculation of the importance of a physical production flow take on if account is taken of the conditions of its production and distribution between the concerned persons?*»⁴. It is, thus, necessary to underline the problem of distribution of national wealth poses major difficulties. In fact, a growth rate of the GNP per capita can give a flattering image on effective development and ultimately on the poverty combatting strategies. Added to this is the fact that the contradiction between national health and human wellness is very striking. It is apparent in countries where income arising from exports increased significantly due to the rise in oil prices since 2003. For many Arab countries, GNP abruptly increases to levels superior to those of the richest of Western States. However, these same countries sometimes have the poorest communities worldwide. For Joan Robinson, « *Economic growth, when it occurred, rarely solved urgent social problems and, most often, did not cover mass population of emerging countries. By making economic inequalities worse and not solving problems, such as unemployment, malnutrition, diseases and housing deficiency, economic growth always exacerbated social problems and tensions*»⁵. In their work, « *Ruins of development* » Wolfgang Sachs and Gustavo Esteva support the same point of view. According to them, « *Since the rise of proletariat and, later in the welfare state, poverty was interpreted as lack in purchasing power, which should be eliminated by economic growth. Under the banner of combatting poverty, forcible transformation into money economies can be conducted as a moral crusade, which could give way to a so justified appeal to economic expansion*»⁶. Besides inequalities concealed by measuring poverty based on GNP per capita, the latter includes all the goods and services produced and marketed, including harmful and noxious products that pollute the atmosphere and affect health. GNP per capita measures production, but provides little information on populations. If deterioration of the environment causes diseases, thus leading to an increase in health expenses and, subsequently, in GNP, such a GNP decrease will be interpreted as a sign of growth and, therefore a drop in poverty, when in fact the population's real conditions and their environment have deteriorated. According to the 2010 world report on human development, there were many attempts to recalculate the figures of national income taking into account the natural capital depreciation.

³ MILANO S. (1988), *La pauvreté absolue*, Paris, Hachette.

⁴ STIGLITZ J., SEN A., FITOUSSI J-P. (2009), *Vers un nouveau système de mesure*, Paris, Odile Jacob.

⁵ ROBINSON J. (1980), *Development and underdevelopment* Paris, Economica.

⁶ WOLFGANG S. and GUSTAVO E. (1996), *Ruins of development*, Montréal, Ecosociété.

One of the first studies carried out to this effect, in Costa Rica, shows that from 1970 to 1990, cumulative depreciation of its forests and oil reserves amounted to over \$ 5 billion., i.e., about 6% of Costa Rica's total GNP for that period. In the case of Indonesia, the same report shows that during the period between 1971 and 1984, cumulative depreciation of forests, soils and oil resources amounted to \$96 billion, i.e., 9% of its GNP for the same period. It is, therefore, commonly accepted that the income-based monetary approach to poverty rests on a narrow idea of welfare or wellness and, because it is indirect, limits our understanding of this phenomenon to what individuals have and what they do not have. Poverty is a larger phenomenon that is apparent in different domains as various forms of deprivation and unsatisfied needs that prevent individuals from leading a normal and decent life or take part in the ordinary activities of society. (Dickes, 1989 ; Alcock, 2006 ; UNDP, 1997). For this reason, it was concluded that adopting multidimensional and direct approaches can prove more satisfactory as to how to perceive poverty, for they have a much broader objective. At this level, it is necessary to distinguish two approaches. First, the approach of situated poverty, which focuses on the prevalence of social construction of poverty since, contrary to what utilitarians pretend, we cannot isolate a phenomenon, such as deprivation, of the environment in which it occurred and developed. This broader concept, which is applied, as a priority, to developing countries, makes it possible to integrate certain dimensions that are not used by Townsend (1979) in the assessment of poverty, such as culture, beliefs and social capital. The second trend derives from the works of Amartya Sen (1980) on the capabilities approach, and which served as the basis for the elaboration by the UNDP of concepts of human development and human poverty. In this case, poverty is defined as a shortfall or deficiency in terms of basic capabilities likely to make it possible for a person to reach what Sen has called fulfilment or achievements. Amartya Sen's aim is to question the relevance of the « *income* » variable in the assessment of poverty. This critical examination holds true for all the different measures which, sharing this vision, perceive poverty in terms of weak or low income.

