



Beyond Income Poverty: Socio-Political and Psychological Exclusion in Jamaica-A Systematic Qualitative and Comparative Analysis of Multidimensional Deprivation, Citizenship and Human Development

Paul Andrew Bourne¹, PhD, DrPH

¹Assistant Professor, University of the Commonwealth Caribbean, Kingston, Jamaica, WI.

Abstract

Poverty in Jamaica has traditionally been conceptualised and measured primarily through household consumption, income adequacy and material deprivation, yet these approaches may insufficiently capture the social, political and psychological conditions through which disadvantage is experienced and reproduced. Recent reductions in official poverty are important developmental achievements, but improvements in consumption-based measures do not necessarily demonstrate equivalent improvements in social belonging, political influence, psychological security, institutional inclusion or perceived life opportunities. This systematic qualitative comparative study critically examines poverty in Jamaica as a multidimensional process involving material deprivation, social exclusion, political marginalisation and psychological exclusion, while comparing the Jamaican experience with evidence from Caribbean, African, Latin American and high-income societies. Drawing on capability theory, social-exclusion theory, relative-deprivation perspectives and the psychology-of-poverty literature, the current study synthesises scholarly research, official Jamaican documents and international developmental evidence to identify mechanisms linking economic hardship with exclusion from institutions, opportunities, participation and psychosocial well-being. The principal research gap is that Jamaican poverty scholarship and policy measurement remain comparatively fragmented across economic, social, political and psychological domains, with insufficient integration of these dimensions in a single explanatory framework capable of distinguishing reduced monetary poverty from persistent exclusion. The study proposes a Multidimensional Poverty-Exclusion-Capability Framework through which poverty reduction in Jamaica should be evaluated not only by whether household resources increase but also by whether citizens acquire meaningful capabilities, institutional access, political voice, psychological security, social recognition and realistic opportunities for upward mobility.

Keywords: Jamaica; poverty; social exclusion; political exclusion; psychological exclusion; inequality; capability deprivation; social policy; Caribbean development; multidimensional poverty

Introduction

Poverty remains one of the most persistent challenges confronting social policy, development studies, political economy and public health because deprivation extends considerably beyond insufficient income. Conventional poverty measures remain indispensable for identifying households unable to attain minimum standards of material consumption, yet they provide only a partial account of how disadvantaged populations experience society and its institutions (Sen, 1999; Townsend, 1979). Individuals may move above an official poverty threshold while continuing to experience insecure employment, inadequate housing, neighbourhood violence, limited institutional influence, social stigma, restricted mobility and persistent psychological insecurity. Social-exclusion scholarship consequently conceptualises disadvantage as a multidimensional and relational process involving restricted participation in economic, social, civic and political life rather than merely insufficient command over financial resources (Levitas et al., 2007; Silver, 1994). Psychological research similarly demonstrates that persistent financial scarcity can produce stress, negative affect, anxiety, cognitive burden and altered decision-making, thereby making poverty simultaneously a material condition and an experienced psychological reality (Haushofer & Fehr, 2014; Mani et al., 2013; Ridley et al., 2020). A comprehensive examination of Jamaican poverty must therefore move beyond asking how many people fall below a consumption threshold towards investigating the extent to which socioeconomic disadvantage limits belonging, citizenship, agency, dignity, security and future possibilities.

Jamaica provides an especially important setting for such an analysis because the country has achieved substantial recent reductions in measured poverty while remaining characterised by important structural inequalities and exposure to economic, climatic and social shocks. Official estimates indicate that Jamaica's national poverty rate declined from 16.7 per cent in 2021 to 8.2 per cent in 2023, while subsequent official reporting placed the rate at approximately 7.8 per cent in 2024 (Jamaica Information Service [JIS], 2025a, 2025b). These improvements are significant, but national averages can conceal geographic inequalities, household vulnerabilities, differences in quality of employment and variations in access to education, healthcare, housing and social protection. The World Bank (2025a) reported that poverty measured using Jamaica's national methodology was approximately 3.0 per cent in the Greater Kingston Metropolitan Area in 2023, illustrating substantial spatial variation even during a period of declining national poverty. Jamaica's poverty trajectory has also historically been highly responsive to economic shocks, with poverty falling to 9.9 per cent in 2007 before rising sharply after the global financial crisis and again increasing during the COVID-19 period (World Bank, 2024a). The central policy question is consequently not simply whether poverty has fallen but whether improvements in material consumption have been accompanied by corresponding reductions in the deeper forms of exclusion capable of reproducing disadvantage across generations.

The distinction between poverty and exclusion is especially consequential because societies may improve aggregate economic indicators while preserving significant differences in social power, institutional accessibility and people's perceptions of their capacity to influence their lives. Sen's (1999) capability approach emphasises that development concerns the substantive freedoms individuals possess to accomplish valued ways of living rather than simply the commodities or incomes available to them. Social exclusion extends this reasoning by drawing attention to processes through which individuals or groups are prevented from participating fully in relationships, institutions and activities considered normal or valuable in their societies (Sen, 2000; Silver, 1994). Political exclusion introduces the additional question of whether disadvantaged citizens possess meaningful opportunities to influence decisions governing resource allocation, community development and public policy rather than possessing formal voting rights alone. Psychological exclusion concerns the internalised and experiential consequences of marginalisation, including shame, stigma, insecurity, hopelessness, diminished self-worth, perceived powerlessness and reduced expectations concerning future possibilities (Walker et al., 2013). These dimensions interact rather than operate separately, suggesting that poverty should be investigated as a dynamic system through which material scarcity can generate exclusion while exclusion itself restricts pathways out of material poverty.

The Jamaican context further requires attention to historical political economy because contemporary social stratification developed in institutions shaped by slavery, plantation production, colonial hierarchy and highly unequal access to land, education and economic power. Beckford (1972) argued that plantation societies developed economic structures oriented towards external markets and concentrated ownership, producing forms of dependency and inequality capable of surviving formal political decolonisation. Colonial institutions also shaped spatial development, class relations and differentiated access to economic and political resources, meaning that post-independence poverty cannot be understood exclusively as an outcome of individual characteristics or contemporary household behaviour. At the same time, historical explanations must not become deterministic because governments, institutions and citizens possess meaningful capacities to reform inherited structures and alter distributional outcomes. Jamaica's post-independence social policies, expansion of education, social-protection programmes and recent improvements in macroeconomic management demonstrate that institutional intervention can alter aspects of disadvantage (PIOJ, 2023; World Bank, 2024a). The critical analytical task is therefore to determine why certain dimensions of poverty respond relatively quickly to economic and policy changes while social, institutional and psychological exclusions may prove substantially more persistent.

Statement of the Problem

The principal problem addressed by this research is that poverty in Jamaica is still frequently discussed as though material deprivation adequately represents the wider experience of socioeconomic disadvantage. Consumption-based poverty measurement remains essential because households require sufficient resources to secure food, housing, transportation, education and other necessities, but a household's movement above an official threshold does not necessarily eliminate vulnerability or exclusion. Individuals whose incomes improve temporarily may remain located in violent or disadvantaged communities, employed in precarious work,

excluded from influential social networks or unable to accumulate assets capable of protecting them against future shocks. They may simultaneously experience limited trust in institutions, weak perceptions of political efficacy, social stigma or psychological stress produced by persistent economic uncertainty. Such conditions can constrain capabilities even when official poverty measures indicate improvement, creating a discrepancy between measured poverty reduction and lived developmental inclusion. The present study therefore investigates whether Jamaican poverty is better conceptualised as an interconnected system of **material, social, political and psychological exclusions** rather than as a predominantly monetary condition.

A second problem concerns vulnerability because crossing above the poverty line does not necessarily place households securely beyond the risk of returning to poverty. Jamaica's historical poverty pattern has displayed substantial fluctuation in response to macroeconomic crises, unemployment, inflation, climatic events and public-health disruptions, demonstrating that many households remain located relatively close to conditions of deprivation (World Bank, 2024a, 2025a). Hurricane exposure and other climatic shocks are particularly significant because poorer and vulnerable households frequently possess fewer assets, less insurance and weaker financial buffers through which losses can be absorbed. Jamaica's National Poverty Reduction Programme appropriately recognises poverty at household, community and national levels, but the persistence of vulnerability suggests that poverty policy must also examine the mechanisms that determine people's resilience following shocks (PIOJ, n.d.). Resilience involves not only disposable income but also employment security, savings, social networks, institutional accessibility, psychological coping capacity and trust that public systems will respond effectively during periods of hardship. A poverty strategy focused exclusively on current consumption may consequently underestimate households whose social and psychological resources remain insufficient to prevent future downward mobility.

Research Gap

The central research gap lies in the **fragmentation of Jamaican poverty knowledge across material, social, political and psychological domains** rather than the complete absence of scholarship on any one of these dimensions. The Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions provides extensive evidence concerning consumption, poverty, education, health, housing and social protection, while Jamaica has additionally developed multidimensional approaches capable of recognising non-income deprivation (PIOJ, 2023). Research on violence, disadvantaged communities, employment, health and social protection provides further evidence concerning consequences frequently associated with deprivation, but these bodies of literature are rarely integrated into a comprehensive theory of exclusion. Psychological poverty research internationally has established connections among scarcity, cognitive burden, stress, anxiety, depression and decision-making, yet these mechanisms have received comparatively little systematic incorporation into mainstream Jamaican poverty analysis (Haushofer & Fehr, 2014; Mani et al., 2013; Ridley et al., 2020). Political exclusion presents an additional underdeveloped dimension because participation is frequently assessed through formal democratic institutions without sufficient attention to whether economically disadvantaged citizens possess comparable influence over agenda setting, policy design, institutional access and resource allocation. Consequently, the unresolved scholarly question is whether declining material poverty in Jamaica

can coexist with persistent social, political and psychological exclusion and, if so, through which mechanisms these exclusions reproduce vulnerability despite improvements in household consumption.

The study therefore differs from conventional poverty research by treating exclusion not simply as another indicator to be added to a multidimensional index but as an explanatory process connecting material deprivation with unequal life chances. This distinction is theoretically important because two households with similar incomes can possess substantially different capabilities depending on neighbourhood security, social networks, institutional access, education, political connections, health, assets and psychological resources. Likewise, individuals living above an official poverty line can experience substantial relative deprivation when prevailing social standards require resources they cannot obtain, restricting participation in activities regarded as normal in their communities (Townsend, 1979). Social exclusion can consequently persist independently of absolute poverty, while political and psychological exclusion may intensify the inability of disadvantaged populations to convert available resources into sustained mobility. Existing Jamaican measurement architecture provides valuable indicators of living conditions but does not yet provide an integrated explanatory framework connecting these interacting processes. This study addresses that gap through a systematic qualitative synthesis that places Jamaica in comparative international scholarship and develops a multidimensional poverty-exclusion model applicable to policy analysis.

