# Appendix A

(a) Sampling method

This article adopts a broad definition of the “informal economy”, including self-employment in informal enterprises (that is, unregistered businesses) as well as wage employment in informal jobs (which could include work for a formally registered enterprise). This broader term, which was endorsed by the International Labour Conference in 2002 (ILO 2002), is now commonly preferred to the narrower concept of the “informal sector”. In accordance with this definition, the survey – part of the larger research project “Informal Worker Organisation and Social Protection” (SPIWORK)[[1]](#footnote-2) – on which this article is based, targeted wage workers, own-account workers and micro-business owners with a maximum of two employees. For wage employment in informal jobs, we asked potential interviewees to specify (i) whether they had a contract and, if so, (ii) whether it specified pay and entitlement to benefits and (iii) whether these provisions were implemented in practice. If the answers to the first two questions were “yes”, but the answer to the last question was “no”, the interviewee was considered to be an informal worker and the interview proceeded.

In terms of the transport sector, the aim was to divide the subsample equally between*boda-boda* and *dala-dala*/*matatu* workers, and to sample drivers, conductors and riders. In the case of micro-traders, the target group were micro-traders who were mobile (on the street, at bus terminals, vacant parking lots, etc.) and less mobile (for example, *mama lishe –* Swahili term for women who cook and sell food/snacks on the side of the road), but excluded those with permanent structures, such as kiosks or regular designated markets. In addition, the enumerators were instructed not to cover micro-traders selling different types of commodities without distinction. In the case of the construction sector, the target groups were skilled and unskilled workers (both wage workers and own-account workers) employed directly by construction/site managers or indirectly via an intermediary (for example, gang leaders). As for the construction sites, we covered large and medium construction/building sites – worker pick-up points – but we excluded individual residential housing sites.

Our aim was to cover 1,200 workers in total (600 per country) and 200 workers per sector (100 per sector per site), where 25 per cent were sampled through associations identified specifically for the project. We wanted to ensure broad coverage of different types of associations among respondents, although we were aware of the potential bias that it introduced to the sample. The remaining 75 per cent were sampled on the basis of geographical location to ensure a degree of randomness, bearing in mind that it is not possible to ensure a representative sample when there is no clearly defined/delimited population of informal workers (and hence the probability of selection cannot be specified). This random sampling was also intended to capture smaller and more informal worker associations. For those workers sampled from associations, the target group were ordinary members and not leaders or members in an official position. Associations included formal associations, savings and credit cooperative organizations and trade unions (i.e. registered associations). For the part of the sample that was selected on the basis of geographical location, the SPIWORK survey selected two urban locations in each country (Kenya: Nairobi and Kisumu; Tanzania: Dar es Salaam and Dodoma) and three zones/districts per location were identified through transport hubs. The same locations were used across the three sectors. For the purposes of this article, we used only the data for Nairobi and Dar es Salaam.

In Tanzania, the construction sector sampling was also partly based on snowballing techniques in order to identify large and medium construction/building sites. The data collection began in June 2018 and, in the first phase, 75 per cent of the targeted workers were surveyed (by geography) using the Survey-to-Go software hosted by the Institute for Development Studies of the University of Nairobi. We subsequently obtained and extracted information regarding the associations to which informal sector workers belonged in preparation for the second data collection phase in November and December 2018. This phase targeted 25 per cent of workers drawn from the associations covered in the first data collection phase.

(b) Data cleaning

Merging the two data sets from Kenya and Tanzania resulted in a total sample of 1,462 workers, but we were left with a final sample of 1,385 observations after data cleaning, which removed observations for:

(i) Workers who were not in the target group, including tuk-tuk drivers and bicycle riders;

(ii) Workers who did not declare earnings or declared earnings above the 99th and below the 1st percentile (outliers) by country and sector; and

(iii) Workers who indicated that they made association contributions above the 99th and below the 1st percentile (outliers) by country and sector.

# Appendix B

**Typology of social protection measures**

**Preventive measures** seek to avert deprivation. They include s*ocial insurance* for “economically vulnerable groups”. Social insurance programmes refer to formalized systems of pension, health insurance, maternity benefits and unemployment benefits. They also include informal mechanisms, such as savings clubs and funeral societies, as well as strategies of risk diversification, such as crop or income diversification. Consequently, welfare associations, which provide assistance with life contingencies such as sickness, marriage and death, are also included in these measures.

**Promotive measures** aim to enhance real incomes and capabilities through a range of livelihood-enhancing programmes targeted at households and individuals. They include measures that have income stabilization as at least one of their objectives. A case in point is microcredit that fulfils income-stabilizing and consumption-smoothing functions. Saving clubs/welfare societies may also fall into this category when they function to smooth income via small loans.

**Protective measures** provide relief from deprivation. They are narrowly targeted safety net measures in the conventional sense – they aim to provide relief from poverty and deprivation where promotional and preventive measures have failed to do so. Protective measures include *social assistance* for the “chronically poor”, especially those who are unable to work and earn their livelihood. This equates most closely to mainstream “social welfare”. Social assistance programmes typically include targeted resource transfers – disability benefits, single-parent allowances and “social pensions” for the elderly poor that are publicly financed – out of the tax base, with donor support, and/or through NGO projects. Other protective measures can be classified as *social services*.

**Transformative measures** seek to address concerns of *social equity* and *exclusion*, such as collective action for workers’ rights, or upholding human rights for minority ethnic groups. Transformativeinterventions include changes to the regulatory framework to protect “socially vulnerable groups” (for example, people with disabilities or victims of domestic violence) against discrimination and abuse, as well as sensitization campaigns to transform public attitudes and behaviour and enhance social equity. Representation of members in dealings with authorities, employers or others, as well as advocacy, fall under this category.

Source: Own compilation based on the framework by Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler (2004).
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1. See <https://ruc.dk/research-project/informal-worker-organisation-and-social-protection>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)