3. SITUATED POVERTY

In order to better understand situations like that of deprivation, we A fin de mieux cerner des situations comme celle de la privation, we started with the following questions: Can we limit ourselves to the standard market model to understand the underlying nature of poverty? Several times, the determinism of Bretton-Wood's strategies of institutions met with the complexity of the studied fields and facts, a fact which translates into wide poverty in the poorest countries of the globe. Suffice it to remember that Amartya Sen's works confirm the reductionism of the utilitarian idea of the market as to the way of dealing of the nature and causes of the prosperity of nations. Initially, all development policies had as slogan the following slogan: « *in the name of combatting poverty as slogan* »⁷. For Hassan Zaoual, poverty is understood in a simplistic way. For experts of Bretton-Woods' institutions, the concern is a simple « *economic category* » that can be calculated from the « *income* » parameter ». However, in an investigation we conducted in the region of Sefrou (Morocco), we came up with the conclusion that poverty is multidimensional by its very nature. The assessment and analysis of poverty requires adaptation to the diversity of the studied individuals and populations. This is incidentally the reason why we have introduced the concept of « *situated poverty* ». Amartya Sen paid special attention to the principle of diversity, as is clear from its recurrence in his arguments. He began his work « *Rethinking Inequality* » by the following formula: « *Human beings are different from each other. We are distinguished from each other by characteristics that are not only external (inherited wealth, the natural and social environment where we live), but also personal (age, gender, vulnerability to diseases, physical and intellectual aptitudes).* »

⁷ ZAOUAL H. (2000), « La pensée économique plurielle : une révolution scientifique en marche », *Séminaire de culture de développement*, DEA Changement social, Université des Sciences et Technologies de Lille.

*To determine what equality requires, it is necessary to take into account this human diversity»⁸. The remarks of Ibn Khaldoun, « the father of history», clarify this point. This great historian of the 14th century, through a comparative analysis between the eating habits of the populations of Hijaz (Saudi Arabia) and those of Shanhajias, veiled people of the South of the Maghreb, puts forward that famine is a blessing for the life of the former so much from the physical as on the mental point of view. According to Majid Rahnema « In general, Ibn Khaldoun argues, people who lack grains and condiments and live in the deserts are in better health than the inhabitants of the plains and heights who lead an easy life: their complexions are purer, their bodies healthier, their huamn types better porportioned and more beautiful, their behaviour not disporportionate, their faculties more receptive and more perpicacious in knowledge. It is a remark that has been confirmed for generations»⁹. This justifies the point of view of the sitologi approach to poverty, according to which, poverty cannot come down to a general and universal formula where only the « income» variable”intervenes, to be later interpreted as a sign of deprivation. It is the individual’s life and environment that should be taken into consideration. It is, therefore, necessary to adapt economic analysis of poverty to the context of each location. According to its « soft relativism» principle, the situated poverty approach states that each location or site, while open to changes, exhibits peculiarities that impregnate people’s individual and collective behavior within a given location.. « Development policies made numerous « site errors» in so far as they tend to be dropped on from the summit to the base instead of favouring listening to and free participation of concerned populations »¹⁰. The 2010 world report on human development stresses that: « the sectors of media, information and leisure, which, thanks to their considerable means, are present worldwide, can powerfully help eradicate or, at least, reduce poverty. They shape not only information, but also new culture and values. We need values that tolerate cultural diversity and respect dignity of the poor so as to reinforce their solidarity and mobilize individuals and communities, companies and others against poverty»¹¹. It equally stipulates that « Well-focused strategies are necessary so that the growth model could be beneficial for the poor and so that generated resources could be invested in human potentials. Growth is not enough. La croissance ne suffit pas. On its own, it can be without regards (the losers find themselves in grinding poverty), without jobs (almost no job is created), without participation (individuals are not associated to decision-making processes), with no future (the environment of future generations is destroyed) and without roots (history and cultural traditions die out ». Like Amartya Sen, Hassan Zaoual assumes that it is necessary that the poor have an area of freedom so that they can better act, since the crowding out (l’effet d’éviction) will sooner or later end up recurring in the form of non participation which is detrimental to economic performance and local accumulation of skills through economic projects meant to respond to the causes of poverty. According to the same author, the assumed skills of « experts » sustain the site stakeholders’ unskilfulness. The poor, thus, are not citizens, but rather customers of institutions and social security. The latter use their expertise without solving the problems that justify their existence. Therefore, there is a new tendency based on the awareness of the role that local cultures and beliefs can play in combatting poverty, a fact which proves to be a first step towards a new concept of combatting poverty and which claims to *situated* and therefore open on new anthropological and cultural dimensions of the concerned location. This confirms the contributions of the capabilities for which a better analysis of deprivation assumes a better understanding of the area and populations studied.*

⁸ SEN A. (2000), *Repenser l’inégalité*, Paris, Seuil.