Aim and Objectives

The primary aim of this study is to critically examine the relationships among poverty, social exclusion, political exclusion and psychological exclusion in Jamaica and to compare the Jamaican experience with evidence from other societies. The first objective is to determine how poverty has been conceptualised and measured in Jamaican policy and scholarship and identify dimensions of disadvantage insufficiently represented by conventional approaches. The second objective is to examine mechanisms through which material scarcity may produce social isolation, institutional marginalisation, political powerlessness, psychological distress and restricted capabilities. The third objective is to investigate whether these processes operate reciprocally, whereby exclusion itself reduces people's capacity to escape poverty and increases vulnerability to future socioeconomic shocks. The fourth objective is to compare Jamaica with selected Caribbean, African, Latin American and high-income contexts to identify common mechanisms alongside historically and institutionally specific features. The fifth objective is to develop an integrated conceptual and policy framework through which Jamaican poverty reduction can be evaluated according to material security, social inclusion, political agency, psychological well-being and sustainable human development.

Research Questions

The study first asks how poverty in Jamaica is conceptualised in conventional monetary, multidimensional and social-policy frameworks and which important dimensions of lived deprivation remain insufficiently captured. It secondly asks how material poverty interacts with exclusion from employment, education, secure communities, social relationships, public services

and socially valued activities. Thirdly, the study examines whether socioeconomic disadvantage restricts meaningful political participation, institutional voice, policy influence and perceptions of citizenship among disadvantaged Jamaicans. Fourthly, it investigates how financial insecurity, deprivation, neighbourhood disadvantage, stigma and perceived powerlessness influence psychological well-being, cognitive burden, hope, self-efficacy and expectations regarding upward mobility. Fifthly, the research compares Jamaican experiences with evidence from other societies to identify internationally recurrent mechanisms and those arising particularly from Jamaica's historical, Caribbean and institutional context. Finally, it asks what policy architecture is required if Jamaica is to progress from reducing measured poverty towards reducing multidimensional exclusion and expanding citizens' substantive capabilities.

Conceptualising Poverty Beyond Income

Absolute poverty approaches seek to identify minimum resources required for basic subsistence, while relative approaches recognise that deprivation must also be understood according to socially established standards of participation (Townsend, 1979). These perspectives provide different but complementary information because inadequate nutrition represents a fundamental deprivation while inability to participate in ordinary educational, cultural or social activities can constitute exclusion even when basic survival requirements are satisfied. Sen (1999) substantially expanded poverty analysis by distinguishing resources from capabilities and arguing that deprivation should be understood through restrictions on what individuals are effectively able to do and become. A person's income therefore represents a means to development rather than development itself because personal, institutional and environmental conditions determine how effectively resources can be converted into valued functioning. This reasoning is particularly relevant to Jamaica because households with similar consumption levels may differ substantially according to disability, community violence, transportation access, school quality, employment conditions, family responsibilities and exposure to climatic risks. Poverty should consequently be conceptualised as insufficient command over both material resources and the social conditions required to convert resources into secure and meaningful lives.

Multidimensional poverty analysis already moves substantially beyond income by examining simultaneous deprivation in areas such as health, education and living conditions. Jamaica's development of a national multidimensional poverty framework represents an important advance because it recognises that household well-being cannot adequately be represented through consumption alone (PIOJ, 2023). Nevertheless, multidimensional measurement and social-exclusion analysis are not synonymous because the former generally identifies accumulated deficits while the latter additionally asks how social relationships, institutions and power structures generate those deficits. Exclusion is relational because an individual can be disadvantaged not simply through possession of fewer resources but through relationships that limit access to networks, services, opportunities and decision-making processes (Silver, 1994). It is also dynamic because today's exclusion from quality education or secure employment can generate tomorrow's income poverty, poor health, restricted social mobility and intergenerational disadvantage. The analytical framework developed here therefore integrates multidimensional deprivation with relational and process-based explanations rather than positioning these traditions as competing approaches.

Social Exclusion

Social exclusion refers broadly to processes through which individuals or groups are prevented from participating adequately in important domains of social, economic and community life (Levitas et al., 2007; Silver, 1994). Such exclusion may involve labour-market marginalisation, inadequate housing, poor transportation, limited digital connectivity, restricted access to services, social isolation or residence in communities carrying powerful territorial stigma. Material poverty frequently contributes to these disadvantages because participation itself requires resources for transportation, communication, clothing, education, recreation and reciprocal social relationships. However, exclusion may also cause poverty when social isolation limits access to employment information, professional networks, institutional assistance or relationships capable of providing support during crises. The direction of causation is consequently reciprocal, creating cumulative disadvantage in which social marginalisation and economic deprivation reinforce one another. Poverty reduction that increases household consumption without expanding participation, connectivity and institutional access may therefore leave significant components of exclusion fundamentally unchanged.

Jamaica's spatial inequalities make neighbourhood context especially important because place can influence educational opportunities, safety, social networks, employment accessibility and interactions with public institutions. Earlier participatory work on urban poverty and violence in Jamaica demonstrated that poor communities experienced overlapping problems involving violence, insecurity, unemployment, weak infrastructure and social fragmentation rather than isolated deficits in income (Moser & Holland, 1997). Contemporary poverty mapping and living-conditions data similarly demonstrate that deprivation is not distributed evenly throughout Jamaica, requiring attention to parish, community and urban-rural differences (Statistical Institute of Jamaica [STATIN], n.d.; World Bank, 2025a). Territorial disadvantage may become self-reinforcing when employers, financial institutions or other actors attach negative reputations to particular communities, thereby converting geographic location into a social penalty. International research describes this process as spatial stigma, through which disadvantaged neighbourhoods can be socially devalued in ways that affect residents' identities and opportunities (Halliday et al., 2020). Jamaican social policy should therefore recognise community disadvantage as both a material and relational phenomenon requiring investment in infrastructure, safety, institutions, mobility and social recognition.

Political Exclusion

Political exclusion extends the analysis from access to economic resources towards the distribution of voice and influence in systems responsible for allocating those resources. Formal democracy guarantees important political rights, but equal citizenship cannot be inferred solely from the existence of elections because citizens may possess very different capacities to organise, obtain information, access decision-makers and influence public priorities. Individuals with greater education, financial resources, organisational connections and professional networks generally possess more opportunities for sustained political engagement than persons preoccupied with unstable employment, transportation costs, caregiving responsibilities or immediate survival needs. Poverty can therefore create a participation inequality in which

disadvantaged populations possess formal political rights but encounter greater practical costs in exercising sustained political agency. Sen (2000) emphasised that social exclusion can involve exclusion from political and civic participation, while Lister (2007) argued for treating people experiencing poverty as political subjects rather than passive objects of policy intervention. The Jamaican poverty debate should accordingly examine whether disadvantaged citizens are represented merely as beneficiaries of programmes or participate meaningfully in defining the problems, priorities and institutional arrangements shaping those programmes.

Clientelism presents an additional concern because assistance mediated through partisan or personal networks can blur distinctions between social citizenship and political dependency. Where access to scarce opportunities is perceived as dependent on connections with political representatives, local brokers or influential networks, material scarcity can increase vulnerability to relationships of political dependence. Such processes do not imply that every Jamaican social programme operates clientelistically, but Jamaica's political history makes the relationship among party competition, community organisation and resource distribution analytically significant. Rights-based social protection differs fundamentally from discretionary assistance because entitlement reduces the extent to which vulnerable citizens must negotiate access through personalised relationships. Universal or transparent eligibility systems can consequently possess political as well as economic significance by strengthening perceptions that citizens receive public services because of legitimate social rights rather than political favour. Poverty reduction should therefore be evaluated partly according to whether it increases autonomous citizenship and institutional trust rather than simply delivering material transfers.

Psychological Exclusion and the Psychology of Poverty

Psychological exclusion refers in this study to the experiential consequences of persistent disadvantage through which individuals may feel socially devalued, powerless, insecure, ashamed, hopeless or unable to imagine realistic pathways towards desired futures. Research across societies demonstrates that poverty-related shame can generate significant social and psychological pain and may encourage concealment, withdrawal and reduced participation (Walker et al., 2013). Welfare systems themselves can either diminish or reinforce such experiences depending on whether programme design communicates social rights and dignity or reproduces stigma towards recipients (Roelen, 2020). Psychological exclusion should not be interpreted as suggesting that people living in poverty possess deficient personalities because the relevant mechanisms arise substantially from material insecurity and social conditions rather than inherent individual characteristics. Poverty is therefore capable of affecting psychological functioning while psychological consequences may subsequently influence economic behaviour, social relationships and institutional engagement. A theoretically adequate Jamaican poverty model must consequently avoid blaming disadvantaged individuals while recognising that economic environments can shape emotions, cognition, expectations and decision-making.

Experimental and interdisciplinary evidence provides substantial support for mechanisms through which material scarcity affects psychological functioning. Mani et al. (2013) found that financial concerns could consume cognitive resources, supporting the proposition that scarcity itself places demands on attention and cognitive performance rather than poor decision-making

simply causing poverty. Haushofer and Fehr (2014) similarly concluded that poverty generates stress and negative affective states that may influence risk preferences, time horizons and decision-making. Ridley et al. (2020) reviewed evidence demonstrating a bidirectional causal relationship between poverty and common mental disorders, particularly depression and anxiety, whereby economic hardship worsens mental health while mental illness can subsequently reduce economic participation and income. These findings are highly consequential for social policy because behaviours sometimes interpreted as irresponsibility, short-termism or lack of motivation may partly represent adaptive responses to scarcity and chronic uncertainty. The psychological consequences of Jamaican poverty should therefore be conceptualised as socially produced constraints requiring economic, institutional and mental-health responses rather than moral judgements concerning individual character.

Violence can intensify these mechanisms because poverty occurring in unsafe environments creates psychological demands substantially greater than those associated with low income alone. Jamaican communities with high exposure to violence may experience fear, trauma, bereavement, restricted mobility and disrupted schooling or economic activity, creating interactions among material deprivation, social exclusion and psychological stress. Research concerning Jamaica has long demonstrated the close relationship between urban disadvantage and violence, while contemporary work continues to recognise important mental-health consequences associated with exposure to insecurity (Moser & Holland, 1997). Poor households may therefore confront a compound burden in which scarce financial resources coexist with environmental threats requiring constant monitoring and adaptive behaviour. Children and adolescents exposed repeatedly to these circumstances may experience effects on emotional development, expectations, social trust and perceived future opportunities. Reducing psychological exclusion in Jamaica consequently requires community safety and social development to be understood as integral components of poverty policy rather than entirely separate policy sectors.

Theoretical Framework

The study integrates **capability theory**, **social-exclusion theory**, **relative-deprivation perspectives**, and the **psychology-of-poverty framework** because no single theoretical tradition adequately explains the multidimensional phenomenon under investigation. Capability theory establishes that poverty involves restrictions on substantive freedoms and valuable functioning rather than simply insufficient resources (Sen, 1999). Social-exclusion theory provides the relational dimension by explaining how individuals can be prevented from participating fully in institutions, relationships and activities through which social citizenship is constructed (Silver, 1994). Relative-deprivation approaches demonstrate that participation depends partly on societal standards, meaning that resources considered adequate for survival may remain insufficient for effective inclusion in contemporary social life (Townsend, 1979). Psychological poverty theory contributes mechanisms through which scarcity, uncertainty, stigma and deprivation influence cognition, affect, mental health and decision-making (Haushofer & Fehr, 2014; Mani et al., 2013; Ridley et al., 2020). Their integration permits poverty to be conceptualised simultaneously as **resource deprivation**, **capability deprivation**, **relational exclusion**, **political marginalisation** and **psychological burden**.

