# PMO-RALG

# BUKOBA RURAL CWIQ
## Survey on Poverty, Welfare and Services in Bukoba Rural DC

## SEPTEMBER 2006

II

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEFINITIONS

*General*

| | |
|---|---|
| Accessible Village | Within a district, accessible villages are villages located closer to the district capital, all-weather roads, and public transport. |
| Remote Village | Within a district, remote villages are villages located farther from the district capital, all-weather roads, and public transport. |
| Socio-economic Group | The socio-economic group of the household is determined by the type of work of the main income earner. |
| Poverty Predictors | Variables that can be used to determine household consumption expenditure levels in non-expenditure surveys. |
| Basic Needs Poverty Line | Defined as what a household, using the food basket of the poorest 50 percent of the population, needs to consume to satisfy its basic food needs to attain 2,200 Kcal/day per adult equivalent.  The share of non-food expenditures of the poorest 25 percent of households is then added.  The Basic Needs Poverty Line is set at TZS 7,253 per 28 days per adult equivalent unit in 2000/1 prices; households consuming less than this are assumed to be unable to satisfy their basic food and non-food needs. |

*Education*

| | |
|---|---|
| Literacy Rate | The proportion of respondents aged 15 years or older, who identify themselves as being able to read and write in at least one language. |
| Primary School Age | 7 to 13 years of age |
| Secondary School Age | 14 to 19 years of age |
| Satisfaction with Education | No problems cited with school attended. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Gross Enrolment Rate | The ratio of all individuals attending school, irrespective of their age, to the population of children of school age. |
| Net Enrolment Rate | The ratio of children of school age currently enrolled at school to the population of children of school age. |
| Non-Attendance Rate | The percentage of individuals of secondary school-age who had attended school at some point and were not attending school at the time of the survey. |

*Health*

| | |
|---|---|
| Need for Health Facilities | An individual is classed as having experienced need for a health facility if he/she had suffered from a self-diagnosed illness in the four weeks preceding the survey. |
| Use of Health Facilities | An individual is classed as having used a health facility if he/she had consulted a health professional in the four weeks preceding the survey. |
| Satisfaction with Health Facilities | No problems cited with health facility used in the four weeks preceding the survey. |
| Village Health Worker | An individual with no or little formal health training appointed by the village to provide basic medical assistance to the villagers. |
| Vaccinations | BCG: Anti-tuberculosis<br>DPT: Diphtheria, Pertussis3, Tetanus<br>OPV: Oral Polio Vaccination |
| Stunting | Occurs when an individual's height is substantially below the average height in his/her age-group. |
| Wasting | Occurs when an individual's weight is substantially below the average weight for his/her height category. |
| Orphan | A child is considered an orphan when he/she has lost at least one parent and is under 18 years. |
| Foster child | A child is considered foster if neither his/her parents reside in the household |

*Employment*

| | |
|---|---|
| Working Individual | An individual who had been engaged in any type of work in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. |
| Underemployed Individual | An individual who was ready to take on more work at the time of the survey. |
| Non-working Individual | An individual who had not been involved in any type of work in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. |
| Unemployed Individual | An individual who had not been engaged in any type of work in the 4 weeks prior to the survey but had been actively looking for it. |
| Economically Inactive Individual | An individual who had not been engaged in any type of work in the 4 weeks prior to the survey due to reasons unrelated to availability of work (e.g. Illness, old age, disability). |
| Household duties | Household tasks (cleaning, cooking, fetching firewood, water, etc.) that do not entail payment |
| Household worker | A household worker performs household duties but received payment. |
| Household as employer | A person is said to be employed by his/her household if he/she does domestic/household work for the household they live in (e.g. a housewife or a child that works on his/her parents' fields or shop). It does not include people whose main job was domestic work for other households (private sector). |

*Welfare*

| | |
|---|---|
| Access to Facilities | A household is considered to have access to facilities if it is located within 30 minutes of travel from the respective facilities. |