⁹ RAHNEMA M. (1991), La pauvreté globale: Une invention qui s’en prend aux pauvres, *Revue Interculture*, Volume XXIV, N° 2.

¹⁰ ZAOUAL. H. (2002), « La pensée économique peut-elle être flexible », in Granier R. et Robert R (sous la dir.), *Culture et structures économiques. Vers une économie de la diversité ?*, Paris, Economica.

¹¹ PNUD (2011), *Rapport mondial sur le développement humain 2010*, Paris, Economica.

4. CAPABILITIES APPROACH

During the last few years, there has emerged a growing interest in the idea of « *capabilities* » introduced by Amartya Sen (1980, 1985, 2000, and 2003). If the Nobel Prize that Sen obtained in 1998 is a symbolic proof, it is certainly the more and more widespread use of this approach among researchers and institutions in their understanding of questions related to wellness, poverty and inequalities that is better evidence for this. The capabilities approach is based on ethical concerns related to social equity. In fact, at the beginning of his reasoning, Amartya Sen poses the question of what attribute a society should equalize to achieve social equity. Starting from a thorough and well-founded criticism to the proposals of the two dominating ethical approaches at the time, i.e., utilitarianism (Bentham, 1789) and Rawlsian theory of equity (Rawls, 1971), he suggested a space of functionings and capabilities, such as adequate assessment of questions related to welfare, poverty and inequalities. Thus, in the field of social equity, this approach constitutes a new paradigm and a real alternative to utilitarian orthodoxy. The capabilities approach is an expanded and normative framework for the assessment of issues related to individuals' welfare, social arrangements, policy implementation and societal changes based on individuals' actual ability to do or to be something and the scope of freedom they enjoy to promote and achieve their objectives. This approach starts from the simple remark that an individual's living standard is directly related to the different states and acts they can accomplish or achieve. Sen makes use of the term “*functionings*” or achievements to refer to these states and acts that individuals effectively attain. For Sen, « *the thesis is that functionings are constituents of the person's existence and that the assessment of their welfare should necessarily be a judgment of these components* »¹². The ability to function constitutes all the real opportunities the individual is offered and represents the various combinations of functionings (states and actions) that the individual can accomplish. Capability is, therefore, a set of vectors of functionings which indicate that an individual is free to lead this or that type of life. Thus, on the conceptual level, the main innovation of the capabilities approach is the adoption of an expanded informational space, wider than that of the traditional approach, to deal with a set of normative questions (Farvaque, 2003). As is stressed by Robeyns (2005), the two focal points of this approach are the focus on the distinctions between means and ends, on the one hand, and between real freedom (capabilities) and functionings (outcomes), on the other. Resources are goods and services (commodities), be they mercantile or not, that the individual has at their disposal, as, for instance, food or a bike. These goods have an instrumental value rather than an intrinsic or inherent value, for what really matters is the way we can use them. Also, like Gorman (1956) and Lancaster (1966), Sen (1985a) draws a line between resources and their characteristics which constitute their desirable properties and determine the uses to which the good can be put. It is these functionings that constitute the intrinsic value. A bike enables its owner to move; food does not only make it possible to satisfy hunger, but also brings the pleasure to eat and to create a social support through the organization of meals (Sen 1985). Therefore, the characteristics of goods (bike) provide individuals with the possibility to implement the related functioning (movement). However, Sen (2003, 150) points out that there is nothing automatic, permanent or inevitable about the relationship between income (and other resources), on the one hand, and individual achievements and freedoms, on the other. In fact, owning a good is different from the ability to benefit from its characteristics. It is not enough to know the quantity of food an individual has to judge the way they are fed. Sen's well-known example is that of an individual suffering from a parasitic disease that makes the digestion of food difficult. This person can suffer from malnutrition, even if they have at their disposal a quantity of food that would enable an individual without such disease to be well fed.

¹² Sen A. (1999), *L'économie est une science morale*, Paris, La Découverte.

