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The 42 Bangladeshi households that we talked to at length twice a month for a year

- The poor: mainly landless and casually employed or self-employed in low-capital activities
- The upper-poor: wide variety of casual, waged and self-employed livelihoods
- The near-poor: share the same environment but do better because they own land or have regular jobs

**Similar in many visible ways (housing, food, clothing), but very diverse in livelihood strategies**
Do the poor actively manage their money, or do they live ‘hand-to-mouth’, spending all income as soon as it comes in?

Our study shows they are active money managers....
33 ‘instruments’

**FORMAL SERVICES:**
- Bank savings
- Bank loans
- Coventional life insurance
- Pro-poor life insurance

**SEMIFORMAL SERVICES:**
- NGO/MFI savings
- NGO/MFI loans

**INFORMAL MUTUALS:**
- ROSCA
- ASCA savings
- ASCA loans
- Saving-up club

**INFORMAL INDIVIDUAL:**
- Saving at home
- Saving on the person
- Mud-bank
- Remitting cash home

**INFORMAL ONE-ON-ONE:**
- Interest free loan given
- Interest free loan taken
- Interest loan given
- Interest loan taken
- Saving with a Money Guard
- Acting as a Money Guard
- Borrowing against pawn
- Lending against pawn
- Hire-purchasing
- Purchases on credit
- Servies supplied on credit
- Wage advance taken
- Wage advance given
- Withholding wages
- Labour sold in advance
- Venture capital taken
- Trade goods taken on credit
- Trade goods given on credit
- Going into rent arrears
33 instruments, and the number of households that used them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMAL SERVICES:</th>
<th>SEMI-FORMALS:</th>
<th>INFORMAL MUTUALS:</th>
<th>INFORMAL ONE-ON-ONE:</th>
<th>INFORMAL INDIVIDUAL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank savings</td>
<td>ROSCA</td>
<td>Saving with a Money Guard</td>
<td>Saving at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank loans</td>
<td>ASCA loans</td>
<td>Acting as a Money Guard</td>
<td>Saving on the person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional life insurance</td>
<td>ASCA savings</td>
<td>Borrowing against pawn</td>
<td>Mad-bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-poor life insurance</td>
<td>INFORMAL M UTUALS:</td>
<td>Lending against pawn</td>
<td>Remitting cash home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO/MIF savings</td>
<td>INFORMAL ONE-ON-ONE:</td>
<td>Hire-purchasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO/MIF loans</td>
<td>INFORMAL INDIVIDUAL:</td>
<td>Service supplied on credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMAL MUTUALS:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wage advance taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSCA</td>
<td>Interest free loan given</td>
<td>Wage advance given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCA savings</td>
<td>Interest free loan taken</td>
<td>Workholding wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCA loans</td>
<td>Interest loan given</td>
<td>Labour sold in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving-up club</td>
<td>Interest loan taken</td>
<td>Venture capital taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMAL ONE-ON-ONE:</td>
<td>Saving with a Money Guard</td>
<td>Trade goods taken on credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest free loan given</td>
<td>Acting as a Money Guard</td>
<td>Trade goods given on credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest free loan taken</td>
<td>Borrowing against pawn</td>
<td>Going into rent arrears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest loan given</td>
<td>Lending against pawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest loan taken</td>
<td>Hire-purchasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMAL INDIVIDUAL:</td>
<td>Saving at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving at home</td>
<td>Saving on the person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving on the person</td>
<td>Mad-bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad-bank</td>
<td>Remitting cash home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remitting cash home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 instruments, and the number of households that used them
Top services and devices

- All classes of household in both locations use a wide range of instruments – except for formal services which don’t reach the rural poor:
- Most used by far are the informal one-on-one services and devices: above all interest-free borrowing (used by 41 out of 42 households). Interest-free lending is also common.
- Other much-used instruments are MFIs, buying goods on credit, various ways of saving at home, money-guards, and savings clubs.
Households who used most instruments

- Sultan and Kuruna, urban near-poor, used 16 instruments – to raise their children and to finance her sari-selling business
- Hafiz and Ramisa, young and landless rural poor, used 14 – to manage their family on his tiny unreliable day-labouring income
- Siraz and Monwara, urban upper-poor, also used 14 – he is ill and gets irregular work as an auto-rickshaw driver, she gets casual domestic work and their son picks rags when he should be in school
- Taleb and Kukhumoni, rural upper poor, also used 14 – to support his market shop and timber-trading business

Rich and poor, business-people and the casually employed – any type of family may be using a wide variety of instruments
Households who used least instruments

- Maymana, rural poor, used only 4 instruments – she is an abandoned mother with a teen-age son who has a growth on his spine. Still, Maymana manages to give interest-free loans to neighbours as well as take them.

