



IDS WORKING PAPER

Volume **2012** Number **413**

CSP WORKING PAPER Number 007

Equal Opportunities for All? – A Critical Analysis of Mexico’s *Oportunidades*

Martina Ulrichs and Keetie Roelen
December 2012

The Centre for Social Protection (CSP) supports a global network of partners working to mainstream social protection in development policy and encourage social protection systems and instruments that are comprehensive, long-term, sustainable and pro-poor. We produce research on conceptual approaches; design issues, including delivery, targeting and affordability; and impacts of different social protection initiatives.

Email: socialprotection@ids.ac.uk

Web: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/idsresearch/centre-for-social-protection>

CSP WP 007



The Vulnerability and Poverty Reduction (VPR) Team aims to construct dynamic and multi-dimensional perspectives on vulnerability and poverty in order to transform thinking, policy and practice.

The VPR team produces working papers on social protection; conflict, violence and development; and poverty and inequality. Follow this link to view a full list of publications:

<http://www.ids.ac.uk/team/vulnerability-and-poverty-reduction>

Equal Opportunities for All? – A Critical Analysis of Mexico’s *Oportunidades*
Martina Ulrichs and Keetie Roelen
IDS Working Paper 413

© Institute of Development Studies 2012
ISSN: 2040-0209 ISBN: 978-1-78118-101-0

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

All rights reserved. Reproduction, copy, transmission, or translation of any part of this publication may be made only under the following conditions:

- with the prior permission of the publisher; or
 - with a licence from the Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd., 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1P 9HE, UK,
- or from another national licensing agency; or
- under the terms set out below.

This publication is copyright, but may be reproduced by any method without fee for teaching or nonprofit purposes, but not for resale. Formal permission is required for all such uses, but normally will be granted immediately. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, prior written permission must be obtained from the publisher and a fee may be payable.

Available from:
Central Communications, Institute of Development, Brighton BN1 9RE, UK
Tel: +44 (0) 1273 915637 Fax: +44 (0) 1273 621202

E-mail: bookshop@ids.ac.uk

Web: www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop

IDS is a charitable company limited by guarantee and registered in England (No. 877338)

Equal Opportunities for All? – A Critical Analysis of Mexico's *Oportunidades*

Martina Ulrichs and Keetie Roelen

Summary

In this paper we challenge the theory of change behind the Mexican Conditional Cash Transfer Programme *Oportunidades*, by questioning whether it sufficiently addresses the structural factors that prevent its poorest group of beneficiaries, indigenous people, from climbing out of poverty. Conditional cash transfer programmes like *Oportunidades* make cash transfers conditional upon school attendance and accessing health care services. The theory of change is based on the human capital theory and predicated on individualistic understandings of poverty, assuming that higher levels of education will ultimately translate into higher salaries and better jobs and thus break the intergenerational transmission of poverty.

We argue that the particular situation of indigenous people poses programme-specific and structural constraints on the 'one-size-fits-all' application of *Oportunidades* and challenges its theory of change, thereby compromising its effectiveness in both the short-term and long-run. The remoteness of indigenous communities and the higher levels of marginalisation compromise *Oportunidades'* performance in terms of coverage, outreach and targeting for indigenous people and may exacerbate and reinforce the groups' marginalised and disadvantaged positions in comparison to the non-indigenous population. One of the shortcomings of the programme's theory of change is an insufficient focus on constraining factors in the market, unequal access to good quality education and health care services, as well as different capital and asset levels of individuals who enter the job market. Higher levels of human capital can be an important condition to achieve higher levels of income, but unequal opportunity structures may seriously inhibit the successful progression out of poverty for different groups of poor people.

Oportunidades has had remarkable positive impacts, such as increasing school attendance and facilitating access to health care services for the poor. But in order to be transformative, it needs to be responsive to particular vulnerabilities and it needs to address the underlying causes of poverty.

Keywords: social protection; conditional cash transfers; indigenous people; Mexico.

Martina Ulrichs is currently working at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) as a Research Consultant. She is a recent IDS graduate in Poverty and Development and has worked with international and bilateral development organisations, including UNFPA, Irish Aid, GIZ and the Rockefeller Foundation. Martina's main interest lies in the conceptualisation, design and implementation of social protection programmes that enhance resilience and build sustainable livelihoods for different groups of vulnerable people.

Keetie Roelen is a Research Fellow at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) in the Vulnerability and Poverty Reduction team and a member of the Centre for Social Protection. Her research interests include the dynamics of (child) poverty, social protection and the linkages between child protection and social protection, and the use of mixed-methods approaches to investigate them. Keetie has worked with many international organisations such as UNICEF, World Bank and UNDP, performing research and policy advice work in Southern and Eastern Africa, South East Asia and Central and Eastern Europe.

Contents

- Summary..... 3
- Acknowledgements 5
- Introduction 6

- 1. **CCTs' theory of change** 8

- 2. **Indigenous people in Mexico**..... 9

- 3. ***Oportunidades*: programme overview** 10

- 4. ***Oportunidades* and indigenous people** 13
 - Programme-specific constraints..... 13
 - Structural constraints..... 15

- 5. **Discussion and conclusion** 16

- References**..... 18

Acknowledgements

This working paper is based on the dissertation submitted by Martina Ulrichs for her Masters in Poverty and Development at the Institute of Development Studies in 2011. The authors would like to thank Juan Jaime Loera-Gonzalez and Juan Luis Sariago for their suggestions and comments.

Introduction

In recent years, social protection has become part and parcel of development strategies and the fight against poverty across the globe. The increased popularity of social protection programmes in a 'Post-Washington Consensus' era follows a changing paradigm in development that places the poor at the centre of social policy, and recognises the importance of the role of the state in delivering a minimum safety net (Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010; Fiszbein and Schady 2009). The objectives of social protection are now widely summarised by the '3Ps', referring to the potential of social protection to **protect** people from hardship following poverty, to **prevent** people from falling into poverty, and to **promote** people out of poverty. In addition, momentum is growing around an alternative agenda of social protection; one that is more aspirational and expects social protection to do more than provide short-term relief from poverty or management of risk, but to be grounded in social justice, address underlying causes of vulnerability and be **transformative** (Devereux, McGregor and Sabates-Wheeler 2011; Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler 2004).

Conditional cash transfers (CCTs) have become an increasingly popular social protection instrument in the last decade, and are widely considered to be one of the interventions that have the potential to be protective, preventive, promotive, as well as transformative. In this paper, we argue that if CCTs, and social protection at large, aspire to 'promote' people out of poverty and be truly transformational they have to respond to the particular needs and structural causes of vulnerability in their programme design, to compensate for higher opportunity costs in complying with the conditions, incurred due to remoteness and limited access to services. In addition, we postulate that CCTs need to be accompanied by structural changes that go beyond behavioural ones at the individual level and address issues such as quality of education, social mobility and labour market conditions. We do so by considering the case of indigenous people in Mexico in reference to the Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Programme *Oportunidades*.