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

VIII

# LIST OF TABLES

## Generic Core Welfare Indicators (2006)

| | Total | Margin of error | Accessible | Remote | Poor | Non-poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Household characteristics** | | | | | | |
| Dependency ratio | 1.2 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Head is male | 73.0 | 2.0 | 74.8 | 71.0 | 80.0 | 70.7 |
| Head is female | 27.0 | 2.0 | 25.2 | 29.0 | 20.0 | 29.3 |
| Head is monagamous | 50.4 | 3.1 | 50.4 | 50.4 | 57.6 | 48.2 |
| Head is polygamous | 10.2 | 1.7 | 11.0 | 9.4 | 10.5 | 10.1 |
| Head is not married | 39.3 | 2.3 | 38.6 | 40.2 | 31.9 | 41.7 |
| **Household welfare** | | | | | | |
| Household economic situation compared to one year ago | | | | | | |
| Worse now | 55.7 | 3.1 | 50.5 | 61.3 | 59.5 | 54.5 |
| Better now | 22.3 | 2.3 | 24.6 | 19.9 | 17.9 | 23.7 |
| Neighborhood crime/security situation compared to one year ago | | | | | | |
| Worse now | 23.9 | 3.1 | 23.8 | 23.9 | 32.8 | 21.1 |
| Better now | 41.8 | 3.9 | 40.0 | 43.7 | 38.2 | 42.9 |
| Difficulty satisfying household needs | | | | | | |
| Food | 24.0 | 2.8 | 22.9 | 25.2 | 10.9 | 28.2 |
| School fees | 4.0 | 1.2 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 1.6 | 4.8 |
| House rent | 1.2 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Utility bills | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| Health care | 24.9 | 3.0 | 23.4 | 26.4 | 28.1 | 23.9 |
| **Agriculture** | | | | | | |
| Land owned compared to one year ago | | | | | | |
| Less now | 3.5 | 1.0 | 4.6 | 2.3 | 3.7 | 3.4 |
| More now | 4.8 | 1.0 | 5.9 | 3.5 | 5.8 | 4.4 |
| Cattle owned compared to one year ago | | | | | | |
| Less now | 5.8 | 1.2 | 6.5 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 6.3 |
| More now | 5.1 | 1.3 | 7.7 | 2.2 | 6.7 | 4.5 |
| Use of agricultural inputs | | | | | | |
| Yes | 36.5 | 4.4 | 41.2 | 31.5 | 21.2 | 41.3 |
| Fertilizers | 80.2 | 5.6 | 76.4 | 85.5 | 83.0 | 79.8 |
| Improved seedlings | 25.4 | 6.2 | 30.2 | 18.8 | 20.0 | 26.3 |
| Fingerlings | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Hooks and nets | 12.0 | 4.9 | 17.7 | 4.2 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Insecticides | 4.8 | 2.4 | 5.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 5.6 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Household infrastructure** | | | | | | |
| Secure housing tenure | 6.3 | 1.8 | 4.7 | 8.0 | 7.4 | 6.0 |
| Access to water | 90.6 | 1.8 | 95.6 | 85.2 | 84.5 | 92.5 |
| Safe water source | 35.2 | 5.8 | 28.9 | 41.9 | 29.6 | 36.9 |
| Safe sanitation | 2.1 | 1.2 | 3.7 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 2.4 |
| Improved waste disposal | 10.2 | 3.0 | 10.9 | 9.4 | 4.1 | 12.1 |
| Non-wood fuel used for cooking | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Ownership of IT/Telecommunications Equipment | | | | | | |
| Fixed line phone | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Mobile phone | 12.2 | 2.4 | 14.8 | 9.4 | 6.0 | 14.1 |
| Radio set | 57.9 | 2.9 | 60.8 | 54.8 | 50.9 | 60.1 |
| Television set | 2.3 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 2.7 |