Thus, information of goods ownership proves insufficient to judge someone's living standard or welfare, for it does not take into account of the relationship between goods and functionings. To be able to take account of such contingent relationship, Sen introduces, at the heart of his approach, a set of internal and external conversion factors, which determine the possibility to convert the characteristics of resources into functionings. First of all, such transformation will be influenced by personal conversion factors related to the individual's internal characteristics (physical, intellectual aptitudes, metabolism, etc.). A person suffering from physical disability will not be able to achieve the characteristic « *movement* » that the good has « *bike* ». In the case of food, metabolism, age, gender, activity level or health conditions are conditions that will influence the way the individual will indeed convert resources (food) into functionings (to be well-fed). Besides, age and gender determine specific needs that income does not take account of (young children, old people, maternity, family obligations). The other conversion factors are external and highlight the influence of social characteristics (politics, social norms, power relationships) and environmental characteristics (climates, infrastructures, public goods) may exert. A country's social rules and traditions may constrain women's behavior, thus reducing all their potential functionings. Likewise, riding a bike may depend on climatic conditions and usability of a country's roads, the ability to be well-fed may depend on drought or flood problems and the ability to be in good health depends on risks of contagious diseases in the region of residence. Therefore, taking account of these different conversion factors will make it possible to consider interpersonal variations, which enables individuals with identical resources may have two different living standards. This last point is particularly important within the framework of the elaboration and assessment of public policies aiming at reducing poverty (Sen, 2003). In the course of Sen's reasoning, it is important to understand the distinction between functioning and capabilities. Functionings are individuals' different states and acts. They form what a person, given a set of conversion factors, can do or be. They can be elementary (i.e., to be well-fed and in good health) or complex, such as the ability to take part in community life, take a rest, be respected, have self-esteem, etc. Assessment of welfare, therefore, takes the form of an assessment of functioning vectors (i.e., individuals' valued states and acts). Reference to functionings makes Sen's approach a direct and multidimensional one. Indeed, although he considers that an individual's welfare should depend deeply on the nature of their existence, that (i.e., accomplished functionings), at the heart of his approach, he places capabilities rather than functionings. As is highlighted by Robeyns (2003), while a functioning is an achievement, a capability represents the possibility of achievement and refers to all potential functionings. Consequently, Sen's emphasis is not on what people have or do, but on what they have the choice to do or do not have the choice to do. Based on all the characteristics of the resources at their disposal and on the conversion factors, an individual can determine vectors of potential functionings that represent the different combinations of potential functionings they can achieve. This set represents all the individual's capabilities and gives an image of the scope of the choices at their disposal. It, therefore, precedes all functionings which constitute all the states and acts that an individual achieves. Moving from the space of capabilities to that of functionings is shown by the individual's real choice, which, in turn, depends on the individual's history as well as on the mechanisms of preferences; these mechanisms themselves depend on the social context. In Sen's view, functionings are more related to living standards, whereas capabilities result in a dimension of freedom and choice. In fact, capabilities refer to an individual's real freedom and real opportunities, and the freedom, in the positive sense of the term, which an individual has to promote or achieve a functioning they would like to enhance. To illustrate the importance of the difference between capability and functioning, we can cite the example of two people who cannot sufficiently provide for their needs in terms of food. However, one is a person suffering from famine whereas the other is a person who has chosen to be on hunger strike as a sign of protest.