Mexico's CCT *Oportunidades* was launched in 1997 under the name PROGRESA, the Spanish acronym for Education, Health and Nutrition Programme (*Programa de Educación, Salud y Alimentación*)¹. Following the premise of the human capital theory, the programme aims to facilitate access to education and incentivise the poor to invest in human capital in a bid to provide them with the necessary tools to lift themselves out of poverty. The assumption that the cash transfer will help to reduce the short-term opportunity cost of poor families involved in sending their children to school is an important element of *Oportunidades*' theory of change and is based on an individualistic concept of poverty (Levy 2006). From a long-term perspective, investments in higher levels of education are expected to translate into better paid skilled jobs and break the cycle of the intergenerational transmission of poverty. Together with Brazil's smaller programme *Bolsa Escola* (consequently absorbed by *Bolsa Família*), *Oportunidades* pioneered this concept of anti-poverty programmes and is today the second largest CCT in Latin America and the Caribbean in terms of the absolute number of beneficiaries (Niño-Zarazua 2010: 11).

We argue that one of the shortcomings of the human capital theory, and ultimately the programmes emerging from it, is an insufficient focus on constraining factors in the market, unequal physical access to social services due to geographical remoteness, as well as different capital and asset levels of individuals who enter the job market. Such structural factors undermine the assumptions underlying the human capital theory and thereby

¹ Hereafter the programme will only be referred to as *Oportunidades*. It was renamed from PROGRESA in 2001, when the then new Fox administration adopted the programme and extended it to urban areas (www.opotunidades.gob.mx, accessed 25 July 2011)

challenge the theory of change of social protection programmes based on it. Higher levels of human capital can be an important condition to achieve higher levels of income, but unequal opportunity structures may seriously inhibit the successful progression out of poverty for different groups of poor people. In this paper, we argue that particular programme-specific and structural constraints prevent indigenous people in Mexico from benefiting from *Oportunidades*, as spelled out in its theory of change.

At a programme level, issues pertaining to the design and implementation compromise access and coverage of indigenous people. Structural constraints include deeply rooted inequalities such as lack of social mobility, access to quality health services and education, as well as wage differentials, and challenge the programme's theory of change built on the premise that higher levels of human capital translate into higher incomes. Although indigenous households may benefit from the programme in terms of the receipt of transfers and increased access to health centres and schools, the structure of opportunities they face to translate these into long-term strategies and escape poverty is less conducive than to that of non-indigenous people.

Mexico's indigenous people (defined as those who speak an indigenous language) are disproportionately represented among the poor. Despite only comprising around 11 per cent of the national population, in 2008 a quarter of the people below the national food poverty line were indigenous (González de Alba 2010: 457). The discrepancy between indigenous and non-indigenous poverty has remained consistent over time and has been consistently reflected in poverty results using different measurements and approaches. The gap between indigenous and non-indigenous people is considerable in terms of severity of poverty as well as geographical marginalisation and access to public services (García-Moreno and Patrinos 2011; CDI-UNDP 2010; CONEVAL 2011a).

The high proportion of indigenous people among the poor is reflected in the disproportionate representation of indigenous beneficiaries in *Oportunidades*: one out of four programme beneficiaries is indigenous (World Bank 2012: 14). However, despite this high proportion, *Oportunidades* does not include any special provision to address the higher levels of indigenous poverty and marginalisation, which places programme-specific and structural constraints on the theory of change. We argue that CCTs, and social protection at large, can only 'promote' people out of poverty and be truly transformational if it responds to varying geographical and socioeconomic conditions that influence programme access and coverage and internalises causes of vulnerability which trap different groups in society into poverty.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: The next section lays out the main elements of the theory of change underlying the programme of a CCT like *Oportunidades*. This is followed by an analysis of indigenous poverty in Mexico and some of the main structural factors, which have led to the perpetuation and reproduction of indigenous poverty over time. The third section introduces the main components of the *Oportunidades* programme, as well as its main achievements and shortcomings. We then argue in the fourth section that the particular situation of indigenous people poses programme-specific and structural constraints on the 'one-size-fits-all' application of *Oportunidades* and challenges its theory of change, thereby compromising its effectiveness in both the short-term and the long-run. The final section will conclude that *Oportunidades* can address some of these constraints by seeking to accommodate the particular needs of indigenous people within its programme design. The structural constraints however require a broader coordination and complementarity between different public policy interventions, particularly with respect to improving the quality of education and health services in remote rural areas. Both are crucial for the programme's theory of change to overcome the intergenerational transmission of poverty.

1. CCTs' theory of change

CCTs have become increasingly popular in the last decade and can now be found across the world with almost every country in Latin America running a CCT programme (Fiszbein and Schady 2009; de Brauw and Hoddinott 2007; Hanlon *et al.* 2010). The role for cash transfers in development and the acknowledgement of their potential to reduce income poverty and increasing levels of well-being, has gained unprecedented momentum. Cash transfers have been described as 'a paradigmatic shift in poverty reduction' (Hanlon *et al.* 2010: 4) and 'an effective intervention to enhance the participation of the poor in economic development and combat inequality, social exclusion and chronic poverty' (Stewart and Handa 2010).

CCTs aim to break the intergenerational cycle of poverty through compliance with certain conditions that promote the investment in human capital formation, based on the theory of accumulation of human capital as a recipe for the eradication of poverty (Fiszbein and Schady 2009; Skoufias and Parker 2003). Advances in poverty research have widely acknowledged the relevance of good health for productivity, and education and health interventions are increasingly combined with transfers to augment the returns to human capital accumulation (Schultz 1997; cited in Mayer-Foulkes 2008: 776).

Underlying the human capital theory lies an individualistic concept of poverty, where poverty is the result of personal deficiencies or a sequence of poor choices made throughout a lifetime (Royce 2009). People are poor because they miscalculated the short-term versus long-term benefits of their actions. One example is choosing to send their children to work instead of school. Underinvestment in education arises from a misperception, whereby the expected results from education are perceived as being lower than the realised returns. In some cases, the poor might be aware of the long-term benefits of education, but simply depend on the immediate income generated by a child and cannot afford the opportunity cost of education (Attanasio, Orazio and Kaufman 2007, cited in Fiszbein and Schady 2009: 9). Similar arguments hold with respect to investments in health, nutrition and other forms of human capital formation or accumulation of productive assets, whereby potential gains in the long-term compete with unfulfilled needs in the short-term. CCTs aim to bridge this gap between the short-term investment in human capital and the long-term benefits for future generations by providing monthly cash stipends which are made conditional on school attendance and health check-ups.

In terms of education, the theory of change behind CCTs is based on the assumption that higher levels of education lead to reduced poverty and vulnerability in the future, through access to higher paid skilled labour. In other words, it assumes that movements out of poverty, as well as a failure to do so, are entirely attributable to individual choice and behaviour. Yet, for higher levels of education to lead to positive outcomes in the long-run, one has to assume a well-functioning educational system, a perfectly working labour market, no constraints to social mobility and a scheme in which competent and proficient workers will be rewarded with higher salaries. CCTs are based on a highly individualistic perspective of poverty, correlating differences in wages with differences in productivity, but disregarding non-economic constraints such as discrimination or social exclusion that are largely structural and cannot be overcome by individual choice and behaviour. A disregard of such constraints ignores the actual opportunities that people have to receive high quality education, and the extent to which higher levels of education can be translated into positive outcomes.

