

Social Support and Poverty

An international research in
Paris (France) and Antananarivo (Madagascar)

Isabelle Parizot (Inserm)

Jean-Michel Wachsberger (Ehess / Dial)

Social Support

- **Social support**

Assistance between relatives (family members, friends, neighbours...)

in different spheres (financial, everyday life, moral support...)

- **Contribute to poverty reduction**

- Instrumental dimension :

- Protection (material goods, money, time...)

- Symbolic dimension :

- Social recognition, social inclusion

- Well-being :

- Self-esteem, ...

An comparative approach Antananarivo / Paris

- **Sociological objective**

To highlight specific logics of social support...
... and its effects on terms of poverty reduction.

- **Political challenge**

– Is private solidarity able to compensate for the weakness of the Welfare State?

Data

- **Research Program: "Health, Inequalities and Social Ruptures"**
 - Multidisciplinary and international program
(Abidjan, Antananarivo, New York, Paris, Sao Paulo, Warsaw)
 - Similar questionnaire, including items adapted to each country
- **Survey in Antananarivo**
 - In 2003
 - Representative sample of malagasy city : 2807 ind.
- **Survey in Paris**
 - In 2004
 - In two poor neighbourhoods
 - Representative sample of these neighbourhoods : 889 ind.

To be un-assisted

individuals that have been not assisted by relatives during the last 6 months (%)

	family	friends	neighbours	Total
<hr/>				
Antananarivo				
Financial or material	52,2	87,4	89,9	48,0
Everyday life	46,3	86,9	79,8	41,6
Moral or affective support	46,9	76,4	80,2	43,2
Total	26,2	70,4	69,7	24,0
<hr/>				
Quartiers parisiens				
Financial or material	72,2	88,6	98,4	66,4
Everyday life	56,5	58,5	88,0	43,0
Moral or affective support	44,0	44,1	89,2	32,2
Total	34,8	38,4	84,2	24,1

Sources : Enquête 1-2-3 module SIRS 2003, MADIO/DIAL ; Enquête SIRS Paris20ème 2004, INSERM U444

By whom is one assisted ?

- **In Antananarivo**

- Family is at the centre of received assistance
 - 74% of the individuals have received an assistance from one or more family membre(s)
- Friend's and neighbour's assistance is of secondary importance
 - 30% have received an assistance from friend(s)
 - 30% have received an assistance from neighbour(s)

- **In Paris**

- Friends contribute to assistance at the same level than family
 - 65% have received an assistance from family
 - 62% have received an assistance from friend(s)
- Neighbourhood contributes only in a small part
 - 16% have received an assistance from neighbour(s)

Co-reinforcement of social supports

- **Positive correlation between the different types of assistance**
 - The more one is financially assisted, the more one is...
 - ... assisted in everyday life
 - ... morally supported
- **Positive correlation between the different sources of support**
 - The more one is assisted by family, the more one is assisted by friends and by neighbours
 - For instance, among those with no family support :
 - In Antananarivo :
 - 90% have received no assistance from friends (vs 63%)
 - In Paris :
 - 72% have received no assistance from friends (vs 20%)

Having received assistance during the last 6 months

Avoir reçu une aide au cours des 6 derniers mois de la part	Antananarivo				Quartiers parisiens			
	de la famille	des amis	des voisins	de quelqu'un	de la famille	des amis	des voisins	de quelqu'un
Variables	OR	OR	OR	OR	OR	OR	OR	OR
Sexe								
Femme (ref.)								
Homme	0,92	<u>1,16</u>	<u>0,67</u>	0,94	<u>0,60</u>	<u>0,63</u>	0,84	<u>0,65</u>
Age								
18-29 (ref.)								
30-59	<u>0,58</u>	<u>0,85</u>	1,03	<u>0,62</u>	<u>0,47</u>	<u>0,58</u>	1,43	<u>0,47</u>
60-99	0,85	<u>0,60</u>	0,78	0,83	0,58	0,78	<u>4,55</u>	1,14
Situation d'emploi								
Actif occupé (ref.)								
Chômeur	<u>2,33</u>	0,86	<u>0,72</u>	<u>2,00</u>	1,14	<u>1,82</u>	1,35	<u>1,82</u>
Retraité				-	0,53	<u>0,32</u>	<u>0,29</u>	<u>0,24</u>
(Autre) Inactif	<u>1,32</u>	<u>0,62</u>	0,93	<u>1,22</u>	1,25	1,00	0,75	0,89
Revenu								
1 ^{er} quartile (ref.)								
2 ^{ème} quartile	1,11	1,11	0,97	1,20	<u>1,43</u>	1,41	1,18	<u>1,69</u>
3 ^{ème} quartile	<u>1,43</u>	1,00	1,02	<u>1,52</u>	1,05	<u>1,69</u>	0,81	1,33
4 ^{ème} quartile (riches)	<u>1,61</u>	1,00	<u>0,63</u>	<u>1,72</u>	0,87	1,43	1,10	1,05
Diplôme								
Aucun ou CEP (ref.)								
BEPC, BEP, CAP	<u>1,22</u>	<u>1,45</u>	<u>0,59</u>	1,16	1,04	1,15	0,71	1,16
Baccalauréat	1,16	<u>1,56</u>	<u>0,64</u>	1,04	1,33	<u>1,82</u>	0,91	<u>1,75</u>
> bac	<u>0,72</u>	<u>2,22</u>	<u>0,44</u>	0,78	<u>1,85</u>	<u>2,00</u>	0,69	<u>2,44</u>
Association religieuse								
Non participation (ref.)								
Participation	<u>1,37</u>	1,11	<u>1,67</u>	<u>1,47</u>				
Nationalité								
Français (ref.)							-	
Etranger					<u>0,71</u>	0,94	<u>0,63</u>	0,93