| **Employment** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Employer in the main job | | | | | | |
| Civil service | 1.1 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Other public serve | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Parastatal | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| NGO | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Private sector formal | 1.7 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 1.5 |
| Private sector informal | 51.6 | 2.2 | 49.6 | 53.7 | 48.5 | 52.7 |
| Household | 41.5 | 2.3 | 42.5 | 40.5 | 44.5 | 40.4 |
| **Activity in the main job** | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 64.2 | 3.1 | 62.5 | 66.1 | 64.0 | 64.3 |
| Mining/quarrying | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Manufacturing | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Services | 1.8 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 1.2 |
| **Employment Status in last 7 days** | | | | | | |
| Unemployed (age 15-24) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Male | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Female | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Unemployed (age 15 and above)) | 0.7 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| Male | 0.9 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
| Female | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Underemployed (age 15 and above) | 32.9 | 2.3 | 30.1 | 35.8 | 28.3 | 34.6 |
| Male | 40.7 | 3.6 | 40.1 | 41.3 | 32.8 | 43.7 |
| Female | 25.9 | 2.4 | 21.0 | 31.1 | 24.3 | 26.5 |
| **Education** | | | | | | |
| Adult literacy rate | | | | | | |
| Total | 80.5 | 2.1 | 84.1 | 76.5 | 79.3 | 80.9 |
| Male | 87.1 | 1.9 | 89.6 | 84.3 | 85.3 | 87.8 |
| Female | 74.6 | 2.8 | 79.2 | 69.7 | 74.1 | 74.8 |
| **Youth literacy rate (age 15-24)** | | | | | | |
| Total | 88.8 | 2.2 | 89.7 | 87.8 | 92.4 | 87.4 |
| Male | 91.4 | 2.2 | 92.0 | 90.7 | 96.6 | 89.5 |
| Female | 86.4 | 2.7 | 87.7 | 85.0 | 89.0 | 85.3 |
| **Primary school** | | | | | | |
| Access to School | 71.6 | 5.8 | 82.3 | 60.1 | 66.7 | 74.0 |
| Primary Gross Enrollment | 122.5 | 3.4 | 119.5 | 125.7 | 120.2 | 123.7 |
| Male | 123.6 | 5.3 | 123.6 | 123.7 | 110.1 | 130.2 |
| Female | 121.2 | 6.1 | 114.3 | 128.1 | 131.5 | 115.6 |
| Primary Net Enrollment | 86.6 | 1.4 | 85.5 | 87.8 | 87.5 | 86.2 |
| Male | 87.9 | 2.3 | 89.4 | 86.2 | 84.5 | 89.5 |
| Female | 85.1 | 2.5 | 80.6 | 89.6 | 90.8 | 82.0 |
| Satisfaction | 51.8 | 4.2 | 55.9 | 47.6 | 52.0 | 51.7 |
| Primary completion rate | 10.1 | 1.5 | 9.7 | 10.6 | 7.9 | 11.2 |

| Secondary school | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Access to School* | 21.1 | 6.0 | 29.1 | 12.9 | 8.2 | 26.6 |
| *Secondary Gross Enrollment* | 15.6 | 2.7 | 16.5 | 14.6 | 15.3 | 15.7 |
| *Male* | 19.8 | 4.8 | 19.4 | 20.2 | 26.0 | 17.8 |
| *Female* | 11.5 | 2.8 | 13.6 | 9.4 | 8.4 | 13.2 |
| *Secondary Net Enrollment* | 12.3 | 2.0 | 12.7 | 11.9 | 11.1 | 12.8 |
| *Male* | 13.1 | 2.8 | 11.8 | 14.6 | 15.2 | 12.5 |
| *Female* | 11.5 | 2.8 | 13.6 | 9.4 | 8.4 | 13.2 |
| *Satisfaction* | 33.4 | 8.3 | 35.9 | 30.5 | 44.8 | 28.6 |
| *Secondary completion rate* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | | | | | | |
| **Medical services** | | | | | | |
| *Health access* | 41.0 | 7.3 | 48.3 | 33.3 | 30.7 | 45.4 |
| *Need* | 36.0 | 2.5 | 36.3 | 35.6 | 36.8 | 35.7 |
| *Use* | 32.0 | 1.8 | 31.2 | 32.8 | 32.7 | 31.7 |
| *Satisfaction* | 78.7 | 3.1 | 81.7 | 75.7 | 79.4 | 78.4 |
| *Consulted traditional healer* | 8.9 | 1.7 | 7.5 | 10.3 | 9.2 | 8.7 |
| *Pre-natal care* | 99.0 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 98.1 | 97.5 | 100.0 |
| *Anti-malaria measures used* | 79.5 | 3.8 | 76.5 | 82.7 | 77.8 | 80.1 |
| *Person has physical/mental challenge* | 3.0 | 0.5 | 3.6 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 3.6 |
| **Child welfare and health** | | | | | | |
| Orphanhood (children under 18) | | | | | | |
| *Both parents dead* | 5.1 | 1.0 | 6.1 | 4.1 | 5.7 | 4.8 |
| *Father only* | 9.5 | 1.7 | 5.7 | 13.4 | 9.8 | 9.4 |
| *Mother only* | 5.1 | 1.2 | 5.7 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 5.5 |
| Fostering (children under 18) | | | | | | |
| *Both parents absent* | 18.9 | 1.8 | 19.4 | 18.3 | 17.9 | 19.4 |
| *Father only absent* | 15.9 | 1.9 | 12.5 | 19.3 | 11.4 | 18.1 |
| *Mother only absent* | 6.4 | 1.3 | 6.8 | 5.9 | 7.0 | 6.1 |
| Children under 5 | | | | | | |
| *Delivery by health professionals* | 81.5 | 2.4 | 81.5 | 81.5 | 79.8 | 82.2 |
| *Measles immunization* | 79.0 | 2.6 | 77.9 | 80.1 | 77.0 | 79.8 |
| *Fully vaccinated* | 58.8 | 4.1 | 57.9 | 59.7 | 61.1 | 57.8 |
| *Not vaccinated* | 4.4 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 5.7 | 3.9 | 4.7 |
| *Stunted* | 40.2 | 3.3 | 37.8 | 42.7 | 43.3 | 38.8 |
| *Wasted* | 2.7 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 1.6 |
| *Underweight* | 20.8 | 3.4 | 15.9 | 26.1 | 27.0 | 18.0 |