This paper challenges the human capital theory mainly with respect to the educational and health component of *Oportunidades*, arguing that its underlying assumptions do not take into account the structural factors that keep the most disadvantaged indigenous people in poverty, thereby undermining the programme's theory of change and potential long-run positive effects for this particular group.

2. Indigenous people in Mexico

Mexico's indigenous people are highly heterogeneous, comprising 11 linguistic groups with up to 356 variations (CDI- UNDP 2010). Indigeneity is defined along linguistic lines and someone is considered to be indigenous if they, or the head of household, speak one of the 11 officially recognised indigenous languages. According to this definition 10.92 per cent (11.67 million people) of the total Mexican population is indigenous (INEGI 2008). Despite their cultural and linguistic heterogeneity, indigenous people are generally characterised by high levels of social, political, economic and cultural marginalisation.

The most recent multidimensional poverty figures published by the National Evaluation Commission (CONEVAL) estimate that 79.3 per cent of indigenous people fall below the national poverty line and of these 40.2 per cent are considered to be extremely poor². The gap between the indigenous poor and non-indigenous poor remains significant and a recent study by the World Bank reveals that some of the most important factors sustaining this gap can be attributed to differences in education and access to services (Garcia-Moreno and Patrinos 2011). The high levels of marginalisation are also reflected in low human development indexes (HDI) across indigenous communities. More than half of the twenty municipalities with the lowest HDI in Mexico are more the 70 per cent indigenous, whilst the ten municipalities with the highest HDI have very low percentages of indigenous population. The gap ranges from the poorest municipality of Batopilas, Chihuahua, with an HDI of 0.3010 to the richest municipality in the country, with an HDI of 0.9207 in Tlahelilpan, Hidalgo (UNDP 2010: 34).

These low levels of human development are closely related to high levels of geographical marginalisation and concentration in the poorest regions of the country. 72 per cent of indigenous people live in small (less than 2500 households) rural communities with no direct access to quality public services (CDI- UNDP 2010). Furthermore, there are around half a million indigenous people who are considered to live in *localidades confidenciales* (confidential locations). This is an official category applied by the National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI) for areas where there are only 1-2 houses. Due to the small size of these locations, any household data obtained through a census could be directly attributed to individual households, which would violate the confidentiality requirements established by the Mexican Statistics Law. Hence, there is no household data available for these *localidades confidenciales* since they are not included in the national census, which collects much of the socio-economic data public programmes are based on. Due to the poor infrastructure and transport system, as well as the lack of political incentives to invest in these remote regions, indigenous people living in these *localidades confidenciales* have remained historically out of reach of public services and neglected by the government (UNDP 2010: 52).

² Poverty in Mexico is measured according to a multidimensional poverty line, using a combination of deficiencies in some of the 8 socio-economic dimensions as well as an income poverty line as benchmarks. According to this new measurement a person is considered to be *moderately poor* if they are below the income poverty line and lack one of the 8 dimensions. The *extremely poor* are defined as those who are below the income poverty line and have deficiencies in 3 or more of the socio-economic dimensions (CONEVAL 2011).

Further characteristics that distinguish indigenous people from non-indigenous people are higher levels of economic and social discrimination. People living in communities with high percentages of indigenous population earn only 26-46 per cent of the average income of people in non-indigenous communities, for the same level of education, age and occupation (Ramirez 2006: 153). The total share of income of the indigenous population is 5.1 per cent of the national total, despite constituting 10.8 per cent of the total population. Furthermore, the quality of the sources of income between indigenous and non-indigenous people differs significantly. Whilst non-indigenous people tend to have higher relative shares of sources of income that tend to increase with respect to total income (e.g. rents, bonuses, pensions), indigenous people tend to have a greater relative share in sources of income, which are associated with the lower income strata, such as government benefits, and production for self-consumption (González de Alba 2010: 453).

The discrimination of indigenous people is also deeply embedded in the way they are perceived in society. A study commissioned by the National Council for the Prevention of Discrimination, CONAPRED (*Consejo Nacional para Prevenir la Discriminación*), revealed that 19.5 per cent of the participants belonging to an 'ethnic group'³ feel that discrimination by society is one of the main problems they face, ranking it higher than poverty, violation of their rights and even unemployment (CONAPRED 2011: 54). 39.1 per cent of them believe they have unequal opportunities in getting a job; 33 per cent say they do not receive the same support from the government as non-ethnic groups; and 27.1 per cent feel they do not have the same opportunity for receiving quality healthcare services (CONAPRED 2011: 56).

Hence, indigenous people are disproportionately affected by higher levels of poverty and discrimination, which are maintained by a structural context of geographical, social and political exclusion (Loera-González 2011). Within *Oportunidades* these characteristics work in at least two ways against indigenous people: they lead to programme-specific constraints that put them at a disadvantage in comparison to non-indigenous beneficiaries in less remote areas, in terms of access to services and opportunity costs to comply with the conditions, and they challenge the programme's theory of change and its assumptions about translating short-term benefits into long-term gains by investing in individuals rather than in addressing the underlying structural causes that maintain them in poverty.

3. *Oportunidades*: programme overview

Oportunidades started in 1997 within the context of post-economic crisis and political instability in Mexico. Structural adjustment policies in the 1980s and 1990s had left the country in economic crisis and the liberalisation policies dramatically changed the conditions in the labour market. As a reaction to increasing patterns of inequality and in the light of social unrest, the Zedillo administration (1994-2000) introduced a conditional cash transfer programme to mitigate the impacts of the reforms on the poor (Levy 2006: 13).

The programme started with 140,544 households in 3,369 rural localities, with the objective to gradually reach national coverage. Full coverage of poor rural households was claimed to have been reached by the programme in 2000, with nearly 2.6 million families in all 31 states (Skoufias 2005: 1). In 2001, the programme was extended to semi-urban and urban communities. In 2010, it covered 5.8 million beneficiary families, but with seven out of ten *Oportunidades* beneficiaries living in localities of 2,500 inhabitants or less, the programme

³ It has been noted that the study does not specify which groups are covered by this category and hence it cannot be said if it is equivalent to indigenous people.

has kept a strong rural focus (www.oportunidades.gob.mx, accessed 02 January 2012). Based on the theory of change of CCTs, *Oportunidades* aims to overcome the intergenerational transmission of poverty through two different types of cash transfers: food and school grants from primary to secondary school.