Sources : Enquête 1-2-3 module SIRS 2003, MADIO/DIAL ; Enquête SIRS Paris20ème 2004, INSERM U444

Having received assistance during the last 6 months – logit models

(Odds Ratios adjusted for nationality or association participation)

		Antananarivo	Quartiers parisiens
Gender	Male (vs female)	0,94	<u>0,65</u>
Age	18-29 (ref.)		
	30-59	<u>0,62</u>	<u>0,47</u>
	60-99	0,83	1,14
Professional sit.	Occupied worker (ref.)		
	Unemployed	<u>2,00</u>	<u>1,82</u>
	Retired	-	<u>0,24</u>
	(other) non-working	<u>1,22</u>	0,89
Income	1 st quartile (poor) (ref.)		
	2 nd quartile	1,20	<u>1,69</u>
	3 rd quartile	<u>1,52</u>	1,33
	4 th quartile (rich)	<u>1,72</u>	1,05
Qualification	None (ref.)		
	BEPC, BEP, CAP	1,16	1,16
	Baccalauréat	1,04	<u>1,75</u>
	> Bac	0,78	<u>2,44</u>

To assist one's relatives

Importance of giving to others

- Building social ties (social insertion)
- To give now... to be assisted later
- Social status and role (prestige, feeling of usefulness...)

Position in the social support system

Relative position in the social support system (%)

	Giver & receiver <i>Integrated</i>	Giver & non-receiver <i>Assistant</i>	Non-giver & receiver <i>Assisted</i>	Non-giver & non-receiver <i>Detached</i>
Antananarivo	61,8	8,8	14,3	15,1
Parisian neighborhood	58,0	20,8	7,2	14,0

Sources : Enquête 1-2-3 module SIRS 2003, MADIO/DIAL ; Enquête SIRS Paris20ème 2004, INSERM U444

Who are the « assisted » and « detached » people?

	Assisted		Detached	
	Antananar.	Paris neighb.	Antananar.	Paris neighb.
Gender Male (vs female)	1,198	0,752	0,96	<u>1,79</u>
Age 18-29 (ref.)				
30-59	<u>1,24</u>	0,87	<u>1,40</u>	1,39
60-99	<u>1,61</u>	1,46	1,00	1,44
Professional sit. occupied worker (ref.)				
Unemployed	<u>3,99</u>	1,77	<u>0,55</u>	1,87
Retired	-	1,80	-	2,83
(other) non-working	<u>3,51</u>	1,29	0,93	1,77
Income 1 st quartile (poor) (ref.)				
2 nd quartile	0,80		0,85	<u>0,41</u>
3 rd quartile	1,15		<u>0,47</u>	0,66
4 th quartile	0,89		<u>0,40</u>	<u>0,38</u>
Qualification None (ref.)				
BEPC, BEP, CAP	<u>0,79</u>	0,86	0,87	1,02
Baccalauréat	<u>0,71</u>	0,73	1,08	0,66
> Bac	<u>0,69</u>	0,49	0,87	0,69
Nationality Foreigner (vs French)	-	1,55	-	1,14
Relig. association particip ^o yes (vs no)	<u>0,70</u>	-	<u>0,43</u>	-

Self esteem

- **Self esteem**

- One of the indicators for subjective well-being

- **Indicator of self-esteem**

- 4 items from the Rosenberg' self-esteem scale

- Mostly, I'm satisfied of my-self

- Sometimes I feel I am really useless

- I feel I have some good qualities

- I feel I am able to do things as well as most of people

- Score of self-esteem constructed by quartiles, in each country

Position in the social support system and Self-esteem

Ind. having a low or a high score of self esteem for each position (%)

	integrated	assistant	assisted	detached	total
Antananarivo					
Low self-esteem ($p < 10^{-3}$)	20,4	19,2	39,5	18,6	22,7
High self-esteem ($p = 0,02$)	23,9	28,4	20,3	28,3	24,5
Quartiers parisiens					
Low self-esteem (NS)	21,9	18,4	28,9	15,5	21,2
High self-esteem ($p = 0,005$)	19,7	32,9	26,3	21,1	22,3

Sources : Enquête 1-2-3 module SIRS 2003, MADIO/DIAL ; Enquête SIRS Paris20ème 2004, INSERM U444

Assisted people :

- unfavorable position in terms of self-esteem (in both cities)

Detached people :

- not systematically in social exclusion situation :

Often occupied workers, important sociability, strong family ties, feeling of usefulness...

=> To be detached from social support networks is not necessarily a sign of social exclusion

Conclusion

- **To go beyond the simplist opposition :**
 "strong communitary solidarity in the South"
 vs "individualism in the North"

- **Social support between relatives do not compensate the public intervention**
 The most deprived (in terms of income and/or cultural capital) are also the less socially supported.