*\* 1.96 standard deviations*

| | 2003 | 2006 | Change | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Estimate | SE | Signif. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
| **Rate of** | | | | | | | |
| **Dissatisfaction with** | 32.9 | 46.7 | 13.8 | 6.8 | ** | 0.4 | 27.7 |
| *Reasons for Dissatisfaction* | | | | | | | |
| *Books/Supplies* | 79.3 | 37.7 | -41.6 | 7.7 | *** | -57.1 | -26.1 |
| *Poor Teaching* | 8.6 | 13.3 | 4.7 | 4.3 | | -3.3 | 14.0 |
| *Lack of Teachers* | 67.3 | 51.7 | -15.6 | 9.1 | | -33.5 | 3.3 |
| *d Condition of Facilities* | 30.1 | 36.6 | 6.5 | 7.8 | | -9.9 | 21.6 |
| *Overcrowding* | 11.4 | 36.7 | 25.3 | 8.0 | *** | 9.4 | 41.7 |
| **Rate of** | | | | | | | |
| **Dissatisfaction with** | | | | | | | |
| **Healht Facilities** | 81.8 | 79.3 | -2.5 | 4.9 | | -11.6 | 7.9 |
| *Reasons for Dissatisfaction* | | | | | | | |
| *Long wait* | 37.4 | 63.9 | 26.5 | 12.8 | ** | 3.9 | 55.7 |
| *of trained professionals* | 36.9 | 9.3 | -27.6 | 10.8 | ** | -48.9 | -5.2 |
| *Cost* | 37.3 | 24.3 | -13.0 | 10.6 | | -33.0 | 9.8 |
| *No drugs available* | 24.4 | 8.6 | -15.8 | 7.8 | ** | -31.7 | -0.2 |
| *Unsuccessful treatment* | 15.7 | 5.1 | -10.6 | 7.8 | | -26.6 | 5.1 |
| **Health Facility Used** | | | | | | | |
| **for Child Delivery** | | | | | | | |
| *Private hospital* | 5.6 | 3.3 | -2.3 | 2.3 | | -7.0 | 2.1 |
| *Government hospital* | 47.3 | 56.1 | 8.8 | 6.0 | * | -1.8 | 22.3 |
| *Traditional healer* | 8.8 | 8.9 | 0.1 | 2.9 | | -5.5 | 6.0 |
| *Pharmacy* | 3.9 | 16.7 | 12.8 | 4.0 | *** | 4.2 | 20.2 |
| **Child Nutrition** | | | | | | | |
| *Stunted* | 39.8 | 38.0 | -1.8 | 6.0 | | -13.1 | 10.9 |
| *Severely Stunted* | 16.1 | 12.0 | -4.1 | 4.1 | | -12.4 | 4.1 |
| *Wasted* | 13.3 | 4.0 | -9.3 | 2.8 | *** | -15.0 | -3.9 |
| *Severely Wasted* | 6.5 | 0.3 | -6.3 | 1.7 | *** | -9.6 | -2.9 |

# 1  INTRODUCTION

## 1.1  The Bukoba Rural District CWIQ

This report presents district level analysis of data collected in the Bukoba Rural District Core Welfare Indicators Survey using the Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire instrument (CWIQ).