- Hosen and Safia, an elderly urban upper-poor couple, also used only 4 – he takes a loan to buy a second hand rickshaw to hire out, and he sends cash home to the village to buy land.

- Akkabar and Haruna are rural near-poor farmers with 3 acres of land. They used only four instruments, too: Akkabar says he just doesn’t like getting involved in financial transactions.

The number of instruments used is not directly related to wealth or status.
So interest free borrowing and lending are the most often used, as well as the most commonly used, of all the instruments.
## Average transactions flows per household in the year (US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper poor</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near poor</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Households are pushing or pulling about 60% of their annual income through financial instruments (annual household income is about $1,400).

- At this rate, the microfinancial market for the poor in Bangladesh may have an annual turnover exceeding $10 billion.
Six households with big transaction flows

- Sayed & Asma, rural poor: $1,354 of transactions in the year, mostly one-on-one informal. Sayed is a timber trader and a gambler.
- Amala, urban poor: $874. Amala’s husband left her years ago: she takes MFI loans and on-lends them to others.
- Abu Taleb & Khukomoni, rural upper poor: $3,489. A mix of private and MFI loans to run his shop and timber trade.
- Sobhan & Halima, urban upper poor: $2,142. He is a salaried car driver: they use ROSCAs and ASCAs, private and MFI loans, take money as a ‘guard’, and lend against pawns: they try to maintain a high standard of living.
- Gani & Jahanara, rural near poor: $2,767. He has 3 acres and uses bank savings and loans, and gives and takes private loans
- Sultan & Kurnuna, urban near poor: $1,969. Car driver and sari-selling wife, enthusiastic users of financial instruments for all purposes!

A wide diversity of needs and lifestyles lead to large transaction flows
Big flows, small balances: 
average annual flows and year-end balances (US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year end:</th>
<th>Financial assets</th>
<th>Financial liabilities</th>
<th>Total annual transaction flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These household are using financial instruments to build the lump sums they need, and not to hold long-term financial assets nor long-term debts
What they spent their lump sums on, and the values of the sums

![Bar chart showing spending categories by income level: Life cycle, Emergency, Opportunity.]

- **Life cycle**
  - Poor, 278 sums
  - Upper poor, 167 sums
  - Near poor, 70 sums

- **Emergency**
  - More than $100
  - $10 to $100
  - $1 to $10
  - Less than $1

- **Opportunity**
  - More than $100
  - $10 to $100
  - $1 to $10
  - Less than $1
Where the sums were formed

- Poor, 278 sums
- Upper poor, 167 sums
- Near poor, 70 sums

*Formal*  *NGO/MFI*  *Informal*
Financial transactions
...an important part of poor peoples’ lives

- ‘You can’t get by without borrowing, even though it’s unpleasant. I’d love a better place to keep my savings’ (Hamida)
- ‘I feel a lot of pain when lending or borrowing goes wrong – but I have to do it as I can’t manage without’ (Renu)
- ‘I don’t like lending and borrowing – it’s a mental burden’ (Akkabar)
- ‘Financial transactions are an important part of life – but they can be bothersome’ (Barek)
- ‘Actually, when we borrow, we don’t sleep at night, for thinking of it’ (Saman and Hazara)

The poor need basic banking services – not just finance for microenterprises run by women
Where are the MFIs?
The good news....

- MFIs reached no less than 33 of our 42 households
- 26 MFIs altogether were found during the study. Between them:
  - They reached 17 of the 23 poor households
  - They reached 11 out 13 upper-poor households
  - They reached 4 out 6 near poor households
- Most of the MFI loans were quite large and many of them were used for ‘opportunities’
- Many of our respondents tried hard to keep up with MFI loan repayment schedules because they found MFIs generally more reliable than other instruments
MFIs have good ‘outreach’
…so why do they have such a small share of the business?

- There were five times as many interest-free loans reported in our study than there were MFI loans.
- The MFIs took a mere 15% share of the total ‘transaction flows’ reported.
- The MFIs had only a 10% share of the 515 ‘lump sums’ that we analysed in detail.
- The MFIs held only 14% of the year-end assets of the 42 households, and 21% of their debt.
- Although many households found them relatively reliable, there were many reports of MFIs breaking promises.

No matter how you measure it, MFIs, even when they have wide outreach, have a shallow penetration of the microfinance market.