The resulting model proposes that material poverty can initiate a sequence in which insufficient resources restrict access to education, transportation, housing, communication, healthcare and socially valued activities. These restrictions can produce social exclusion by narrowing networks and opportunities while simultaneously increasing contact with institutions from positions of dependency rather than equal citizenship. Social and economic exclusion may subsequently weaken political agency by reducing time, resources, trust and confidence required for sustained institutional participation. Persistent insecurity and marginalisation can generate psychological consequences including stress, shame, hopelessness, diminished self-efficacy and cognitive burden, which may reduce the capacity to pursue long-term investments or navigate complicated institutions. These psychological processes can then feed back into economic circumstances, producing a dynamic poverty-exclusion cycle rather than a one-directional sequence. The framework therefore predicts that successful poverty reduction requires simultaneous interventions at material, relational, institutional and psychological levels.

Methodology

This research employs a **systematic qualitative comparative analysis** combining documentary review, thematic synthesis and comparative-historical interpretation. The methodology is appropriate because the research seeks to identify mechanisms, meanings and institutional relationships linking poverty with social, political and psychological exclusion rather than estimating a single statistical effect. Evidence is drawn from peer-reviewed scholarship, Jamaican government and institutional publications, international development reports and comparative social-exclusion literature. Documentary sources include material from the PIOJ and STATIN, World Bank, UNDP and relevant international organisations alongside scholarly research concerning poverty, social exclusion, mental health and political participation. The analytical period places particular emphasis on post-independence Jamaica while incorporating earlier historical literature where necessary for understanding plantation structures, social stratification and institutional development. The approach therefore integrates contemporary poverty evidence with historical and theoretical analysis rather than treating current deprivation as disconnected from longer-term social processes.

The search strategy was structured around combinations of the terms *Jamaica, poverty, multidimensional poverty, social exclusion, political exclusion, political participation, psychological poverty, mental health, scarcity, inequality, violence, social protection, Caribbean* and *capability deprivation*. Relevant comparative searches incorporated terms relating to Latin America, South Africa, the Caribbean, the United Kingdom and other societies in which multidimensional poverty or social exclusion has been extensively examined. Priority was given to peer-reviewed publications, recognised scholarly books, nationally authoritative documents and reports from established international development organisations. Sources were included when they contributed conceptually or empirically to explaining material poverty, exclusion, participation, psychological consequences, institutional processes or cross-national comparison. Unsupported commentary, duplicate material and publications lacking clear relevance to the research questions were excluded from the analytical synthesis. Because this study constitutes qualitative evidence synthesis rather than a meta-analysis, evidence was interpreted according to

conceptual relevance, methodological credibility and explanatory contribution rather than statistical effect-size aggregation.

Thematic synthesis followed the general approach articulated by Thomas and Harden (2008), beginning with coding of evidence into conceptually meaningful categories before consolidating related codes into descriptive and analytical themes. Initial deductive categories comprised material poverty, employment, education, health, housing, community conditions, social participation, political voice, institutional relationships, stigma, psychological distress, agency, resilience and intergenerational transmission. Inductive analysis permitted additional relationships to emerge from the literature rather than restricting findings to categories established before reviewing the evidence. Cross-case comparison subsequently examined whether mechanisms identified in Jamaica appeared in other societies and whether their institutional expression differed according to historical, welfare and political contexts. Negative and contradictory evidence was retained because the objective was explanatory synthesis rather than confirmation of the proposition that every disadvantaged Jamaican experiences every dimension of exclusion. The final analysis produced interconnected themes concerning vulnerability, spatial exclusion, labour-market exclusion, political voice, psychological scarcity, resilience and the limitations of conventional poverty reduction.

Findings: Declining Poverty and Persistent Vulnerability

The first major finding is that **poverty reduction and vulnerability reduction are related but analytically distinct processes** within contemporary Jamaica. The decline in Jamaica's national poverty rate from 16.7 per cent in 2021 to 8.2 per cent in 2023 represents a substantial improvement in material welfare and constitutes the lowest officially reported incidence since national poverty measurement began in 1989 (Office of the Prime Minister [OPM], 2025; World Bank, 2024). Nevertheless, Jamaica's historical poverty trajectory demonstrates repeated reversals associated with economic crises and the COVID-19 pandemic, indicating that reductions achieved during favourable periods can be partially reversed by subsequent shocks (Katayama et al., 2025). This distinction is important because economic resilience depends upon assets, savings, insurance, employment quality, social networks and access to protective institutions rather than current household consumption alone. A household marginally above the national poverty threshold may therefore occupy a fundamentally different socioeconomic position from a financially secure household despite both being statistically classified as non-poor. Jamaica's recent achievement should consequently be interpreted as evidence of significant progress requiring consolidation rather than proof that the deeper structural conditions producing vulnerability have been resolved.

The Jamaican evidence consequently raises an important conceptual distinction among **poverty status, vulnerability to poverty and secure socioeconomic inclusion**. Conventional poverty measurement identifies whether household resources or consumption fall below a specified threshold, but this approach does not necessarily determine the probability that currently non-poor households will become poor following unemployment, illness, inflation, natural disaster or another economic shock (Ravallion, 2016). Vulnerability is therefore prospective rather than exclusively contemporaneous because it concerns exposure to future welfare losses and the

resources available for absorbing them. This interpretation is particularly appropriate to Jamaica because historical poverty reduction has repeatedly been interrupted by external and domestic shocks, producing what the World Bank describes as a poverty “rollercoaster” (Katayama et al., 2025). Households escaping poverty without accumulating productive assets, savings, secure employment or adequate social protection may consequently remain situated close to the boundary separating economic security from renewed deprivation. Sustainable poverty reduction should therefore be evaluated partly according to whether households become increasingly resistant to shocks rather than exclusively according to whether their current consumption exceeds the national poverty line.

The distinction between chronic and transient poverty provides additional analytical value because households experiencing persistent deprivation may require substantially different interventions from those temporarily pushed into poverty by economic shocks. Chronic poverty is generally associated with long-term disadvantages that may involve limited human capital, restricted productive assets, weak employment opportunities and intergenerational processes, whereas transient poverty may arise following temporary disruptions to income or household circumstances (Hulme & Shepherd, 2003). Jamaican social policy consequently requires mechanisms capable of identifying not only who is currently poor but **why households are poor, how long deprivation persists and what conditions make particular households vulnerable to recurrence**. Such differentiation would allow social protection to combine immediate assistance with interventions addressing the mechanisms sustaining long-term disadvantage. Households experiencing temporary income shocks may primarily require effective stabilisation mechanisms, whereas chronically disadvantaged households may additionally require sustained investments in education, skills, health, housing, community infrastructure and labour-market integration. The poverty-vulnerability distinction therefore has direct policy significance because different pathways into deprivation require correspondingly differentiated pathways towards sustainable inclusion.

Climate and environmental exposure further complicate this relationship because Jamaican households exist within a small-island environment repeatedly vulnerable to hurricanes, flooding, drought and other natural hazards. Disaster-related losses can destroy housing, agricultural production, household assets, infrastructure and employment opportunities, potentially moving non-poor households into poverty while deepening deprivation among populations already experiencing disadvantage. International evidence demonstrates that poorer households frequently suffer disproportionate welfare losses from natural disasters because they possess fewer assets, less insurance, weaker savings buffers and more restricted opportunities for recovery (Hallegatte et al., 2017). Climate vulnerability should consequently be treated as a poverty issue rather than exclusively as an environmental or infrastructural concern because repeated shocks can undermine household resilience and reverse developmental gains. Preventive poverty policy should therefore include climate-resilient housing, livelihood diversification, disaster-responsive social protection, insurance mechanisms and emergency assistance capable of protecting household assets before temporary disruption becomes persistent deprivation. Jamaica's experience ultimately demonstrates that sustainable poverty reduction requires

resilience architecture capable of protecting developmental gains from foreseeable economic, health and environmental shocks.

Employment constitutes another important dimension because labour-market participation cannot automatically be equated with sustainable socioeconomic inclusion. As indicated in the original findings, low wages, irregular working hours, informal employment, insufficient social protection and employment instability can leave economically active individuals vulnerable despite their statistical classification as employed. The International Labour Organization's decent-work framework appropriately broadens employment evaluation beyond the existence of work towards productive employment, rights, social protection and social dialogue (International Labour Organization [ILO], 1999). Employment also generates non-monetary resources including professional networks, identity, status, skills acquisition, pension entitlements and opportunities for upward occupational mobility. Consequently, two employed Jamaicans may occupy substantially different developmental positions where one possesses stable, adequately remunerated and protected employment while another depends upon irregular or precarious work generating little capacity for saving or asset accumulation. Jamaican poverty policy should therefore distinguish **employment creation from creation of decent and productive employment capable of supporting sustained movement from vulnerability towards economic security.**

This finding parallels evidence from other developing societies where improvements in employment quantity have not necessarily eliminated working poverty or labour-market insecurity. Latin American multidimensional poverty research increasingly incorporates employment quality and social protection because labour-force participation alone provides an incomplete measure of economic inclusion. Similar problems occur in African societies where substantial informal sectors allow individuals to be economically active without necessarily obtaining stable earnings, contributory benefits or adequate protection against shocks. Even high-income societies increasingly recognise in-work poverty, precarious employment and unstable working arrangements as mechanisms through which labour-market participation can coexist with economic insecurity. The Jamaican case therefore reflects a broader international transformation in poverty analysis away from a binary employment-unemployment distinction towards consideration of employment adequacy and security. This comparative evidence strengthens the argument that **productive and protected work represents a mechanism of poverty exit, whereas insecure work may merely relocate poverty within the employed population.**

Findings: Spatial and Community Exclusion

The second major finding concerns the **spatial concentration of disadvantage and the capacity of place to structure opportunities independently of individual household resources.** Significant geographic differences in Jamaican poverty demonstrate that national averages can conceal important variations in living conditions and access to opportunities across communities and regions. Rural communities may confront transportation limitations, restricted access to services, agricultural vulnerability and narrower labour markets, while disadvantaged urban communities can experience overcrowding, insecure housing, violence and territorially

concentrated stigma. These circumstances influence access to education, healthcare, employment, financial services, digital infrastructure and social networks, producing what can appropriately be conceptualised as a **geography of opportunity**. Spatial disadvantage therefore means that individuals possessing similar education, motivation and household resources may encounter substantially different opportunities depending upon the institutional and socioeconomic characteristics of the communities in which they live. Poverty reduction consequently requires transformation of disadvantaged places rather than expecting individuals independently to overcome barriers embedded within their residential environments.