The survey was commissioned by the Prime Minister's Office – Regional Administration and Local Governance and implemented by EDI (Economic Development Initiatives), a Tanzanian research and consultancy company. The report is aimed at national, regional and district level policy makers, as well as the research and policy community at large.

CWIQ is an off-the-shelf survey package developed by the World Bank to produce standardised monitoring indicators of welfare. The questionnaire is purposively concise and is designed to collect information on household demographics, employment, education, health and nutrition, as well as utilisation of and satisfaction with social services. An extra section on governance and satisfaction with people in public office was added specifically for this survey.

The standardised nature of the questionnaire allows comparison between districts and regions within and across countries, as well as monitoring change in a district or region over time.

Bukoba Rural District CWIQ was the second of its kind to be administered in Bukoba Rural District, the first one having been administered in 2003. Chapter 9 of this report analyses changes between the two surveys.

Although beyond the purpose of this report, the results of Bukoba Rural CWIQ could also be set against those of other CWIQ surveys that have are being implemented at the time of writing in other districts in Tanzania: Bariadi DC, Bukombe DC, Bunda DC, Dodoma DC, Dodoma MC, Hanang DC, Karagwe DC, Kasulu DC, Kibondo DC, Kigoma DC, Kilosa DC, Kishapu DC, Kongwa DC, Kyela DC, Ludewa DC, Makete DC, Maswa DC, Meatu DC, Kahama DC, Mbulu DC, Morogoro DC, Mpwapwa DC, Muheza DC, Musoma DC, Ngara DC, Ngorongoro DC, Njombe DC, Rufiji DC, Shinyanga MC, Singida DC, Songea DC, Sumbawanga DC, Tanga MC, Temeke MC. Other African countries that have implemented nationally representative CWIQ surveys include Malawi, Ghana and Nigeria.

## 1.2  Sampling

The Bukoba Rural District CWIQ was sampled to be representative at district level. Data from the 2002 Census was used to put together a list of all villages in the district. In the first stage of the sampling process villages were chosen proportional to their population size. In a second stage the sub-village (kitongoji) was chosen within the village through simple random sampling. In the selected sub-village (also referred to as cluster or enumeration area in this report), all households were listed and 15 households were randomly selected. In total 450 households in 30 clusters were visited. All households were given statistical weights reflecting the number of households that they represent.

A 10-page interview was conducted in each of the sampled households by an experienced interviewer trained by EDI. The respondent was the most informed person in the household, as identified by the members of the household. A weight and height measurement was taken by the interviewers for each individual under the age of 5 (60 months) in the surveyed households.

## 1.3  Constructed variables to disaggregate tables

The statistics in most tables in this report will be disaggregated by certain categories of individuals or households. Some of these variables have been constructed by the analysts and, in the light of their prominence in the report, deserve more

# 1 Introduction

**Table 1.1: Variables Used to Predict Consumption Expenditure**

| *Basic Variables* | *Household Assets* |
|---|---|
| Age of household head | Bicycle |
| Household size | Roof material |
| Education of household head | Wall material |
| Main source of income | Radio, radio cassette, music system |
| Distance to market | Iron, electric or charcoal |
| | Saving/current bank account |
| *Food Security* | Telephone |
| Problems satisfying food needs | Vehicle |
| Number of meals per day | Wheel barrow |
| | Watch or clock |
| *Household Amenities* | |
| Source of water | |
| Type of toilet | |
| Source of light | |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

explanation. This chapter discusses some of the most important of these variables: poverty status, cluster location and socio-economic group.

## 1.3.1  Poverty Status

The poverty status of a household is obtained by measuring its consumption expenditures and comparing it to a poverty line. It is, however, difficult, expensive and time consuming to collect reliable household consumption expenditure data. One reason for this is that consumption modules are typically very lengthy. In addition, household consumption patterns differ across districts, regions and seasons; hence multiple visits have to be made to the household for consumption data to be reliable.

However, household consumption expenditure data allows more extensive and useful analysis of patterns observed in survey data and renders survey outcomes more useful in policy determination. Because of this, the Tanzanian government has become increasingly interested in developing ways of using non-expenditure data to predict household consumption and, from this, poverty measures.