Regarding the good “*food*”, both people realize the functioning of being “malnourished”, but not through the same path.; while one of them was forced into such a situation, the other one has made a choice. The notion of choice is not easy to understand. One finds the same questions asked in works on deprivation in which involve determining whether choices are forced or deliberate. Based on these considerations, Sen suggests a distinction between living standard, welfare and « *agency* ». For him, the living standard is the broadest notion and is connected with information related solely to the individual. The difference between the living standard and welfare emerges from the possible influence of external sources on a person’s welfare. Thus, pain (joy) caused by sorrow (happiness) of a relative reduces (increases) welfare, but does not affect the living standard. Agency is much broader and rests on the idea that an individual can have objectives and values other than the search of their personal comfort. An example is a person’s commitment towards the issues of their community through the participation to anti-globalization protests, being persuaded that this globalization has harmful effects (Robeyns, 2003). These various concepts constitute the backbone of the capabilities approach, of which the use, as a framework of thought, is very wide and is confined to studies of poverty. The capabilities approach to poverty constitutes a way to move from the analysis of means to the analysis of ends. In this context, Sen (2003, 36) considers that « *it is just to consider poverty as deprivation of the basic capabilities, rather than merely a low of income* ». This definition of poverty refers to a shortfall or deficiency of basic capabilities. The latter constitute a subset of the set of “capabilities” and refer to the freedom to achieve basic things that are necessary to survive and to avoid or escape poverty. Thus, while capabilities can cover a vast and varied field, basic capabilities refer precisely to the real possibility to avoid poverty. They concern the ability to satisfy minimum and adequate levels of certain crucial functionings. The identification of these minimum and acceptable levels constitutes the basis of Sen’s approach to poverty. For Robeyns (2005, 101), basic capabilities are crucial to analyze poverty and, in more generally, to study the welfare of the majority of the population in a developing country, whereas in rich countries, welfare focuses rather on capabilities that are more or less necessary for physical survival. The capabilities approach is the development paradigm that is underlying the concepts of human development and poverty introduced by the UNDP (1990, 1997). One of the major changes that this new paradigm offers is the possibility of analyzing the different questions regarding poor countries and individuals within a flexible framework, rather than imposing political or other prescriptions in the name of a rigid neoliberal orthodoxy (Fukuda-Parr, 2003). Within the framework of this approach, human development is geared towards the expansion of capabilities, whereas human poverty reduction involves ensuring that individuals who should have to primary resources have a set of basic capabilities likely to help them achieve these resources. The main difference between the concepts of human development and human poverty is that the former focuses on the living conditions of all individuals in society while the latter lays emphasis on those of poor individuals. Thus, as part of the overall view of human development, the disadvantages of the poorest people can, in an aggregated level, be made up for by the gains of the well-to-do ones. The concept of human poverty and poverty indices were introduced in order to focus on the situation of the most underprivileged people. In this case, lack of progress in the reduction of disadvantages of people in deprivation cannot be made up for by the significant progress of the well-to-do. Subsequently, Anand and Sen (1997) consider that the two approaches are useful for understanding the development process, and that they are not exchangeable. The human poverty approach was introduced by the UNDP’s 1997 Human Development Report. This report seeks to focus on the challenges of poverty eradication in the world with a view towards human development.. For this purpose, it does not simply focus on poverty, in the monetary sense of the term, but rather on a multidimensional approach to poverty. (Anand and Sen, 1997). It draws its inspiration, to a large extent, from Sen’s capabilities approach, as is shown by the introductory phrase of the first chapter of the 1997

Human Development Report., which stipulates that « *It is the deprivation lives that people may lead that poverty can be seen. Poverty implies not only low income or deficiency in elements necessary to well being, but also denial of and deprivation in opportunities and basic choices for living a tolerable life* ». These choices and opportunities refer to basic capabilities. This means that, in this approach, poverty is not merely a state of deprivation currently lived by an individual, but also the absence of real opportunities, due to social constraints or to personal characteristics, for living a life that they reasons to valorize. Nevertheless, with poverty being a state that everyone one wishes to avoid, it may be said that its study can disregard this notion of freedom and focus on the individual's real functionings. This approach largely exceeds the physiological model of deprivation, for « *capabilities* » mean, « *to be in good health, have access to knowledge, have access to resources necessary to have a decent standard of living and be able to take part in the community's social life* » (PNUD, 2001). From a political point of view, the objective is, therefore, the « *removal of obstacles in what one can do in life, obstacles such as illiteracy, diseases, insufficient access to resources, or insufficient political and civic rights* » (Fukuda-Parr, 2003). Fukuda-Parr (2003) evokes a five-point strategy for development and poverty reduction: (1) give priority to social development with a spread of opportunities of education and health care., (2) economic growth creating resources for multidimensional human development, (3) social and political reforms in view of establishing a democratic governance to secure all people's rights, (4) foster equality in the three preceding points, namely for the poorest people (5) global political and institutional reforms to create an economic environment where access to markets, technology and information would be easier for poor countries. Within these diverse components, one can notice the rise of the concept of empowerment (World bank, 2000 ; Narayan, 2002) and the increasingly accrued taking into account of questions related to gender equality. The capabilities approach has led to clear conceptual advances in the field of poverty studies, both as to the debate on the absolute or relative aspect of poverty and as to its role in the appearance of the concept of human poverty. These conceptual advances are nevertheless are confronted with important operationalization problems, which are partly due to the scope of this approach.

5. OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE CAPABILITIES APPROACH

The great riches and complexity of Sen's approach are not easy to express empirically, for the capabilities approach is much more demanding on the informational and methodological level than on the monetary level of poverty. If for some people, the problems facing this approach seem to be insuperable, for others they are simply a reflection of the intrinsic and irreducible complexity of the concepts it makes possible to understand. Such is Chiappero Marinetti's (2000) point of view, who stresses that the empirical applications of the capabilities approach require an adequate space for the evaluation of capabilities (or functioning), a pertinent list of capabilities and functionings, a set of indicators for each of the dimensions of wellness taken into account, the way, if necessary, to combine the elementary indicators to obtain an assessment on each dimension of wellness and the way to add information on the different dimensions and achieve a comprehensive assessment of wellness. Assessment of capabilities requires that, on the one hand, valuable items be selected and, on the other hand, the value of these items be determined (Sen, 2000). In fact, beyond the preceding, there emerges the problem of the list of elements to consider and their relative importance. This question is related to the horizontal imprecision of the capabilities approach. Sen's reference to the different states and acts, which a person has reasons to valorize suggests that this approach is inherently multidimensional and refers to a multitude of functionings/ capabilities, which can impact individuals' wellness. In the case of the study of poverty, confining oneself to a set of basic functionings makes it possible to limit their number. However, even at the level of basic functionings, Sen's capabilities approach does not provide a list of functionings/ dimensions,

nor does it provide a clearly defined selection method. This question is of paramount importance and is recursively at the heart of the current debates on the operationalization of this approach (Robeyns, 2005). Indeed, although Sen's theory is theoretically attractive, as long as one does not have clearly defined criteria for the selection of value functionings, one will face a series of criticisms. In particular, the absence of a list makes Sen's approach is not fully specified. Absence of a list makes Sen's approach not completely specified. For some researchers, this incompleteness poses a problem. Nussbaum (2003) considers that as long as Sen has not explicitly determined a list, his approach will lack percussion. Alkire (2001, 2002) shares the same point of view. She considers that lack of a procedure for the identification of pertinent capabilities (dimensions) makes the implementation of this approach difficult. These two authors agree that, in this case, the approach may be not understood and may give free reins to all sorts of deviations. In fact, without a list or a transparent selection method, numerous works aligning themselves with this theory may adopt different approaches or steps, which will lead to more confusion than clarity. Other authors leveled stronger criticisms. Townsend (1985, 667), for instance, argues that the absence of scientific criteria for the selection of dimensions is « *scientifically unacceptable* ». For him, « *one should consider the question of knowing how capabilities are selected and in what way they are absolute* ». In the same vein, Sugden (1993) raises the following question: « *given the large number of functioning that Sen considers as pertinent, given the scope of disagreement between reasonable people as to the nature of what is a decent life and given the unsolved problem of the way in which sets should be assessed, it is natural to raise the question of knowing the extent to which Sen's framework of analysis is operational* ». In reply to these criticisms, Sen admitted that it is necessary not only to identify the capabilities and classify them into the most central ones and the most trivial ones, but also to assess their relative weight. However, he thinks that any subsequent specification on his part would be controversial. In fact, while he is not averse to the idea of determining that, in some specific cases, certain capabilities are more important than others, he refuses to endorse the a predetermined and definite list of capabilities. The reason for this is that the capabilities approach is not confined to a sole objective. It was elaborated as abroad framework of thought. Consequently, Sen believes that each application necessarily depends on its context and it for this reason that his approach was deliberately incomplete. The selection of capabilities should therefore be geographically contextualized. Thus, from a methodological point of view, « *they are applications to specific questions, context-sensitive and limited by data, which can give birth to a pertinent list* » (Farvaque, 2003). Besides, the elaboration of the list pertains to a value judgment that should be explicitly made through a democratic and participative method. It is not the work of a theorist. It is, therefore, clear that if the malleability of this approach makes it evasive in the eyes of certain people, Sen considers it as an asset and thinks that this approach cannot be made more specific without carrying out a universal assessment, which will make it possible to choose the valuable items and their relative weight. Thus, while this incompleteness is the point which leaves this approach wide open to the most ferocious criticisms, it is one of the reasons of its success. If he refuses to give a list of basic functionings, Sen nevertheless lays tracks that will help understand the scope he intends to give to his approach. These tracks are in the form of domains that one can take into consideration and the form of two selection criteria, based on consensus, which will make it possible to select the set of pertinent, basic capabilities without having recourse to value judgments.