This finding is consistent with Sampson's (2012) neighbourhood-effects perspective, which demonstrates that spatially concentrated disadvantage can acquire social consequences extending beyond the characteristics of individual residents. Communities characterised by persistent unemployment, weak institutions, inadequate infrastructure and concentrated poverty may experience cumulative processes through which disadvantage becomes socially reproduced. Such environments can influence educational expectations, employment networks, collective efficacy, institutional trust and exposure to violence, creating mechanisms connecting neighbourhood conditions with individual developmental outcomes. The Jamaican experience should therefore be examined through both **household poverty and neighbourhood opportunity structures**, rather than assuming that household-level interventions alone can generate equal opportunities across geographically unequal environments. This interpretation also helps explain why some individuals may remain socially excluded after moving above the official poverty threshold because their surrounding community conditions remain substantially unchanged. Place-based development consequently becomes essential for converting household-level poverty reduction into sustainable community-level transformation.

Violence represents an especially consequential component of Jamaican spatial exclusion because unsafe environments restrict substantive freedoms to move, socialise, attend school, operate businesses and participate in community life. Individuals may avoid employment, education or recreational opportunities because movement across particular spaces creates actual or perceived physical risk, while businesses may reduce investment in communities associated with persistent insecurity. Moser and Holland's (1997) qualitative research in Jamaican communities demonstrated that residents understood violence as interconnected with unemployment, inadequate infrastructure, social fragmentation and institutional weaknesses rather than simply as an isolated criminal-justice problem. Violence can additionally weaken trust among neighbours and between citizens and public institutions, thereby reducing the collective capacity required to advocate for community improvement. These processes generate a potential feedback relationship in which deprivation contributes to insecurity while insecurity simultaneously restricts investment, employment and social participation capable of reducing deprivation. Jamaican development policy should consequently integrate poverty reduction, violence prevention, community infrastructure, education, employment and psychosocial interventions rather than administering them through conceptually isolated policy domains.

Spatial stigma can intensify these effects when negative representations of disadvantaged communities become attached to their residents irrespective of individual characteristics. Halliday et al. (2020) argue that territorial stigma has important public-health consequences

because places can acquire negative reputations that affect identities, opportunities and relationships between residents and wider society. A qualified young Jamaican originating from a highly stigmatised community may therefore confront disadvantages that cannot be explained solely through personal education, skills or household income if employers or institutions associate residential location with criminality or social disorder. Such processes effectively convert geography into a social marker through which structural disadvantage can become personalised. Territorial stigma may also affect residents psychologically by producing embarrassment, concealment, defensive identity formation or perceptions that institutions and wider society view their communities as inherently problematic. Community transformation must consequently address not only physical infrastructure and economic conditions but also the **social valuation and institutional treatment of residents from disadvantaged places**.

The comparative evidence suggests that these mechanisms are not uniquely Jamaican, although their expression reflects particular national histories and institutional arrangements. Research from the United States demonstrates substantial neighbourhood effects associated with concentrated disadvantage and unequal access to institutions and opportunities (Sampson, 2012). South African spatial inequalities similarly illustrate how historically produced residential patterns can continue structuring access to employment, transportation and public services long after formal political institutions have changed. Latin American cities frequently display comparable patterns of peripheral disadvantage in which housing, transportation, insecurity and employment accessibility interact to create spatially differentiated opportunities. Jamaica differs significantly in scale, history and institutional organisation, meaning that these societies should not be treated as directly equivalent cases. Nevertheless, comparison demonstrates a recurring international mechanism whereby **social inequality becomes spatially embedded, and spatial inequality subsequently reproduces social inequality**.

These findings have major implications for the design of Jamaican anti-poverty programmes because household transfers cannot independently alter all the mechanisms through which disadvantaged places reproduce exclusion. Financial assistance may improve food consumption and household welfare while residents continue encountering unsafe streets, inadequate transportation, weak schools, limited employment opportunities or restricted access to health and social services. Place-based interventions should therefore coordinate housing, transportation, schools, digital connectivity, public spaces, community safety, employment development and institutional accessibility within geographically targeted strategies. Community participation is essential because residents possess experiential knowledge concerning barriers and priorities that may not be visible through administrative indicators alone. Development should also avoid treating disadvantaged communities exclusively as collections of social problems because such framing can reinforce precisely the territorial stigma that inclusive policy seeks to overcome. The appropriate objective is therefore to transform disadvantaged communities into **institutionally connected environments of opportunity rather than locations in which deprivation is merely managed**.

Findings: Political Exclusion and Unequal Citizenship

The third major finding is that **formal political inclusion does not necessarily produce equivalent substantive political influence**, despite Jamaica's established democratic institutions and traditions of electoral participation. Voting rights establish an essential foundation for democratic citizenship, but equality of political rights does not necessarily imply equality in citizens' capacity to access policymakers, influence agendas, organise collectively or navigate administrative institutions. Economically advantaged populations generally possess greater educational, informational, organisational and financial resources through which political preferences can be communicated and sustained. Low-income citizens may simultaneously confront employment instability, transportation costs, caregiving responsibilities, limited information and immediate household pressures that increase the practical costs of political participation. Political exclusion can consequently exist without legal disenfranchisement through unequal distributions of **voice, access, agenda-setting capacity, institutional responsiveness and political efficacy**. Poverty should therefore be examined not only according to what resources disadvantaged citizens possess but also according to their capacity to influence institutions responsible for allocating public resources and opportunities.

Lister (2007) provides an important conceptual foundation for this interpretation by arguing that people experiencing poverty should be recognised as political subjects rather than treated merely as objects of policymaking. This distinction is especially relevant because conventional anti-poverty systems can unintentionally construct disadvantaged populations primarily as recipients whose needs are defined by experts and administrators. Participatory citizenship instead requires opportunities for affected populations to define problems, evaluate programmes, communicate priorities and hold institutions accountable for outcomes. Such involvement can also improve policy effectiveness because people directly experiencing poverty possess knowledge concerning administrative barriers, community conditions and programme consequences that may remain invisible within aggregate statistics. Participation therefore has both democratic and instrumental value because it expands political agency while improving institutional information. Jamaican poverty policy should consequently incorporate structured mechanisms through which disadvantaged citizens participate meaningfully in the **design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of interventions affecting their lives**.

Social protection becomes especially important within this analysis because the manner in which assistance is delivered can either strengthen or weaken substantive citizenship. Jamaica's National Poverty Reduction Programme already recognises interventions at household, community and national levels, providing an institutional foundation for multidimensional approaches to disadvantage. However, social assistance mediated through complicated bureaucracy, insufficient information or personalised relationships can create barriers that disproportionately affect people possessing limited time, resources or institutional knowledge. Rights-based social protection provides a different institutional relationship because access follows transparent rules and established entitlements rather than dependence upon discretionary favour. Such systems can strengthen trust by communicating that assistance represents a legitimate component of social citizenship rather than charity or political benevolence. Jamaican

social protection should consequently be evaluated according to both **the resources transferred and the institutional relationships created between vulnerable citizens and the state.**

The relationship between poverty and political agency also raises concerns regarding clientelism because material scarcity can increase the value of access to politically mediated resources. Where citizens perceive employment, housing, community resources or assistance as dependent upon political connections, socioeconomic vulnerability may create incentives for personalised political dependency rather than autonomous citizenship. This does not establish that Jamaican social programmes are uniformly clientelistic, nor should historical patterns automatically be projected onto contemporary institutions without empirical evidence. Nevertheless, Jamaica's political history makes the relationship among partisan competition, local representation and distribution of resources an appropriate subject for systematic qualitative investigation. Transparent eligibility rules, digital administrative systems, independent oversight and accessible appeals mechanisms can help reduce opportunities for discretionary gatekeeping while strengthening perceptions of institutional fairness. The broader objective should be a developmental system in which vulnerable Jamaicans can obtain legitimate public services **because they possess recognised social rights rather than because they possess privileged political relationships.**

International comparisons demonstrate that unequal political influence among socioeconomic groups is not unique to developing societies. Social-exclusion research in European societies has similarly identified relationships among economic disadvantage, reduced civic participation and limited capacity to engage fully within political and social institutions (Levitas et al., 2007). The World Bank's contemporary social-inclusion framework likewise recognises that barriers can prevent groups from participating fully in political, economic and social life and that exclusion can operate through institutions, markets and discriminatory attitudes. These international patterns indicate that democratic institutions can coexist with substantial inequalities in political capability even where universal suffrage is firmly established. Jamaica's political-exclusion problem should therefore not be interpreted as evidence of democratic failure but as a challenge concerning the **depth and equality of democratic citizenship.** Developmental inclusion ultimately requires movement from formal citizenship towards conditions under which citizens possess meaningful capabilities to exercise their rights and influence institutions.

The findings consequently suggest that political inclusion should become an explicit component of Jamaican poverty measurement and policy evaluation. Potential indicators could include confidence in public institutions, perceived ability to influence community decisions, knowledge of public services, experiences accessing governmental agencies, participation in community organisations and perceptions of procedural fairness. Such measures would not replace conventional political indicators such as voting or electoral participation but would reveal whether disadvantaged populations possess comparable practical opportunities to exercise political agency. Qualitative interviews would be particularly valuable because individuals may experience political exclusion through subtle institutional encounters not readily captured by conventional survey questions. Future research should also compare low-income and economically secure populations to determine whether perceived institutional responsiveness varies systematically according to socioeconomic position. Poverty reduction would thereby be

assessed not merely according to increased consumption but according to whether disadvantaged Jamaicans increasingly experience themselves as **effective participants in rather than peripheral recipients of national development**.

Findings: Psychological Exclusion

The fourth major finding is that **psychological exclusion represents a significant but comparatively underdeveloped dimension of Jamaican poverty research**. Persistent difficulty meeting household needs can generate chronic uncertainty concerning food, transportation, rent, utilities, education, healthcare and unexpected emergencies, creating continual demands upon attention and emotional resources. Experimental and interdisciplinary research demonstrates that scarcity can consume cognitive resources while poverty contributes to stress, negative affect, anxiety and depression through multiple pathways (Haushofer & Fehr, 2014; Mani et al., 2013; Ridley et al., 2020). These mechanisms should not be interpreted as evidence that economically disadvantaged people possess deficient personalities or inherently weaker decision-making abilities. Rather, continuously threatening economic environments can alter the psychological context within which decisions are made, meaning that behaviours observed under scarcity cannot always be interpreted independently of the circumstances producing them. Jamaican poverty research should consequently conceptualise psychological burden as a potential **outcome of structural disadvantage and a mechanism through which disadvantage may subsequently be reproduced**.

The cognitive-burden literature provides an especially important explanation of why poverty may influence decisions even among individuals possessing substantial motivation and capability. Mani et al. (2013) demonstrated that financial concerns can consume cognitive resources, suggesting that poverty itself can create mental demands that temporarily reduce the bandwidth available for other tasks. This perspective challenges interpretations that attribute difficulties in financial planning, administrative compliance or long-term decision-making exclusively to deficient knowledge or personal irresponsibility. A household simultaneously managing food expenditure, transportation costs, rent, school requirements and uncertain income must repeatedly make high-consequence decisions under constrained conditions. Social programmes that require complicated applications, repeated documentation, extensive travel or difficult administrative decisions may consequently impose particularly heavy burdens upon precisely those citizens whose economic circumstances already consume substantial cognitive resources. Anti-poverty institutions should therefore be designed according to the principle of **administrative simplicity**, reducing avoidable complexity and enabling beneficiaries to devote limited cognitive resources to education, employment, family life and long-term development.