There is a core set of variables that are incorporated in the majority of surveys. These variables inform on household assets and amenities, level of education of the household head, amount of land owned by the household and others. By observing the relation between these variables and consumption expenditure of the household in an expenditure survey, a relationship can be calculated. These variables are called poverty predictors and can be used to determine household expenditure levels in non-expenditure surveys such as CWIQ. This means that, for instance, a household that is headed by an individual who has post secondary school education, with every member in a separate bedroom and that has a flush toilet is more likely to be non-poor than one where the household head has no education, a pit latrine is used and there are four people per bedroom. This is, of course, a very simplified example; however, these are some of the variables used to calculate the relationship between such information and the consumption expenditure of the household.

For the purpose of this report, the data collected in the *Household Budget Survey* 2000/01 (HBS) was used to select the poverty predictors and determine the quantitative relationship between these and household consumption. The five-year gap is far from ideal, but the data itself is reliable and is the most recent source of information available. Work was then done to investigate the specific characteristics of Bukoba Rural in order to ensure that the model developed accurately represents this particular district.

Some caveats are in order when tabulating variables used as poverty predictors on poverty status. Poverty status is defined as a weighted average of the poverty predictors; hence it should come as no surprise that poverty predictors are correlated to them. For instance, education of the household head is one of the variables included in the equation used to calculate household consumption. The relationship is set as a positive one, consequently when observing the patterns in the data this relationship may be positive by construction. Table 1.1 lists the variables that have been used to calculate predicted household consumption expenditure.

Once the consumption level of a household has been predicted, it is compared to the Basic Needs Poverty Line set by National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) on the basis of the 2000/01 HBS. The

Basic Needs Poverty Line is defined by what a household, using the food basket of the poorest 50 percent of the population, needs to consume to satisfy its basic food needs to attain 2,200 Kcal/day per adult equivalent. The share of non-food expenditures of the poorest 25 percent of households is then added. With this procedure, the Basic Needs Poverty Line is set at TZS 7,253 per 28 days per adult equivalent unit in 2000/01 prices. Households consuming less than this are assumed to be unable to satisfy their basic food and non-food needs[1].

The Bukoba Rural CWIQ uses poverty predictors to classify households as poor or non-poor, i.e. to determine whether a household's monthly consumption per adult equivalent unit is below or above the Basic Needs Poverty Line. This binary approach generates two types of mistakes associated with the prediction:

1. A poor household is predicted to be non-poor
2. A non-poor household is predicted to be poor

One way of determining the accuracy of the poverty predictors is to see how many mistakes of each type the model makes. To do this the poverty predictor model is applied to the actual consumption expenditure data. Results of this exercise are presented in Table 1.2. Each type of mistake happens in less than 10 percent of the cases, and both with relatively the same frequency. The model wrongly predicts a non-poor household to be poor in 7.4 percent of the cases, and vice versa in 6.6 percent of the households. This gives an overall percentage of correct predictions of 86 percent.

When the model is applied to the CWIQ data for Bukoba Rural 2006, the estimated population living in poverty is 24 percent, very much consistent with the 23 percent estimated with HBS for Bukoba Rural. The confidence intervals overlap with previous CWIQ estimation of 31 percent of the population in Bukoba Rural living under the poverty line.

**Table 1.2. Predicted vs. Actual Poverty Ratios, Kagera Rural, 2000/01**

| Predicted | Actual | | |
|-----------|--------|------|-------|
|           | Non Poor | Poor | Total |
| Non Poor  | 61.4   | 6.6  | 68    |
| Poor      | 7.4    | 24.6 | 32    |
| Total     | 68.8   | 31.2 | 100   |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

However, it must be kept in mind that the aim of the model is not estimating poverty rates, but to determine the characteristics of the poor population. Hence, the accuracy of the model does not hinge on the closeness between the estimated and actual poverty rate; but on the percentage of correct predictions as indicated in Table 1.2.

Expenditure surveys, such as the 2000/2001 Household Budget Survey, are much better suited for informing on poverty rates. However, such large scale surveys have insufficient number of observations to inform on district-level trends. The Bukoba Rural CWIQ, on the other hand, is sufficiently large to allow detailed district-level analysis. The accuracy with which households can be classified by poverty status using the CWIQ gives credence to the use of predicted poverty level as a variable throughout this report.

## 1.3.2  Cluster Location

Cluster Location is constructed on the basis of self-reported travel time of the household to three different locations: the nearest place to get public transport, the nearest all-weather road and the district capital. Travel time is probed for by the household's most commonly used form of transport. For each household, the average travel time is taken across these three locations. For each cluster, the median of the 15 means is calculated. All clusters are then ranked according to this median. The 15 clusters with the lowest median are labelled as accessible and the 15 clusters with the highest median are labelled as remote. Table 1.3 shows the distribution of each of the variables used to construct the cluster location.