The two transfers are linked to separate and independent conditionality requirements, which are constantly monitored by the public service providers. The food grant, which is the same amount for all beneficiary households, is conditional on health check-ups for all family members, with particular emphasis on very young children and lactating or pregnant women. It also includes a fixed amount of cash for the households' energy consumption. The cash is transferred directly to the mothers, who are required to attend communal education workshops ('*pláticas*') on specific issues related to health and nutrition. Compliance with these conditionalities is closely tracked by the staff at the health centre, and failure to comply for four consecutive months or six non-consecutive months results in a family being expelled (Oportunidades 2011). The school grants on the other hand, are linked to specific children in the household; the amount increases with each educational level achieved and is higher for girls than for boys once they enter secondary school. Children must have a monthly attendance rate of 85 per cent in order to receive the school grant; non-compliance leads to the grant being retrieved, but does not lead to the expulsion of the family from the nutrition and health component of the programme (Oportunidades 2011; Álvarez, Devoto and Winters 2007).

In comparison to other CCTs, where conditionalities are implemented more loosely, *Oportunidades* monitors compliance rigidly and non-compliance with the health conditions has led to the expulsion of beneficiary households⁴. This inflexibility of the programme is particularly disadvantageous for households in remote areas with limited access to social services, who have higher transport costs and less reliable services. The programme has been scrutinised by civil society and media for this inflexibility, which has led to the expulsion of some of the poorest and most marginalised indigenous groups in the country, such as the Rarámuri in the Mexican state of Chihuahua (Milenio 2012; Sariego 2011).

Targeting within *Oportunidades* is a two-stage process. Firstly, recipient communities are identified through the national Deprivation Index (*Índice de Marginación*) developed from the data of the national population census⁵, which is complemented with data provided by other government entities to include localities not captured in the Deprivation Index. In the second stage of the targeting process, a household survey is undertaken and eligibility of households is assessed on the basis of a proxy means test. This serves to capture the socio-economic data of each household and provide them with a beneficiary registration number (Oportunidades 2011; Escobar Latapí and González de la Rocha 2008: 448; Álvarez *et al.* 2007: 642).

In the first years of the programme, there were no mechanisms in place to 'graduate' households, and beneficiary families kept receiving the transfers unless they failed to comply with the conditions. This changed in 2004, when the Scheme for Differentiated Support EDA (*Esquema Diferenciado de Apoyo*) was introduced. Since then household eligibility is re-evaluated every three years, and if households are above the cut-off point they enter the EDA scheme and benefits are slowly phased out (González de la Rocha 2006: 19; Álvarez *et al.* 2007: 642). The amount of beneficiaries who are transferred to the EDA scheme is very small. In an evaluation undertaken by the Federal Auditing Agency (ASF) in 2009 only 6.4 per cent of beneficiaries who had been in the programme for 11 years were recorded to have moved to the EDA scheme (CEFP 2011).

⁴ Non-compliance with the conditions related to the health component in four months, or six inconsecutive months, leads to expulsion (Oportunidades 2012).

⁵ The Deprivations Index is constructed by social indicators: i) very high, ii) high, iii) medium, iv) low, v) very low. The groups with high or very high deprivation levels are prioritised for inclusion in the programme (INSP 2005b).

Several evaluations of the programme have reported positive impacts on beneficiary households, including indigenous ones. In terms of impacts on health, *Oportunidades'* conditionality component has had a positive effect on increasing attendance to health centres, particularly for prenatal care, nutritional and vaccinations. Evaluations have also reported positive impacts in beneficiary communities on reducing prevalence of obesity, infant mortality and high blood pressure (INSP 2003 and 2005a). In general, beneficiary families show a greater willingness to participate in healthcare campaigns and tend to be more aware of their health status (Sánchez López 2008: 110).

The impacts on health however tend to be major in communities with direct access to basic services, which is reflected in better provision of services and more accurate diagnosis (CIESAS 2008). In remote areas with deficient health infrastructure, access to health care services can become an obstacle to participating in the programme. Only 21.9 per cent of communities with more than 40 per cent of indigenous people have direct access to health services (CDI-UNDP 2010). The available health centres in rural areas, and particularly in indigenous areas, tend to suffer from very low quality services with a high turnover of staff, lack of medication and inadequate facilities (González de la Rocha, Paredes Bañuelos and Sánchez López 2008: 131; Sánchez López 2008: 107; CONEVAL 2011b). This not only leads to a limited effectiveness of the health component of the programme, but also creates distrust among beneficiaries who often opt to go to health care centres which are further away, thus increasing the opportunity costs and causing a strain on the households' economy (Sánchez López 2008; Álvarez *et al.* 2008). The quality of the health care providers has also been identified as one factor which impacts significantly on drop-out rates of beneficiaries. Álvarez *et al.* (2008) found that beneficiaries in communities with access to the health centres provided by the Ministry of Health (SSA) had much lower survival rates due to poor quality of the service, as compared to those with access to the National Institute of Social Security (IMSS) 'Solidaridad' programme (Álvarez *et al.* 2008: 655). The high levels of fragmentation of the health sector and unequal access to good health care services are a nation-wide issue, which lies outside the realm of the *Oportunidades* programme but is an essential structural element for its success. In its most recent evaluation, the National Evaluation Commission (CONEVAL) identified the discrepancies in the quality of health care provision as one of the programme's major obstacles and urged for more inter-sectorial coordination of the programme with health care providers to ensure a better delivery of services (CONEVAL 2011b).

In terms of results of the education component, school attendance of indigenous beneficiaries has increased and the programme has contributed significantly to narrowing the gap in school enrolment between indigenous and non-indigenous children, particularly for girls and for students from secondary level upwards (World Bank 2012: 20; Bando, López-Calva and Patrinos 2005). Yet there are still significant inequalities in terms of the quality of education obtained. The quality of education is particularly poor in rural areas with high proportions of indigenous people, and a strong public-private as well as urban-rural divide is reflected in the national assessments of educational attainments and quality of teaching (*Estándares Nacionales*). Amongst the test scores of public schools in rural areas, those with high proportions of indigenous students have consistently obtained lower test scores than all other types of schools (Ramírez 2006: 186; CONEVAL 2011b). Some of the main problems of schools in indigenous areas are the high numbers of students per teacher, frequent teacher absenteeism, high costs of travelling long distances to schools, as well as linguistic barriers for monolingual students (World Bank 2012; Parker, Rubacalva and Teruel 2005). Although the quality of education is not in the realm of *Oportunidades*, it is a major hindering factor for the theory of change, which assumes that higher levels of education are equivalent to a higher set of skills.

4. *Oportunidades* and indigenous people

Oportunidades has been described as a 'milestone' in terms of coverage of indigenous areas which were previously neglected by social programmes (González de la Rocha *et al.* 2008: 131). In the process of scaling up, *Oportunidades* has nearly reached full coverage of municipalities with indigenous households and 93.7 per cent of all indigenous people are covered by the programme (World Bank 2012: 14). This has been a remarkable progress, but despite the significant representation of indigenous people in the programme, *Oportunidades* does not include any special provisions to account for the different cultural, socio-economic and geographic characteristics of indigenous livelihoods and it fails to reach out to the poorest most marginalised indigenous households in the *localidades confidenciales*. Sariego (2011) observed that the extensive rules of operation of the programme only make 12 references to indigenous people, and that these are limited to the issue of bilingual schools. The programme is reluctant to treat indigenous recipients differently, arguing that this would be a form of discrimination by stigmatising them as being poor because they are indigenous. It does however acknowledge the necessity of a differential treatment to obtain gender equity, by awarding higher school grants for girls than boys (Sariego 2011: 32).