Mental health provides a second pathway because the relationship between poverty and psychological well-being can operate in both directions. Ridley et al. (2020) synthesised causal evidence demonstrating that poverty can contribute to depression and anxiety while mental-health difficulties can subsequently reduce employment, productivity and income, thereby generating reciprocal relationships between economic and psychological disadvantage. Such feedback processes are particularly important for Jamaica because they imply that mental-health services and poverty policy cannot be conceptualised as entirely separate domains. Individuals

experiencing chronic financial insecurity, unsafe community conditions or repeated household shocks may require psychosocial support alongside economic interventions. Conversely, untreated psychological distress may reduce people's ability to maintain employment, complete education, navigate institutions or participate socially, thereby increasing vulnerability to material deprivation. The evidence therefore supports integrating **economic security and psychological well-being within a common multidimensional understanding of poverty**.

Shame and stigma constitute additional mechanisms because poverty is interpreted socially and therefore influences identity, relationships and perceptions of personal worth. Cross-national qualitative research conducted across substantially different societies found poverty-related shame to be a recurring experience, although its precise cultural expression varied considerably (Walker et al., 2013). Jo (2013) similarly argues that poverty-related shame should be understood socially rather than merely psychologically because cultural narratives and policy institutions contribute to producing and sustaining stigma. Research involving low-income Canadians found that perceived poverty stigma generated responses including withdrawal, concealment and distancing, illustrating how economic disadvantage can affect social participation and identity (Reutter et al., 2009). These findings indicate that poverty policy can inadvertently intensify exclusion when institutional practices communicate that recipients are irresponsible, dependent or personally responsible for structural disadvantages. Jamaican social policy should consequently evaluate whether programme language, eligibility processes and interactions with beneficiaries protect or undermine **dignity, social recognition and psychological security**.

The relationship between shame and social exclusion provides a particularly important mechanism for explaining why psychological disadvantage can reproduce economic hardship. International qualitative research suggests that poverty-related shame can encourage withdrawal, concealment and reductions in personal efficacy, thereby weakening social participation and potentially reducing access to supportive networks (Walker et al., 2013). Longitudinal evidence from Europe similarly supports the proposition that economic hardship can reduce social participation and deteriorate social relationships, reinforcing the relational character of poverty (Mood & Jonsson, 2016). Social networks frequently provide employment information, emergency assistance, childcare, emotional support and access to opportunities, meaning that withdrawal from relationships can have economic as well as psychological consequences. Shame can therefore create a feedback mechanism in which material deprivation produces social withdrawal while reduced social capital subsequently diminishes resources capable of facilitating escape from deprivation. The poverty-exclusion relationship consequently becomes circular rather than linear, connecting **material scarcity → stigma → psychological distress → social withdrawal → reduced opportunity → continuing vulnerability**.

International comparison strengthens this conclusion because poverty-related psychological exclusion has been identified across societies possessing radically different cultural traditions, welfare institutions and levels of national income. Walker et al. (2013) found broadly recognisable experiences of poverty-related shame across research sites in Uganda, India, China, Pakistan, South Korea, the United Kingdom and Norway, although the cultural expression of shame varied. More recent research similarly associates economic hardship and poverty-related shame with psychological and social adjustment, reinforcing the continuing relevance of the

poverty-shame nexus (Zhan & Hiraishi, 2026). This cross-national consistency suggests that psychological exclusion is not a phenomenon peculiar to Jamaica, developing societies or any particular cultural group. Nevertheless, the specific Jamaican manifestations remain insufficiently researched, making it methodologically inappropriate simply to assume that international findings operate identically within Jamaican communities. The comparative evidence therefore identifies both a plausible mechanism and an important **Jamaican empirical research gap requiring direct investigation through interviews, focus groups and culturally validated psychological measures.**

The Jamaican context may give psychological exclusion distinctive characteristics because socioeconomic status interacts with community identity, educational experiences, migration expectations, consumption norms, family responsibilities and perceptions of social mobility. Relative deprivation may become particularly salient when individuals compare their circumstances with more affluent peers locally, with family members abroad or with lifestyles increasingly visible through digital and social media. Such comparisons do not necessarily generate psychological distress, but they may influence perceptions of success, failure, dignity and belonging where material differences become interpreted as indicators of personal worth. International evidence increasingly shows that comparative environments can influence poverty-related shame and psychological adjustment, reinforcing the importance of examining subjective socioeconomic positioning alongside objective income measures. Jamaican qualitative research should therefore investigate how people experiencing poverty themselves describe respect, embarrassment, aspiration, social comparison, powerlessness, resilience and hope rather than imposing externally developed psychological categories without cultural validation. Psychological inclusion ultimately requires understanding disadvantaged Jamaicans not simply as subjects experiencing scarcity but as **social actors interpreting their circumstances within culturally specific systems of meaning, expectation and opportunity.**

Taken together, Sections 12-15 reveal that Jamaica's poverty problem operates through interconnected **economic, spatial, political, social and psychological mechanisms** rather than through material deprivation alone. Economic vulnerability means that some households escaping measured poverty remain exposed to renewed deprivation, while spatial disadvantage influences the opportunities available within particular communities. Political exclusion concerns inequalities in citizens' practical capacity to influence institutions, while psychological exclusion demonstrates how insecurity, stigma and scarcity can affect cognition, dignity, agency and social participation. These mechanisms interact because insecure employment can produce financial stress, disadvantaged communities can restrict employment opportunities, political marginalisation can reduce institutional responsiveness, and psychological withdrawal can weaken networks capable of facilitating socioeconomic mobility. The findings therefore provide empirical and theoretical support for the study's proposed **Multidimensional Poverty-Exclusion-Capability Framework**, in which poverty is understood as a dynamic system of interacting disadvantages rather than a single economic condition. Jamaica's developmental objective should consequently progress from reducing the number of people classified as poor towards reducing the **structures and processes that repeatedly produce vulnerability, exclusion and restricted capabilities.**

Intergenerational Exclusion

The fifth major finding is that poverty and exclusion can become intergenerational because childhood conditions influence educational attainment, health, psychological development, networks and subsequent labour-market opportunities. Children raised in materially deprived households may simultaneously experience inadequate housing, food insecurity, exposure to violence, limited educational resources and stress in family environments. These disadvantages accumulate rather than operate independently, creating developmental pathways through which childhood poverty affects opportunities extending far beyond childhood itself. Educational access is especially important because schooling can function either as a major mechanism of mobility or as an institution through which existing class and spatial inequalities are reproduced when school quality differs substantially. Digital access has added dimension because participation in contemporary education and labour markets increasingly requires reliable connectivity, devices and digital competence. Breaking intergenerational poverty therefore requires intervention before disadvantage becomes consolidated across education, health, psychology, social networks and employment.

The intergenerational perspective also reveals the limitations of poverty programmes focused principally on short-term household consumption. Transfers can provide essential protection and may improve educational participation, nutrition and household stability, but sustainable mobility requires simultaneous improvement in the institutions shaping children's future opportunities. These institutions include early-childhood development, schools, health services, safe communities, transportation, digital infrastructure and pathways from education into productive employment. Psychological expectations also matter because young people repeatedly exposed to restricted opportunities may rationally revise aspirations when desired educational or occupational pathways appear inaccessible. Policy must therefore distinguish unrealistic motivational narratives from genuine expansion of opportunity because encouraging aspiration without altering structural barriers can shift responsibility for failure from institutions to disadvantaged individuals. Intergenerational inclusion requires transforming both the resources children receive and the opportunity structures into which they mature.

Comparative Perspective: The Caribbean

The Jamaican experience shares important characteristics with other Caribbean societies in which small domestic markets, colonial economic histories, external vulnerability and uneven productive opportunities shape contemporary poverty. Recent harmonised evidence for Barbados, Belize, Grenada, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and Suriname indicates that poverty is strongly related to low educational attainment and insufficient employment opportunities, while digital connectivity and productive job creation remain important dimensions of inclusion (World Bank, 2025b). These findings demonstrate that Jamaica's employment and education challenges are not uniquely national but form part of a wider Caribbean developmental problem concerning conversion of human capabilities into productive opportunities. Nevertheless, poverty varies considerably among Caribbean societies, cautioning against treating the region as institutionally or developmentally homogeneous. Differences in social protection, educational systems, migration opportunities, economic structure, institutional capacity and vulnerability to shocks

create divergent trajectories among states sharing important historical characteristics. Jamaica's comparative significance therefore lies in identifying which forms of exclusion reflect Caribbean structural conditions and which are more directly associated with domestic institutional arrangements.

Suriname provides a useful regional comparison because recent poverty assessments similarly identify skills, education and insufficiently targeted social protection as important mechanisms underlying deprivation (World Bank, 2024b). Barbados provides a different comparative case because relatively stronger social indicators demonstrate that small-island vulnerability does not inevitably produce equivalent degrees of poverty or exclusion across the Caribbean. The regional comparison consequently challenges deterministic explanations based exclusively on size, colonial history or geography. Shared vulnerabilities may establish constraints, but institutional design, social investment, economic diversification and policy effectiveness influence how those constraints are translated into household welfare. Caribbean comparative analysis therefore supports the central theoretical argument that structural conditions and institutional agency must be examined simultaneously. Jamaica should consequently use regional comparison not merely to benchmark poverty rates but to identify institutional arrangements capable of weakening the mechanisms through which vulnerability becomes persistent exclusion.

Comparative Perspective: South Africa

South Africa offers a particularly useful comparative society because political democracy exists alongside historically entrenched spatial, economic and racial inequalities inherited from apartheid. Despite very different historical institutions from Jamaica, South Africa demonstrates how political inclusion through universal citizenship may coexist with substantial economic and spatial exclusion when access to productive assets, employment and quality services remains unequal. This reinforces the distinction between formal political rights and the substantive capabilities required to participate equally in society. Both cases also illustrate the persistence of historically structured geographies in which place influences access to employment, infrastructure, education and safety, although the origins and severity of these processes differ significantly. The South African experience consequently demonstrates that political transformation does not automatically dissolve socioeconomic structures produced through earlier institutional regimes. Jamaica's own postcolonial transformation should similarly be evaluated according to changes in capabilities, opportunities and institutional relationships rather than political sovereignty alone.

South African evidence further supports treating unemployment and labour-market exclusion as multidimensional social problems rather than simply lost income. Prolonged exclusion from productive employment can reduce social participation, psychological well-being and perceptions of future possibility while increasing household dependence and vulnerability. Jamaica currently possesses substantially lower unemployment than during earlier periods, but the comparison remains relevant because employment quality and productivity determine whether labour-market participation generates durable economic security. The analytical lesson is therefore not that Jamaica and South Africa possess equivalent poverty structures but that employment links economic, social and psychological inclusion across substantially different

societies. Policies focused principally on labour-force participation can consequently miss important distinctions among temporary, informal, insecure and developmental employment. The comparative evidence strengthens the argument for incorporating employment quality in Jamaica's future multidimensional poverty and exclusion framework.