6. CONCLUSION

In spite of incompleteness that Ammatya Sen's approach exhibits, it should be nevertheless admitted that anypoverty reduction policy that does not take into consideration the capabilities of individuals or groups of population increasesdeprivation. In other words, any person's emancipation and « *well being*» depends on their capability to change their situation.

Increase in income does not automatically lead to the improvement of « *well being* » when the individual as well as their environment are not able to develop relying on their endogenous capabilities. Therefore, the problem lies in the inadequacy and not the lowness of income. Having an adequate income does not mean having an income that is inferior to a poverty threshold set from outside. Instead, it is having an income lower to what a person should have to ensure a specific level of capability. This means that, to analyse poverty, one should not confine oneself to data on income¹³; it is necessary to pay particular attention to the diversity of environments and social phenomena. According to Sen, « *Ana analysis of poverty based solely on income will only say half the truth* ».

LITERATURE:

1. Abdelmalki L. et Courlet C. (1996), *Les nouvelles logiques du développement*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
2. Amin S. (1973), *Le développement inégal*, Paris, Les éditions de minuit.
3. Assidon E. (1990), *les théories économiques de développement*, Paris, La Découverte.
4. Benabdellali N. (1999), *Le Don et l'anti-économique dans la société arabo-musulmane*, Rabat, Eddif.
5. Bneatham J. (1789), *The principales of morales and legislation*, Hafiner Press, Londres.
6. D'Autume A., et Cartelier J. (1995), *L'économie devient-elle une science dure?*, Paris, Economica.
7. Dickes (1989), *Pratique de l'échelonnement multidimensionnel, de l'observation à l'interprétation*, Paris, De Boeck.
8. Esteva G. et Sachs W. (1996), « *Des ruines du développement* », Bruxelles, Ecosociété.
9. Farvaque E. (2009), *Economie de la démocratie*, Paris, De Boeck.
10. Ferreol G. (1992), (sous dir.), *Intégration et exclusion dans la société française contemporaine*, Presses Universitaires de Lille.
11. Ibn Khaldoun (1956), *Al-Muqaddima*, Beyrouth, Tome I, Dar al-Kitab al-lubnani.
12. Milano S. (1988), *La pauvreté absolue*, Paris, Hachette.
13. Milano S. (1992), *La pauvreté dans les pays riches : du constat à l'analyse*, Paris, Nathan.
14. Parr F. (2003), *Capacity for development : New Solutions to old problems*, New-York, Taylor and Francis.
15. Rahnema M. (2003), *Quand la misère chasse la pauvreté*, Paris, Fayard.
16. Rawls J. (1971), *Théorie de la justice*, Paris, Essai.
17. Robinson J. (1980), *Développement et sous-développement*, Paris, Economica.
18. Salama P. et Valier J. (1994), *Pauvreté et inégalité dans le Tiers-Monde*, Paris, Edition La découverte.
19. Salama P. et Destremau B. (2002), *Mesure et démesure de la pauvreté*, Paris, PUF.
20. Sen A. (1993), *Ethique et économie*, Paris, PUF.
21. Sen A. (1993), *L'économie est une science morale*, Paris, La Découverte.
22. Sen. A. (1998), *un nouveau modèle économique: Justice, démocratie, liberté*, Paris, Economica.
23. Sen A. (2000), *Repenser l'inégalité*, Paris, Seuil.
24. Sen A. (2000), *Un nouveau modèle économique : Développement, justice, liberté*, Paris, Odile Jacob.
25. Stiglitz J. (2002), *La Grande désillusion*, Paris, Fayard.
26. Townsend P. (1979), *The concept of poverty*, Heinmann, Londres.
27. Wolfgang S. et Gustavo E. (1996), *Des ruines du développement*, Montréal, Ecosociété.

¹³ Instead of measuring poverty based on income, Sen suggests calculating one can achieve with this income, while taking into account the fact that these achievements can vary from one individual to another and from one place to another. Otherwise, how can we explain that there exist poverty pockets inside middle classes in rich countries?

28. Zaoual H. (2002), *Du rôle des croyances dans le développement économique*, Paris, L'Harmattan.