The few evaluations that have been undertaken to assess the differential impact of *Oportunidades* on indigenous and non-indigenous people have revealed that, notwithstanding positive effects, indigenous people are at a disadvantage due to the programme's inability to account for the structural circumstances which keep them socially excluded (Sánchez López 2008; Sariego 2008, 2011; González de la Rocha *et al.* 2008; World Bank 2012; De la Peña, Bastos and Calonge 2012). Some of these, such as high levels of geographic dispersion, poor infrastructure and low social mobility, have been highlighted in the previous section. These particular factors impacting on indigenous livelihoods make their 'structure of opportunities' (González de la Rocha *et al.* 2008: 132) less conducive to escaping poverty and undermine *Oportunidades*' potential impact in two ways: (i) they compromise the programme-specific 'one-size-fits-all' approach with respect to design and implementation, leading to issues in terms of quality of coverage and outreach in the short-term; and (ii) structural constraints challenge the programme's theory of change and the assumption, grounded in the human capital theory and individualised understandings of poverty, that higher levels of education lead to improved outcomes in the long-run.

Programme-specific constraints

Factors characterising the situation of indigenous people undermine *Oportunidades*' programme design and implementation at two levels. Firstly, despite high levels of coverage, there is a small but persistently excluded and marginalised group of indigenous people living in *localidades confidenciales* which is not covered by the programme due to its extreme geographical remoteness and lack of socio-economic household data necessary for the targeting process. Secondly, the indigenous households that are included in the programme are to a large proportion situated in remote and hard-to-reach areas with no direct or limited access to services, which compromises their ability to adhere to conditions and thereby to receive the full transfer. Geographical remoteness and limited access to services implies higher opportunity costs for the majority of indigenous beneficiaries, which the fixed amount of the transfer does not take into account.

Despite having officially reached national coverage, *Oportunidades* excludes a great proportion of the half a million people living in the highly remote and marginalised *localidades confidenciales*, since the majority of them have no access to social services.

They represent widely dispersed households that are difficult and costly to reach by any government programmes. They have been left out of the national census, which provides the socio-economic data for the national Deprivation Index. Since these *localidades confidenciales* are not included in the Deprivation Index, they are not considered in the first targeting phase of *Oportunidades* which is based on community marginalisation (see section two). Even if they were included through direct inclusion, the lack of access to social services and resulting inability to comply with the programme's conditionalities make these households ineligible for the programme. The programme claims to have full coverage, yet excludes the poorest and most marginalised people in the country. This misconception of full coverage might lead to the further neglect of these *localidades confidenciales* through public policy, which would inevitably create a 'second poverty floor' (Sariego 2011: 29). The programme claims to include these localities through the Food Support Programme PAL (*Programa de Apoyo Alimentario*), which used to function as a separate programme but since 2010 falls under the same administration as *Oportunidades*. It was originally introduced to target particularly those households that were not eligible for *Oportunidades* due to a lack of access to social services. PAL has recently been extended to 87,000 families living in highly remote indigenous areas (Oportunidades 2010) and although this is a step towards including some remote households into public programmes, the measure itself only has the potential to alleviate food poverty on a short-term basis. Furthermore, there are some households that live in communities with access to social services and are entitled to *Oportunidades*, yet only receive the food support through PAL (CONEVAL 2011b).

Beyond coverage, the modes of operation of the programme are set universally for all beneficiary households. Consequently, demographic dispersion and geographic inaccessibility will cause programmes to operate at lower levels of quality and efficiency in indigenous communities. One example of this is the operation of the Attention and Registration Centres, CARs (*Centros de Atención y Registro*), which monitor and administer compliance with the conditionality of transfers and deliver the benefits. They were introduced in 2004 to ensure a better link between the beneficiaries and the *Oportunidades* programme (Oportunidades 2011). Each CAR is allocated a fixed number of 8,000 households, regardless of their level of dispersion or accessibility. Consequently, promoters working for CARs in highly remote areas have to spend more time reaching the different households and have less time to dedicate to the beneficiaries. Furthermore, promoters are not trained to work in indigenous communities and the programme's operational dynamics are hindered when the flow of reliable information between programme representatives and its beneficiaries is not tailored to cultural and linguistic differences (Sánchez López 2008: 111; Sariego 2008). In regions like the northern Tarahumara, for example, where households are highly dispersed and mostly indigenous, CARs should be allocated a smaller number of households to adjust to the geographical context and improve the quality of assistance provided (Sariego 2008: 213-215).

Finally, spatial remoteness increases the opportunity costs related to collection of benefits and compliance with the conditions. Benefit levels are the same for all households and do not take into account distance from schools or health centres, or depth of poverty. The net transfer, after deducting the higher cost of transport incurred due to geographical remoteness and limited access to services, is thus lower for indigenous people than for non-indigenous ones (González de la Rocha *et al.* 2008: 136). Furthermore, indigenous people tend to be generally poorer than non-indigenous ones. The fact that the cash stipend is the same for all beneficiaries (with the exception of higher school grants for girls), not taking into account poverty levels and opportunity costs, means that the net amount of the cash transfer is smaller for indigenous people than for non-indigenous beneficiaries with lower opportunity costs.

This 'ethno-territorial' element of indigenous poverty should thus be taken into account in the project design, to ensure that beneficiaries with different poverty profiles can benefit equally from the programme (Sariego 2011: 29; Sánchez López 2008: 109; World Bank 2012: 22). One option would be to integrate a differential amount of cash for beneficiaries living in particularly remote areas, to cover the higher participation cost to comply with conditionality requirement. It has also been suggested that indigenous beneficiaries should be included by default in the programme to avoid exclusion errors (Sariego 2011). However, this might not be sufficient in the case of households with limited access to social services who will not be able to comply with the conditionality requirements of the programme. More comprehensive policies will need to be developed to address the causes of their marginalisation.

Structural constraints

The theory of change in terms of long-term impacts of *Oportunidades* is grounded on the assumption that higher levels of education, accompanied by health and nutrition interventions, lead to lower levels of poverty and vulnerability. This theory of change can be challenged with regards to two structural constraints. Firstly, the quality of services provided to indigenous beneficiary households when complying with conditions are sub-standard due to issues of remoteness and language barriers. Secondly, the lack of social mobility and discrimination in the labour market challenge the long-term objective of *Oportunidades*, and basic premise of the human capital theory, that investments in human capital have the potential to break intergenerational transmissions of poverty.