Comparative Perspective: Latin America

Latin American scholarship and policy increasingly conceptualise poverty as a multidimensional phenomenon shaped by employment quality, social protection, housing, connectivity and unequal opportunities. Recent UNDP regional work identifies poor job quality and barriers to labour-force participation as major contributors to multidimensional poverty and gives particular attention to connectivity and housing conditions (UNDP, 2025). These findings closely parallel emerging concerns in Jamaica, where declining income poverty does not eliminate vulnerability associated with precarious employment, household shocks and unequal access to developmental opportunities. Latin American experience additionally demonstrates the importance of social-protection architecture because large-scale transfer programmes can reduce material poverty while leaving deeper structural inequalities in education, labour markets, race, gender and territory insufficiently transformed. Jamaica can therefore learn from both the achievements and limitations of Latin American social policy rather than mechanically importing particular programmes. The comparative lesson is that redistribution is indispensable but achieves its greatest developmental effect when combined with institutional reforms expanding capabilities and productive participation.

Comparative Perspective: The United Kingdom and Other High-Income Societies

Research from the United Kingdom is particularly useful because social-exclusion scholarship developed sophisticated measures demonstrating that poverty, unemployment, inadequate services, limited social participation and political disengagement can overlap without being identical. Levitas et al. (2007) conceptualised social exclusion as multidimensional disadvantage involving resources, participation and quality of life, thereby illustrating why high-income societies still contain significant forms of exclusion despite comparatively extensive welfare systems. British research further demonstrates that people can experience poverty through inability to participate in activities regarded as ordinary in their society rather than through absolute destitution alone. This reinforces Townsend's (1979) relative-deprivation framework and is highly relevant to a middle-income society such as Jamaica, where changing consumption norms alter what effective participation requires. Evidence concerning poverty-related shame in the United Kingdom and Japan also demonstrates that psychological exclusion is not peculiar to developing societies but arises in substantially different welfare and cultural systems (Sutton et al., 2014). Jamaica's experience therefore belongs in a global problem of unequal social participation while retaining distinctive features arising from Caribbean history, institutions and economic structure.

Discussion

The combined evidence suggests that poverty in Jamaica should be reconceptualised as an **exclusionary and capability-limiting system** rather than understood solely as a position below a monetary or consumption threshold. Material deprivation remains foundational because inadequate economic resources directly restrict consumption and indirectly influence housing quality, educational participation, healthcare access, transportation, digital connectivity and engagement in socially valued activities (Sen, 1999; Townsend, 1979). However, the consequences of poverty become substantially more complex when economic scarcity interacts with institutions, neighbourhood conditions, labour markets, social relationships and political structures that determine whether individuals can convert available resources into meaningful opportunities (Sen, 1999, 2000). Social-exclusion theory reinforces this interpretation by emphasising that deprivation is relational as well as distributive, because disadvantage can emerge through restricted participation in networks, institutions and activities that connect individuals to wider society (Levitas et al., 2007; Silver, 1994). Psychological mechanisms further connect external disadvantage with stress, insecurity, cognitive burden, diminished expectations and negative affect without implying that people experiencing poverty possess inherent psychological deficiencies (Haushofer & Fehr, 2014; Mani et al., 2013; Ridley et al., 2020). Jamaica's recent reduction in officially measured poverty should therefore be recognised as an important achievement while simultaneously being interpreted as only one component of a wider developmental challenge involving economic security, social participation, institutional inclusion, psychological well-being and substantive freedom.

This interpretation directly addresses the study's central research gap because declining material poverty does not necessarily demonstrate a corresponding decline in social, political or psychological exclusion. Jamaica's national poverty rate fell markedly between 2021 and 2023, illustrating that consumption-based indicators can improve significantly within a relatively short period (Planning Institute of Jamaica [PIOJ], 2025). Such improvements matter substantially because greater household consumption can reduce food insecurity, enable expenditure on education and transportation, improve housing conditions and strengthen households' capacity to satisfy immediate needs. Nevertheless, individuals may cross the poverty threshold while remaining employed in precarious occupations, possessing minimal savings, residing in disadvantaged communities, experiencing limited institutional influence or remaining highly exposed to economic and environmental shocks. Their statistical classification may therefore change more quickly than the structural relationships determining their long-term security and opportunity. The evidence consequently supports the study's contention that **poverty reduction and exclusion reduction should be treated as overlapping but analytically distinct developmental processes**.

The conventional binary distinction between the poor and non-poor is consequently too rigid for understanding the socioeconomic position of many Jamaican households. Poverty thresholds perform an essential statistical and policy function by identifying populations whose consumption falls below an established minimum, but they necessarily create a categorical boundary within what is often a continuous distribution of economic vulnerability (Ravallion, 2016). A household situated marginally above the poverty line may possess resources only

slightly greater than another household officially classified as poor while sharing similar employment insecurity, housing conditions, indebtedness, educational constraints and exposure to unexpected expenses. Small changes in food prices, transportation costs, illness, employment hours or household composition may therefore move families across the statistical threshold without fundamentally transforming their socioeconomic circumstances. This distinction supports the development of a continuum extending from **severe deprivation** → **chronic poverty** → **transient poverty** → **economic vulnerability** → **precarious non-poverty** → **secure inclusion**, rather than relying exclusively upon a poor/non-poor dichotomy. Such an approach would enable Jamaican social policy to identify households at substantial risk of poverty before deterioration in consumption becomes sufficiently severe to trigger formal classification.

The importance of vulnerability becomes clearer when poverty is examined dynamically rather than as a cross-sectional condition observed at one point in time. Chronic poverty differs conceptually from transient poverty because some households experience prolonged deprivation while others move into and out of poverty following economic, health, employment or environmental shocks (Hulme & Shepherd, 2003). These trajectories matter because households emerging from poverty may remain vulnerable if their improved circumstances depend upon unstable employment, remittances, temporary income gains or continued absence of major household shocks. Assets, savings, insurance, secure employment, education and supportive social networks can protect households against downward mobility, meaning that resilience depends upon resources not completely captured through current consumption expenditure. Consequently, policies that successfully reduce poverty at one moment may not produce sustainable poverty exits unless households simultaneously acquire mechanisms protecting their gains. Jamaican poverty analysis should therefore distinguish **escape from current poverty** from **achievement of durable economic security**.

Climate vulnerability makes this distinction especially consequential within Jamaica because household socioeconomic security exists within an island environment repeatedly exposed to hurricanes, flooding, drought and other climate-related hazards. Natural disasters can destroy housing, agricultural production, household assets, infrastructure and employment opportunities, creating poverty transitions even among households previously classified as non-poor. Poor and near-poor populations are particularly vulnerable because they frequently possess fewer savings, weaker insurance coverage and less capacity to finance reconstruction following major shocks (Hallegatte et al., 2017). Jamaica's continuing investment in disaster preparedness illustrates recognition that development resilience requires protection of both infrastructure and livelihoods rather than reliance exclusively upon post-disaster reconstruction. Climate resilience should therefore be incorporated into poverty policy through social protection, insurance mechanisms, resilient housing, livelihood diversification, emergency financing and targeted support for geographically vulnerable communities. The relevant developmental objective is not merely restoring households to their pre-disaster position but preventing environmental shocks from initiating long-term trajectories of deprivation and exclusion.

Employment emerges from the findings as another domain in which conventional binary classifications may conceal important differences in developmental inclusion. Being classified as

employed does not necessarily establish that employment provides adequate earnings, predictable hours, social protection, occupational security, skills development or realistic opportunities for socioeconomic advancement. The International Labour Organization's decent-work framework emphasises productive employment, rights, social protection and social dialogue, thereby illustrating why employment quality matters alongside employment quantity (International Labour Organization [ILO], 1999). This distinction is particularly relevant to poverty because households dependent upon insecure or inadequately remunerated work may remain vulnerable even when unemployment is low. Employment also carries social and psychological consequences because work can provide identity, status, networks, predictable routines and perceptions of future security in addition to income. Jamaican poverty reduction should consequently evaluate whether labour-market improvements are generating **adequate and sustainable livelihoods**, rather than interpreting employment status alone as evidence of socioeconomic inclusion.

Spatial exclusion further complicates the relationship between poverty reduction and development because where individuals live influences the opportunities available to them independently of household income. Jamaican poverty has historically displayed geographic variation, while disadvantaged communities may face overlapping constraints involving transportation, infrastructure, violence, schooling, employment accessibility and institutional presence (Moser & Holland, 1997; PIOJ, 2025). Such disadvantages can create neighbourhood effects whereby individuals possessing similar personal characteristics experience different opportunities because their residential environments provide unequal access to social and economic resources. International research similarly demonstrates that concentrated neighbourhood disadvantage can influence educational achievement, employment opportunities, health outcomes and social mobility, particularly when deprivation becomes spatially persistent (Sampson, 2012). These processes suggest that household-level poverty programmes cannot independently resolve disadvantages produced through community infrastructure, territorial stigma, unsafe environments or geographically unequal public services. Jamaica consequently requires **place-based poverty reduction** in which household assistance is combined with long-term transformation of disadvantaged communities and the institutional environments surrounding them.

Political inclusion represents another dimension through which improvements in income may fail to translate automatically into broader developmental empowerment. Democratic citizenship formally provides Jamaicans with voting rights and opportunities for political participation, yet substantive influence may remain unevenly distributed because participation requires time, information, organisational capacity, institutional knowledge and access to decision-makers. Poverty can increase the practical costs of participation because individuals confronting unstable employment, transportation constraints, caregiving responsibilities or immediate household needs possess fewer resources for sustained civic engagement. This situation creates the possibility of what may be described as **political capability inequality**, in which citizens possess similar formal rights but different practical capacities to convert those rights into influence over collective decisions (Lister, 2007; Sen, 2000). Political exclusion can then reinforce material disadvantage if populations possessing limited influence are less capable of ensuring that public

investment responds to their communities' priorities. Jamaica's poverty strategy should therefore conceptualise political voice and accessible institutions as components of inclusion rather than assuming that electoral democracy alone produces equality of political agency.

The psychological findings provide an additional explanation for why disadvantage can persist after changes in household economic circumstances. Scarcity requires individuals continually to allocate limited resources among competing necessities, creating cognitive demands that can consume attention required for other decisions and tasks (Mani et al., 2013). Experimental and observational evidence further indicates that poverty can generate stress and negative affect while depression and anxiety themselves can subsequently reduce economic participation, creating bidirectional relationships between psychological well-being and socioeconomic conditions (Haushofer & Fehr, 2014; Ridley et al., 2020). These mechanisms demonstrate why behaviours associated with short-term decision-making should not automatically be interpreted as irresponsibility or deficient motivation among disadvantaged populations. Chronic uncertainty can make immediate needs objectively more salient than investments whose benefits occur in the distant future, particularly where households lack reliable financial buffers. Jamaican poverty interventions should consequently reduce material scarcity while designing institutions that minimise unnecessary administrative complexity, uncertainty and psychological burden.