The low quality of education and healthcare services is related to the geographic remoteness of the indigenous poor, which has been identified as one of the main obstacles to reaching the programme's objectives of accumulation of human capital (Behrman, Parker and Todd 2009; Boltvinik 2005; Skoufias 2005; *Oportunidades* 2008). This does not exclusively affect indigenous people, yet they are disproportionately burdened by it. According to the former United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous People, the poor quality of education for indigenous people embodies one of the main forms of discrimination against them (Stavenhagen 2005: 97). The curriculum of schools in indigenous communities is still heavily influenced by the *indigenismo* policies of cultural assimilation, despite attempts to push towards cultural integration. The curricula are often designed in Spanish and tailored for an urban population, rather than being adapted to the languages and cultural contexts of indigenous people. Consequently, indigenous students, and particularly monolingual ones, score the lowest in tests and are more likely to drop-out prematurely (Parker *et al.* 2005). Attempts to promote intercultural training for teachers and further bicultural and bilingual education have not had the necessary impact due to insufficient political support and resources (Stavenhagen 2005: 103-106).

Decade-long neglect by public programmes and limited investments in infrastructure in indigenous regions means that indigenous people are faced with bigger hurdles to participate in the programme and benefit from increased exposure to social services. The low quality of education amongst the indigenous population has been identified as one of the reasons why returns to higher levels of education in general are likely to be lower for them than for non-indigenous people with the same level of education (Hall and Patrinos 2006: 226). A recent assessment of the quality of teaching has shown that *Oportunidades* beneficiaries in general score lower capacity assessments, with 30 per cent of non-indigenous beneficiaries and 56 per cent of indigenous beneficiaries leaving primary school without having acquired the necessary competencies to continue successfully with secondary school (CONEVAL 2011b). *Oportunidades* does not address the issue around the quality of services, but only facilitates access to education. Access to education alone

does not increase human capital and consequently will not result in higher incomes for indigenous people, since the education received is suboptimal and does not equip beneficiaries with the necessary or adequate skills to access better paid jobs.

In order to achieve the human capital goals, the government needs to work on providing sufficient and adequate supply. In some cases this might involve the provision of services where they did not previously exist, whilst in others it means improving the quality of those services that are already in place (Fiszbein and Schady 2009: 23). Yet *Oportunidades* has not been accompanied by any measures to improve the quantity and quality of services (Escobar Latapí and González de la Rocha 2008: 451). For the programme to be transformative on the long-term, rather than assistentialist, it needs to be coordinated with policy interventions which address the deficiencies in the education and health sectors (CONEVAL 2011b).

In addition to low quality of services, long-term impacts are further undermined by a significant wage gap between indigenous and non-indigenous people with the same levels of education and in the same occupational activity, and by a lack of social mobility to translate a higher level of education into a matching job. In 1989, indigenous peoples' monthly earnings were about one third of that of non-indigenous people, but by 2002 they had fallen to just one quarter. It is particularly concerning that the earnings gap increased among the population that usually benefits from higher levels of education: young workers, those with completed levels of secondary education and non-agricultural workers (Ramírez 2006: 154).

Social mobility and occupational flexibility in Mexico have decreased in the aftermath of structural adjustment policies in the 1990s (Cortés and Escobar Latapí 2005; González de la Rocha and Escobar Latapí 2008). For a programme built on the assumption that higher levels of human capital will lead people out of poverty, it is vital to consider the job opportunities available to beneficiaries after leaving school. González de la Rocha *et al.* (2008) documented the impact of the programme on the occupational activity of former beneficiaries of *Oportunidades*, by comparing the occupation of indigenous and non-indigenous ex-beneficiaries and their peers. The study revealed that the job opportunities in indigenous regions are very limited, especially for young people who graduate with higher levels of education. One of the few options they have is to migrate. However, due to high dependence on their own social networks after migration, indigenous migrants often get locked into a cycle of working in low-paid and low-skilled jobs, with little opportunity to access better paid, higher-skilled occupations. In most cases young indigenous people find work in the service industry, in commercial activities or in the manufacturing business (González de la Rocha *et al.* 2008: 141).

5. Discussion and conclusion

This paper argues that for social protection to address underlying drivers of poverty and vulnerability and to be transformative, it needs to be cognisant of and responsive to groups' particular vulnerabilities, as well as be accompanied by structural changes beyond remit of social protection programming. It does so by providing a critical analysis of Mexico's *Oportunidades*' theory of change in reference to a particularly vulnerable group in society, namely indigenous people.

Oportunidades was put in place in the late 1990s to address the high levels of poverty and inequality that resulted from structural adjustment reforms in the country. It marked a milestone in Mexican social policy and set a model for CCT programmes in Latin America and the world. The scope and impact of *Oportunidades* has been remarkable, yet it is

necessary to critically analyse whether the model lives up to its promises and benefits different types of poor people equally. Despite indigenous people in Mexico being amongst the most vulnerable and marginalised, *Oportunidades* fails to appropriately and adequately address the structural causes perpetuating their poverty. The remoteness of indigenous communities and the higher levels of marginalisation do not lend themselves well to the 'one-size-fits-all' programme design and implementation, compromising *Oportunidades*' performance in terms of coverage, outreach and targeting for indigenous people. To the contrary, it runs the risk of perpetuating and reinforcing the groups' marginalised and disadvantaged positions in comparison to the non-indigenous population. In terms of the potential for long-term positive outcomes, indigenous people in Mexico are unable to benefit from *Oportunidades* along the lines of the programme's theory of change due to structural constraints. Poor quality education, limited social networks and labour market mobility and wage differentials result in unequal opportunities in terms of translating improved educational attainment into higher incomes.

Oportunidades is failing indigenous people in Mexico because it is predicated on an individualistic understanding of what causes poverty and what needs to be done to overcome it. The programme's theory of change reflects this individualistic understanding in that it places the sole responsibility for moving out of poverty on individuals, making it dependent on their individual choices and behaviour. We argue that for social protection to truly support indigenous people in their efforts to move out of poverty, it needs to 1) adapt its design to counter geographic, demographic and socioeconomic conditions that prevent indigenous people from escaping poverty, and 2) go hand-in-hand with addressing structural constraints that indigenous people try to negotiate but have little to no influence on.

At a programme level, a differential approach towards indigenous people could enhance the programme's effectiveness by addressing the issues around remoteness, differential access to services and consequently higher opportunity costs for the poorest beneficiaries of the programme. Options include a smaller catchment area for the CAR's and higher transfers for beneficiaries living further away from service providers. Furthermore, conditionalities could be less rigid in the case of beneficiaries who live in areas with limited access to health services and schools. Such a 'sensitive' approach to social protection has already been argued for with respect to gender (Jones and Holmes 2010), children (Sabates-Wheeler and Roelen 2011) and people affected by HIV (Yates, Chandan and Lim Ah Ken 2010; Temin 2008).