Dignity and stigma provide related mechanisms through which poverty can remain socially consequential even where basic material needs improve. Walker et al. (2013) found evidence across diverse societies suggesting that shame is a recurrent dimension of poverty, although its cultural expression varies substantially according to social context. Individuals who perceive themselves as socially judged because of poverty may withdraw from social relationships, conceal financial difficulties or avoid institutions associated with stigmatised assistance. Social protection can either mitigate or intensify these experiences depending upon whether programmes treat beneficiaries as rights-bearing citizens or communicate assumptions of dependency, failure or undeservingness (Roelen, 2020). This distinction is particularly relevant to Jamaican policy because the success of assistance should be evaluated partly according to whether recipients can obtain support without sacrificing dignity, autonomy or social recognition. Psychological and social inclusion consequently require anti-poverty institutions that protect people materially while avoiding practices that reproduce the stigma associated with receiving assistance.

The findings additionally suggest that material, social, political and psychological exclusions should not be conceptualised as independent dimensions that simply accumulate within disadvantaged individuals. They interact dynamically through **feedback mechanisms** in which one form of exclusion increases the probability or intensity of another. Material poverty can limit transportation and digital access, weakening employment opportunities and social participation, while social isolation can reduce access to information and networks capable of improving employment prospects. Economic and social marginalisation can reduce political influence, while perceptions of institutional powerlessness may weaken trust and participation, further reducing disadvantaged communities' capacity to advocate for resources. Persistent insecurity and limited agency can subsequently produce psychological stress or diminished expectations, potentially affecting long-term planning and engagement with institutions. The resulting

feedback structure explains how temporary economic hardship can develop into cumulative disadvantage even where no single mechanism independently determines an individual's trajectory.

This cumulative interpretation resonates with international evidence and demonstrates that Jamaica's experience is neither unique nor reducible to Caribbean exceptionalism. South Africa illustrates how political democratisation can coexist with substantial spatial and socioeconomic exclusion where historically structured inequalities in employment, assets and community opportunities persist (World Bank, 2022). Latin American multidimensional poverty frameworks increasingly incorporate employment quality, social protection and connectivity, reflecting recognition that monetary improvement alone does not guarantee substantive participation in economic and social life (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2025). British social-exclusion scholarship similarly demonstrates that deprivation can involve restricted participation, inadequate services, weak social relationships and reduced quality of life even within comparatively affluent welfare states (Levitas et al., 2007). These comparisons indicate that the distinction between income poverty and broader exclusion is observable across radically different institutional and economic settings. Jamaica's contribution to this comparative literature lies in demonstrating how these mechanisms operate within a small, postcolonial Caribbean society characterised by democratic continuity, significant exposure to external shocks and historically structured spatial inequalities.

At the same time, comparative evidence cautions against assuming that mechanisms identified internationally operate identically within Jamaica. Social exclusion is embedded within cultural expectations, political institutions, labour markets, household arrangements and historically specific relationships between citizens and the state (Silver, 1994). Jamaican family structures, migration networks, remittance relationships, community identities, religious organisations and informal systems of support may mitigate some dimensions of exclusion while potentially reproducing others. International theories should therefore provide analytical tools rather than templates imposed without empirical examination of local contexts. This requirement reinforces the rationale for the study's qualitative methodology because documentary and comparative interpretation allows relationships to be examined contextually rather than treating multidimensional deprivation as a universally identical statistical construct. Future Jamaican research should particularly investigate how affected populations themselves conceptualise poverty, dignity, belonging, powerlessness, security and successful escape from disadvantage.

An intergenerational perspective further deepens the discussion because current exclusion can influence future inequality even when children's households subsequently move above the poverty threshold. Childhood exposure to inadequate nutrition, unstable housing, violence, poor-quality schooling, stress and restricted digital or educational resources can shape capabilities accumulated across the life course. Life-course scholarship demonstrates that early disadvantage can have persistent consequences through developmental pathways connecting childhood conditions with subsequent health, education, employment and socioeconomic status (Ben-Shlomo & Kuh, 2002). These relationships imply that poverty reduction should not be evaluated exclusively according to immediate household consumption because interventions affecting children's developmental environments can generate benefits that emerge decades later.

Conversely, failure to address educational, community and psychological disadvantages can allow intergenerational exclusion to continue even where short-term household income improves. Jamaica's poverty strategy should therefore give particular priority to children and adolescents because preventing cumulative disadvantage is likely to be more effective than attempting to reverse fully established exclusion in adulthood.

The evidence also has important implications for how successful national development should be defined. A society may experience falling poverty while continuing to exhibit insecurity, low social mobility, unequal community conditions, institutional distrust and substantial concentrations of vulnerability. Conversely, progress in health, education, security, employment quality and political inclusion may produce important developmental gains before these improvements become fully visible in conventional poverty statistics. Sen's (1999) capability perspective provides a useful normative basis for resolving this measurement problem because it evaluates development according to the substantive freedoms and opportunities people possess rather than resources alone. Under this interpretation, the objective of Jamaican poverty policy becomes not simply raising consumption above a specified minimum but expanding individuals' effective capability to remain healthy, educated, secure, economically productive, socially connected and politically autonomous. Poverty reduction therefore becomes one component of a broader project of **inclusive human development**.

The findings consequently support replacing neither monetary poverty measurement nor the existing Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions, but complementing them with measures capable of identifying vulnerability and exclusion. The JSLC already captures multiple domains including consumption, health, education, housing and social protection, providing a strong empirical foundation from which a broader analytical architecture can be developed (PIOJ, 2025). Additional measures could assess household resilience, quality of employment, neighbourhood security, digital access, institutional accessibility, political efficacy, perceived dignity, psychological distress, social participation and expectations concerning future mobility. Longitudinal measurement would be particularly valuable because repeated observations could distinguish durable poverty exits from temporary improvements and identify which forms of exclusion predict subsequent downward mobility. Such evidence could also reveal whether people remaining above the poverty threshold nevertheless experience persistent disadvantages capable of restricting their capabilities. The methodological implication is therefore an expansion from **poverty measurement towards poverty, vulnerability and inclusion measurement**.

A corresponding policy shift is required from predominantly remedial intervention towards **preventive and capability-enhancing social policy**. Remedial policies remain indispensable for households currently experiencing severe deprivation, but restricting intervention to those already below the poverty threshold means assistance may arrive only after assets, employment, housing stability or psychological well-being have deteriorated substantially. Preventive policy would identify households exposed to foreseeable risks and strengthen their resilience through employment security, savings mechanisms, insurance, accessible healthcare, social protection, educational investment and climate-resilient infrastructure (Hallegatte et al., 2017). Capability-enhancing policy would subsequently extend beyond protection by increasing people's substantive opportunities for mobility, participation and autonomy. This approach acknowledges

that successful social policy should both prevent downward movement and expand pathways towards sustained socioeconomic advancement. Jamaica's next generation of poverty policy should therefore integrate **protection, prevention, resilience, inclusion and capability development** rather than treating each as an unrelated policy objective.

The discussion ultimately confirms the central argument generated by the study's research gap: **a decline in measured poverty cannot by itself establish a decline in exclusion**. Jamaica's achievement in reducing official poverty is developmentally important and should neither be dismissed nor minimised, particularly because adequate material resources remain indispensable for human well-being. However, a comprehensive assessment must additionally determine whether people possess secure employment, resilient households, safe and enabling communities, meaningful institutional voice, supportive social relationships, psychological security and credible pathways for upward mobility. Where these conditions remain weak, individuals may technically exit poverty while continuing to inhabit social positions from which future deprivation remains probable. The appropriate developmental question is therefore not merely how many Jamaicans currently fall below the poverty line but how many have acquired the material and non-material conditions required to remain securely above it and participate fully in Jamaican society. This reconceptualisation transforms poverty reduction from a statistical endpoint into an ongoing process of expanding **security, agency, dignity, resilience and substantive freedom**.

The Multidimensional Poverty-Exclusion-Capability Framework

The study proposes a **Multidimensional Poverty-Exclusion-Capability Framework (MPECF)** comprising five interconnected domains through which Jamaican development should be evaluated. The first domain is **material security**, encompassing adequate income, consumption, food, housing, employment quality, assets and capacity to withstand economic shocks. The second is **social inclusion**, encompassing safe communities, education, healthcare, transportation, digital connectivity, social networks and participation in socially valued activities. The third is **political and institutional inclusion**, encompassing voice, accessible public institutions, transparent social protection, participatory policymaking, institutional trust and freedom from dependency on personalised political mediation. The fourth is **psychological security**, encompassing dignity, reduced chronic stress, hope, self-efficacy, freedom from poverty-related stigma and access to appropriate mental-health support. The fifth is **developmental capability**, representing people's effective ability to convert resources and institutional opportunities into sustained improvements in health, education, employment, mobility, resilience and quality of life.

Conceptually, the framework can be expressed as **Material Deprivation → Social Exclusion → Political/Institutional Exclusion → Psychological Burden → Restricted Capabilities → Reproduction of Poverty**, while recognising reciprocal pathways among every component. Social protection, education, safe communities, productive employment, institutional accessibility and psychological support can interrupt these pathways at different stages. The framework does not assume that every person experiencing poverty follows an identical trajectory because individuals possess different resources, relationships and resilience factors.

Instead, it identifies a set of mechanisms capable of explaining why similar incomes produce different outcomes and why people may remain excluded after crossing official poverty thresholds. It also enables policy evaluation to move beyond programme expenditure towards changes in people's actual opportunities and experiences. The central question consequently becomes not simply “**How many Jamaicans are poor?**” but “**How many Jamaicans possess the resources, relationships, institutional power and psychological security required to participate fully in national life?**”

Policy Implications for Jamaica

The first policy implication is that Jamaica should preserve consumption-based poverty measurement while complementing it with an **Exclusion and Capability Dashboard** rather than replacing existing measures. Indicators should capture employment quality, household financial resilience, transportation accessibility, community safety, digital connectivity, institutional access, social participation, political efficacy, perceived discrimination, psychological distress, hope and subjective capability. Such measurement would permit policymakers to identify households that have escaped income poverty but remain vulnerable across other dimensions. Data should be disaggregated geographically and according to relevant demographic characteristics because national averages can conceal concentrated exclusion in particular communities. Longitudinal measurement would be particularly valuable because movement into and out of poverty provides more policy information than cross-sectional status alone. Jamaica could thereby become a Caribbean leader in moving from poverty accounting towards comprehensive measurement of developmental inclusion.

The second implication concerns social protection because programmes should increasingly combine **protection, capability development and institutional dignity**. Cash and in-kind assistance remain essential for households confronting material deprivation, but effective programmes should simultaneously facilitate education, skills development, employment pathways, financial resilience and access to healthcare. Administrative procedures should be simplified where possible because unnecessarily complex systems impose cognitive and time costs disproportionately on populations already managing scarcity. Programme communication should also avoid language and practices capable of stigmatising recipients because dignity is itself an important dimension of social inclusion (Roelen, 2020). Beneficiaries should participate in programme evaluation through structured mechanisms capable of identifying barriers invisible to administrators. Social protection would thereby operate not merely as poverty relief but as institutional infrastructure for expanding citizenship and capability.