For *Oportunidades* to be 'transformative', the structural constraints need to be addressed through a more holistic development agenda, which places a stronger emphasis on the complementarity and coordination of development interventions. Reducing the nation-wide inequalities related to the quality of education and access to good health care services is part of the parcel and a vital step towards addressing the supply-side constraints placed on *Oportunidades*' long-term objective of overcoming the intergenerational transmission of poverty through the accumulation of human capital. This goes hand in hand with addressing the structural causes of poverty and inequality. Discrepancies in the quality of healthcare and education between rural and urban areas, and private and public providers, will remain the main structural constraining factor of *Oportunidades*' theory of change, unless it is addressed by a more comprehensive social policy agenda.

References

- Álvarez, C.; Devoto, F. and Winters, P. (2007) 'Why do Beneficiaries Leave the Safety Net in Mexico? A Study of the Effects of Conditionality on Dropouts', *World Development* 36.4: 641-658
- Bando, G.R.; López-Calva, L.F. and Patrinos, H.A. (2005) *Child Labour, School Attendance, and Indigenous Households: Evidence from Mexico*, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3487, Washington DC: World Bank
- Behrman, J.R.; Parker, S.W. and Todd, P. (2009) 'Schooling Impacts of Conditional Cash Transfers on Young Children: Evidence from Mexico', *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 57.3: 439-477
- Boltvinik, J. (2005) 'Políticas Focalizadas de Combate a la Pobreza en México. El Progreso/Oportunidades' ['Targeted Poverty Eradication Policies in Mexico. Progreso/Oportunidades'] in J. Boltvinik and A. Damián (eds), *La Pobreza en México y el Mundo – Realidades y Desafíos [Poverty in Mexico and the World – Realities and Challenges]*, Mexico City and Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores
- CDI- UNDP (2010) *Cédulas de información básica de los pueblos indígenas de México. Base de datos municipal 2005 [Official information on indigenous people. Municipal database 2005]*, Mexico City: Comisión Nacional para el Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas, United Nations Development Programme
- CEFP (2011) Pobreza urbana y pobreza rural [Urban and rural poverty], *Nota Informativa notacefp/035/2011*, Centro de Estudios de las Finanzas Públicas www.cefp.gob.mx/publicaciones/nota/2011/septiembre/notacefp0352011.pdf (accessed 27 June 2012)
- CIESAS (2008) *Evaluación Cualitativa de Impacto de Largo Plazo del Programa Oportunidades en Zonas Rurales [Long-Term Qualitative Impact Evaluation of Oportunidades in Rural Areas]*, Documento técnico sobre salud, Guadalajara: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios en Antropología Social
- CONAPRED (2011) *Encuesta Nacional sobre Discriminación en México Enadis 2010 - Resultados Generales, [National Survey on Discrimination in Mexico Enadis 2010 – General Results]*, Mexico City: Consejo Nacional para Prevenir la Discriminación
- CONEVAL (2011a) *Coneval presenta los resultados de la medición de la pobreza 2010 para cada municipio del país, [Coneval presents the results from the poverty measurement for each municipality in 2010]* Press Communiqué No. 015, 2 December 2011, Mexico City: Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo Social

- CONEVAL (2011b) *Evaluación Específica de Desempeño 2010 - 2011 – Programa de Desarrollo Humano Oportunidades [Performance Evaluation 2010 - 2011 – Human Development Programme Oportunidades]*
www.coneval.gob.mx/cmsconeval/rw/pages/evaluacion/evaluaciones/especificas/edd_2010_2011/sedesol.es.do. (accessed 18 October 2012)
- Cortés, F. and Escobar Latapí, A. (2005) 'Intergenerational Social Mobility in Urban Mexico', *CEPAL Review* 85: 143-160
- De la Peña, G.; Bastos, S. and Calonge, F. (2012) *Perfil de la población indígena beneficiaria del Programa Oportunidades en zonas urbanas [Profile of the indigenous beneficiaries of Oportunidades in urban areas]*, Mexico City: Secretaría de Desarrollo Social, Coordinación Nacional del Programa de Desarrollo Humano Oportunidades
- Devereux, S. and Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2004) *Transformative Social Protection*, IDS Working Paper 232, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies
- Devereux, S.; McGregor, J.A. and Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2011) 'Introduction: Social Protection for Social Justice', *IDS Bulletin* 42.6
- de Brauw, A. and Hoddinott, J. (2007) *Must Conditional Cash Transfer Programs be Conditioned to be Effective? The Impact of Conditioning Transfers on School Enrolment in Mexico*, IFPRI Discussion Papers 757, Washington DC: International Food Policy Research Institute
- Escobar Latapí, A. and González de la Rocha, M. (2008) 'Girls, Mothers, and Poverty Reduction in Mexico: Evaluating Progres-Oportunidades', in S. Ravazi (ed.) *The Gendered Impacts of Liberalization: Towards Embedded Liberalism?*, New York: Routledge/UNRISD
- Fiszbein, A. and Schady, N. (2009) *Conditional Cash Transfers – Reducing Present and Future Poverty*, Washington DC: World Bank
- García-Moreno, V. and Patrinos, H.A. (2011) *Indigenous Peoples and Poverty in Mexico*, Indigenous People Country Brief. No. 7, Washington DC: World Bank
- González de Alba, I.G. (2010) 'Poverty in Mexico from an Ethnic Perspective', *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 11.3: 449-465
- González de la Rocha, M. (2006) 'Introducción' [Introduction], in M. González de la Rocha, A. Agudo Sanchíz, A. Castañeda Valdes, P. Paredes Bañuelos, M. Triano Enríquez and P. Villagómez Ornelas (eds) *Procesos domésticos y vulnerabilidad: perspectivas antropológicas de los hogares con Oportunidades [Domestic processes and vulnerability: anthropological perspectives of households with Oportunidades]*, Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios en Antropología Social, Publicaciones de la Casa Chata

- González de la Rocha, M. and Escobar Latapí, A. (2008) 'Choices or Constraint? Informality, Labour Market and Poverty in Mexico', *IDS Bulletin* 39.2
- González de la Rocha, M.; Paredes Bañuelos, P. and Sánchez López, G. (2008) 'Chapter 3 – Life after Oportunidades: Rural Program Impact after 10 Years of Implementation', in *External Evaluation Oportunidades 2008. 1997-2007: Ten Years of Intervention in Rural Areas, Vol. 1, Impacts of Oportunidades after 10 Years of Operation in Rural Mexico*, Mexico City: Secretaría de Desarrollo Social
- Hall, G. and Patrinos, H.A. (2006) *Indigenous People, Poverty and Human Development in Latin America*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Hanlon, J.; Barrientos, A. and Hulme, D. (2010) *Just Give Money to the Poor: The Development Revolution from the Global South*, Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press
- INEGI (2008) *Encuesta Nacional de Empleo y Ocupación, 2008 [National Employment and Occupation Survey]*, Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Geografía
- INSP (2005a) *Evaluación externa de impacto del Programa Oportunidades [External impact evaluation for the Oportunidades Programme]*, Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública
- INSP (2005b) *General Rural Methodology Note*, November 2005, Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública (INSP), Coordinación Nacional de Programa de Desarrollo Humano Oportunidades, Secretaria de Desarrollo Social
http://evaluacion.oportunidades.gob.mx:8010/b34e550cd0d8b7c93e609ccff4ea5593/notas/general_rural_methodology_note.pdf (accessed 26 November 2012)
- INSP (2003) *Evaluación externa de impacto del Programa Oportunidades [External impact evaluation for the Oportunidades Programme]*, Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública
- Jones, N. and Holmes, R. (2010) *The Politics of Gender and Social Protection*, ODI Briefing Paper 62, London: Overseas Development Institute
- Levy, S. (2006) *Progress Against Poverty: Sustaining Mexico's Progresa-Oportunidades Program*, Washington DC: Brookings Institute
- Loera-González, J. (2011) 'Wellbeing Dimensions and Inter-Ethnic Determinants: the Case of the Raramuri People in Northern Mexico', *Ethnopolitics Papers* No.14
www.ethnopolitics.org/ethnopolitics-papers/EPP014.pdf (accessed 26 November 2012)
- Mayer-Foulkes, D. (2008) 'The Human Development Trap in Mexico', *World Development* 36.5: 775-796