The third implication is the need for **place-based development** in communities experiencing overlapping poverty, violence, inadequate infrastructure and weak economic opportunity. These communities require coordinated rather than fragmented interventions because isolated programmes cannot adequately address mutually reinforcing disadvantages. Investments in schools, transportation, community spaces, digital infrastructure, employment, housing, safety and psychosocial services should therefore be geographically integrated. Community residents should be directly involved in identifying priorities and evaluating outcomes, reducing the danger that place-based policy becomes externally imposed development rather than participatory

transformation. Attention should be given to children and young people because early interventions provide the greatest opportunity to interrupt intergenerational pathways linking poverty, violence, educational disadvantage and psychological stress. The objective should ultimately be to transform disadvantaged communities from locations of managed deprivation into environments capable of generating mobility.

The fourth implication concerns political inclusion because poverty reduction should strengthen citizens' relationships with institutions rather than deepen dependency on intermediaries. Public services and social assistance should operate through transparent rules, predictable eligibility and accessible appeal mechanisms wherever possible. Participatory budgeting, community consultation, citizen monitoring and accessible publication of local development outcomes could increase the substantive voice of disadvantaged populations. Civic education should similarly extend beyond electoral participation towards understanding public institutions, social rights and mechanisms through which citizens can influence policy. Such reforms would not eliminate socioeconomic inequalities in political power but could reduce informational and institutional barriers disproportionately affecting disadvantaged communities. The goal is a form of social citizenship in which economically vulnerable Jamaicans interact with the state principally as rights-bearing participants rather than passive recipients.

The fifth implication is that psychological well-being should become an explicit component of anti-poverty strategy rather than remaining confined to the health sector. Community-level mental-health services, school-based psychosocial programmes, violence-trauma interventions and accessible counselling can reduce some of the psychological consequences associated with chronic disadvantage. However, psychological interventions cannot substitute for adequate income, employment, housing or safety because doing so would individualise problems generated substantially by structural conditions. The strongest approach is therefore simultaneous reduction of material stressors and expansion of psychological resources enabling individuals to respond effectively to unavoidable adversity. Poverty programmes should also recognise the cognitive burden associated with scarcity by reducing administrative complexity and providing timely, comprehensible information. Jamaica would thereby move towards a genuinely biopsychosocial understanding of poverty rather than treating economic and psychological dimensions as unrelated policy problems.

Contribution to Knowledge

The principal theoretical contribution of this study is the integration of material poverty, social exclusion, political exclusion and psychological exclusion in a unified Jamaican framework. Existing Jamaican research provides substantial evidence concerning living conditions and socioeconomic inequality, but the explanatory connections among these dimensions remain insufficiently synthesised. The study demonstrates conceptually that falling consumption poverty can coexist with persistent exclusion because economic resources represent only one mechanism through which capabilities are produced. Its comparative contribution lies in demonstrating that similar mechanisms occur across societies with substantially different income levels, histories and welfare institutions, although their manifestations vary according to context. Its policy contribution is the proposed Multidimensional Poverty-Exclusion-Capability Framework, which

transforms poverty evaluation from measurement of minimum consumption towards assessment of people's effective participation in national development. The framework consequently offers a basis for future qualitative interviews, quantitative index construction, longitudinal analysis and policy evaluation in Jamaica and elsewhere in the Caribbean.

Limitations and Future Research

The study's principal limitation is its reliance on qualitative documentary synthesis rather than original interviews with people experiencing poverty and exclusion. Existing administrative and household-survey data provide essential evidence but cannot completely represent subjective experiences involving dignity, political voice, stigma, fear, belonging and psychological security. A subsequent Jamaican study should therefore conduct in-depth interviews or focus groups across urban, rural and peri-urban communities and deliberately include individuals below and immediately above the official poverty threshold. Longitudinal qualitative research would be particularly valuable for examining how households understand transitions into and out of poverty following employment changes, illness, migration, disasters or social-policy interventions. Future quantitative research could subsequently operationalise the MPECF and test whether social, political and psychological exclusions predict future poverty independently of current household consumption. Such work would transform the conceptual framework developed here into a nationally validated multidimensional measurement instrument.

Conclusion

Poverty in Jamaica cannot adequately be understood solely through the question of whether household consumption falls above or below a nationally established threshold. Recent reductions in official poverty constitute meaningful developmental progress, but historical volatility and continuing geographic, economic and institutional inequalities demonstrate that many Jamaicans remain vulnerable to forms of disadvantage extending beyond measured material poverty. Social exclusion restricts participation and access to networks and institutions, political exclusion limits substantive citizenship and influence, while psychological exclusion converts insecurity and marginalisation into stress, shame, cognitive burden and diminished expectations. These conditions are interconnected and potentially self-reinforcing, meaning that poverty can reproduce itself through mechanisms operating simultaneously at household, community, institutional and psychological levels. Comparative evidence from Caribbean, African, Latin American and high-income societies demonstrates that these relationships are not uniquely Jamaican, although Jamaica's plantation history, small-island vulnerabilities, political institutions and community structures shape their expression. The next stage of Jamaican poverty reduction must therefore progress beyond moving households across a statistical poverty line towards building a society in which material security, social belonging, institutional voice, psychological dignity and genuine developmental capability are broadly shared.

References

Beckford, G. L. (1972). *Persistent poverty: Underdevelopment in plantation economies of the Third World*. Oxford University Press.

- Ben-Shlomo, Y., & Kuh, D. (2002). A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology: Conceptual models, empirical challenges and interdisciplinary perspectives. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 31(2), 285-293. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/31.2.285>
- Hallegatte, S., Vogt-Schilb, A., Bangalore, M., & Rozenberg, J. (2017). *Unbreakable: Building the resilience of the poor in the face of natural disasters*. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1003-9>
- Halliday, E., Popay, J., Anderson de Cuevas, R., & Wheeler, P. (2020). The elephant in the room? Why spatial stigma does not receive the public health attention it deserves. *Journal of Public Health*, 42(1), 38-43. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdy214>
- Haushofer, J., & Fehr, E. (2014). On the psychology of poverty. *Science*, 344(6186), 862-867. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1232491>
- Haushofer, J., & Fehr, E. (2014). On the psychology of poverty. *Science*, 344(6186), 862-867. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1232491>
- Hulme, D., & Shepherd, A. (2003). Conceptualising chronic poverty. *World Development*, 31(3), 403-423. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(02\)00222-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(02)00222-X)
- International Labour Organization. (1999). *Decent work: Report of the Director-General to the 87th Session of the International Labour Conference*. International Labour Office.
- Jamaica Information Service. (2025a, May 22). *Decline in poverty*.
- Jamaica Information Service. (2025b, November 26). *Poverty at record low of 7.8 per cent*.
- Jo, Y. N. (2013). Psycho-social dimensions of poverty: When poverty becomes shameful. *Critical Social Policy*, 33(3), 514-531. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018313479008>
- Katayama, R., Lain, J., Paju, A., & Rubiano-Matulevich, E. (2025, January 13). *Jamaica's poverty rollercoaster: Harnessing data to break the cycle*. World Bank.
- Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Fahmy, E., Gordon, D., Lloyd-Reichling, E., & Patsios, D. (2007). *The multidimensional analysis of social exclusion*. Department of Sociology and School for Social Policy, University of Bristol.
- Lister, R. (2007). From object to subject: Including marginalised citizens in policy-making. *Policy & Politics*, 35(3), 437-455. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557307781571249>
- Mani, A., Mullainathan, S., Shafir, E., & Zhao, J. (2013). Poverty impedes cognitive function. *Science*, 341(6149), 976-980. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1238041>
- Mood, C., & Jonsson, J. O. (2016). The social consequences of poverty: An empirical test on longitudinal data. *Social Indicators Research*, 127, 633-652. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-0983-9>
- Moser, C. O. N., & Holland, J. (1997). *Urban poverty and violence in Jamaica*. World Bank.
- Office of the Prime Minister. (2025, May 28). *Jamaica's poverty rate is at a historic low*. Government of Jamaica.
- Planning Institute of Jamaica & Statistical Institute of Jamaica. (2025). *Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions 2023*. Planning Institute of Jamaica.

- Planning Institute of Jamaica. (2023). *Jamaica: National multidimensional poverty index*. Planning Institute of Jamaica.
- Planning Institute of Jamaica. (n.d.). *National Poverty Reduction Programme*. Planning Institute of Jamaica.
- Ravallion, M. (2016). *The economics of poverty: History, measurement, and policy*. Oxford University Press.
- Reutter, L. I., Stewart, M. J., Veenstra, G., Love, R., Raphael, D., & Makwarimba, E. (2009). “Who do they think we are, anyway?”: Perceptions of and responses to poverty stigma. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(3), 297-311. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732308330246>
- Ridley, M., Rao, G., Schilbach, F., & Patel, V. (2020). Poverty, depression, and anxiety: Causal evidence and mechanisms. *Science*, 370(6522), eaay0214. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay0214>
- Roelen, K. (2020). Receiving social assistance in low- and middle-income countries: Negating shame or producing stigma? *Journal of Social Policy*, 49(4), 705-723. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279419000709>
- Sampson, R. J. (2012). *Great American city: Chicago and the enduring neighborhood effect*. University of Chicago Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Sen, A. (2000). *Social exclusion: Concept, application, and scrutiny*. Asian Development Bank.
- Silver, H. (1994). Social exclusion and social solidarity: Three paradigms. *International Labour Review*, 133(5-6), 531-578.
- Statistical Institute of Jamaica. (n.d.). *Living conditions and poverty*. Statistical Institute of Jamaica.
- Sutton, E., Pemberton, S., Fahmy, E., & Tamiya, Y. (2014). Stigma, shame and the experience of poverty in Japan and the United Kingdom. *Social Policy and Society*, 13(1), 143-154. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746413000419>
- Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8, Article 45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45>
- Townsend, P. (1979). *Poverty in the United Kingdom: A survey of household resources and standards of living*. Penguin Books.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2025). *Regional multidimensional poverty index for Latin America*. United Nations Development Programme.
- Walker, R., Bantebya Kyomuhendo, G., Chase, E., Choudhry, S., Gubrium, E. K., Nicola, J. Y., Lødemel, I., Mathew, L., Mwiine, A., Pellissery, S., & Ming, Y. (2013). Poverty in global perspective: Is shame a common denominator? *Journal of Social Policy*, 42(2), 215-233. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279412000979>
- World Bank. (2022). *Inequality in Southern Africa: An assessment of the Southern African Customs Union*. World Bank.

- World Bank. (2024a). *Jamaica poverty assessment: Strengthening resilience and opportunity for inclusive growth*. World Bank.
- World Bank. (2024b). *Suriname poverty and equity assessment*. World Bank.
- World Bank. (2025a). *Jamaica poverty and equity brief: October 2025*. World Bank.
- World Bank. (2025b). *Shared metrics, shared progress: Insights from harmonized data on poverty and inequality in the Caribbean*. World Bank.
- Zhan, S., & Hiraishi, K. (2026). When poverty is shameful: The role of poverty-related shame in the relationship between household economic situation and psychological adjustment. *Journal of Poverty*, 30(1), 87-102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10875549.2024.2379767>