Milenio (2012) 'Oportunidades ha dado de baja a 20 mil Raramuris' ['Oportunidades expels 20.000 Raramuris'], 1 January 2012
www.milenio.com/cdb/doc/noticias2011/8ec692e124be1520a5722fb45d21d6f0.
(accessed 30 March 2012)

Niño-Zarazúa, M. (2010) *Mexico's Progresas-Oportunidades and the emergence of social assistance in Latin America*, BWPI Working Paper 142, Manchester UK: Brooks World Poverty Institute

Oportunidades (2011) *Reglas de Operación [Operational Rules]*, Mexico City: Coordinación Nacional de Programa de Desarrollo Humano Oportunidades, Secretaría de Desarrollo Social
www.Oportunidades.gob.mx/Portal/wb/Web/reglas_de_operacion_2011. (accessed 2 September 2011)

Oportunidades (2010) 'Atiende SEDESOL a siete millones y medio de indígenas a través de Oportunidades, en todo el País' ['The Ministry for Social Development SEDESOL reaches seven million and a half indigenous people through the Oportunidades Programme'], *Press Release No. 022/2010*, Mexico City: Coordinación Nacional de Programa de Desarrollo Humano Oportunidades, Secretaría de Desarrollo Social

Oportunidades (2008) *Evaluación Externa del Programa Oportunidades 2008. A diez años de intervención en zonas rurales (1997-2007). Tomo II – El reto de la calidad de los servicios: resultados en salud y nutrición. [External Evaluation of the Programme Oportunidades 2008. 10 Years of intervention in rural areas (1997-2007) Volume II – The challenge of the quality of services: results from health and nutrition]*, Mexico City: Coordinación Nacional de Programa de Desarrollo Humano Oportunidades, Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública, Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios en Antropología Social

Parker, S.W.; Rubacalva, L. and Teruel, G. (2005) 'Schooling Inequality and Language Barriers', *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 54.1: 71-94

Ramírez, A. (2006) 'Chapter 6: Mexico', in G. Hall and H.A. Patrinos (eds) *Indigenous Peoples, Poverty and Human Development in Latin America*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Royce, E. (2009) *Poverty and Power: A Structural Perspective on American Inequality*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers (Kindle Edition)

Sabates-Wheeler, R. and Roelen, K. (2011) 'Transformative social protection programming for children and their carers: a gender perspective', *Journal for Gender and Development* 19.2: 179-194

Sánchez López, G. (2008) 'Chapter 2 – Living in Poverty: An Analysis of Health, Disease and Care Processes Among Rural Indigenous Households', in *External Evaluation of Oportunidades 2008. 1997-2007: Ten Years of Intervention in Rural Areas, Vol. 1*,

Impacts of Oportunidades after 10 Years of Operation in Rural Mexico, 1st ed, Mexico City: Secretaría de Desarrollo Social

- Sariego, J.L. (2008) 'Chapter 2 – Coverage and Operation of Oportunidades in Inter-Cultural Indigenous Regions', in *External Evaluation of Oportunidades 2008. 1997-2007: Ten Years of Intervention in Rural Areas, Vol. 4, Impacts of Oportunidades after 10 Years of Operation in Rural Mexico*, 1st ed, Mexico City: Secretaría de Desarrollo Social
- Sariego, J.L. (2011) 'Pobreza y Etnicidad: Factores detrás de la Inclusión y la Exclusión en Programas de Transferencias Condicionadas. El Caso de Oportunidades' ['Poverty and Ethnicity: Issues behind the Inclusion and Exclusion in Conditional Cash Transfers. The Case of Oportunidades'], in M. González de la Rocha and A. Escobar Latapí (eds) *Pobreza, transferencias condicionadas y sociedad [Poverty, Conditional Cash Transfers and Society]* (in press), Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social
- Skoufias, E. (2005) *PROGRESA and Its Impacts on the Welfare of Rural Households in Mexico*, Research Report 139, Washington DC: International Food Policy Research Institute
- Skoufias, E. and Parker, S. (2003) *Conditional Cash Transfers and Their Impact on Child Work and Schooling: Evidence from the Progresa Program in Mexico*, FCND Discussion Paper No. 123, Washington DC: International Food Policy Research Institute
- Stavenhagen, R. (2005) 'Cuarto Informe: La educación indígena (2005)' ['Fourth Report: indigenous education (2005)'], in R. Stavenhagen (2007) *Los Pueblos Indígenas y sus Derechos – Informe Temáticos del Relator Especial sobre la situación de los Derechos Humanos y las Libertades Fundamentales de los Pueblos Indígenas. [Indigenous People and their Rights - Report from the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights and Freedom of Indigenous People]*, Mexico City: UNESCO
- Stewart, S. and Handa, S. (2010) 'Reaching Orphans and Vulnerable Children through Cash Transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa: Simulation Results from Alternative Targeting Schemes', in S. Handa, S. Devereux and D. Webb (eds) *Social Protection for Africa's Children*, Abingdon: Routledge
- Temin, M. (2008) *Expanding social protection for vulnerable children and families: learning from an institutional perspective*, Inter-Agency Task Team (IATT) on Children and HIV/AIDS: Working Group on Social Protection Working Paper, New York: UNICEF
- UNDP (2010) *Informe sobre Desarrollo Humano de los Pueblos Indígenas en México [Human Development Report for Indigenous People in Mexico]*, Mexico City: UNDP
- World Bank (2012) 'Evaluación social y plan de acción para la definición del modelo alternativo de la operación y gestión del Programa Oportunidades para población indígena. [Human Development Programme Oportunidades – Social Evaluation and

action plan to identify an alternative operational and management model for Oportunidades for the indigenous population], Preliminary Draft, 28 June 2012, Mexico City: World Bank

Yates, R.; Chandan, U. and Lim Ah Ken, P. (2010) 'Child-sensitive social protection. A new approach to programming for children affected by HIV and AIDS', *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies* 5.3: 208- 216