---

[1] The exact procedure by which this line has been set is described in detail in the 2000/01 HBS report: National Bureau of Statistics, 2002, "*2000/2001 Tanzania Household Budget Survey*".

**Table 1.3. Cluster Location**

| | Median time to district capital (minutes) | Median time to nearest all-weather road (minutes) | Median time to nearest public transport (minutes) | Poverty rate | Estimated number of households |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cluster location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 10.0 | 10.0 | 60.0 | 14.8 | 49,563 |
| Remote | 15.0 | 30.0 | 150.0 | 33.0 | 48,853 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

Table 1.3 further shows that the poverty rates differ substantially by cluster location: households in remote villages are more likely to be poor than households in accessible villages. Whereas the poverty rate in accessible villages is 15 percent, the figure for remote villages is more than double at 33 percent.

households were the head is in the "other" category. Households in the categories "employee" and "self-employed other" are more likely to be located in accessible villages, whereas the categories "self-employed agriculture" and "other" are associated with households located in remote villages**.**

# Socio-economic Group

The socio-economic group refers to a household that depends on the employment of the main income earner of the household. Note that this is not always the head of the household. Throughout the report those employed in the private sectors, formally or informally, as well as Government and Parastatal employees are categorised as 'Employees'. Self-employed individuals are divided into two groups, depending on whether they work in agriculture ('Self-employed agriculture') or in trade or professional sectors ('Self-employed other'). Finally, those who worked in other activities or who had not been working for the 4 weeks preceding the survey are classed as 'other'.

Table 1.4 shows that poverty rates are higher for households where the main income earner is an individual in the "employee" or "self-employed agriculture" categories, and lowest for

**Table 1.4 Socio-economic Group**

| | Poverty Rate | Percentage Living in Remote Clusters | Percentage Living in Accessible Clusters |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | |
| Employee | 24.7 | 41.4 | 58.6 |
| Self-employed agriculture | 25.7 | 54.1 | 45.9 |
| Self-employed other | 21 | 26.7 | 73.3 |
| Other | 17.5 | 54.8 | 45.2 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

# 2 VILLAGE, POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

## 2.1    Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the Bukoba Rural's households and population characteristics. The main population characteristics are presented in section two. Section three presents the main characteristics of the households, such as area of residence, poverty status, number of members, and dependency ratio. The same analysis is then conducted for the household heads in section four. An examination of orphan and foster status in the district concludes the chapter.

## 2.2    Main Population Characteristics

Table 2.1 shows the percent distribution of the population by cluster location and poverty status, by gender and age. Overall, the district's population is young. For instance, less than 10 percent of the population is over 60 years old, whereas 45 percent is under 15 years old. The remaining 45 percent is between 15 and 59 and groups. The location of the household does not seem to show strong correlation with the age of the population. However, poverty status does seem to be correlated with age. People from non-poor households seem to be slightly older than the poor, especially women.

The dependency ratio of the district's households is shown in Table 2.2. The dependency ratio is the number of household members under 15 and over 64 years old (the dependant population) over the number of household members aged between 15 and 64 (the working age population). The result is the average number of people each adult at working age takes care of.

The mean dependency ratio is 1.2, meaning that one adult has to take care of more than 1 person. There seems to be no strong correlation between cluster location and the dependency ratio. However, on average poor households present a somewhat higher dependency ratio than non-poor households.

The dependency ratio increases with the number of household members, from 0.7 for households with 1 or 2 members, to 1.3 for households with 7 or more members. There are no apparent differences in household size when households are split by socio-economic group. Differences by the gender of the household head, however, are stark. On average, female headed households have a higher dependency ratio (1.5) than households headed by a male (1.1).

Table 2.3 shows the percent distribution of households by number of household members. The mean household size is 4.8 individuals. Households with at most two individuals only represent 18 percent of all households in Bukoba Rural. Households with 3 to 6 members represent 60 percent of the total.

**Table 2.1: Percent distribution of total population by gender and age**

|  | Male | | | | Female | | | | Total | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | 0-14 | 15-59 | 60+ | Total | 0-14 | 15-59 | 60+ | Total | 0-14 | 15-59 | 60+ | Total |
| **Total** | 24.7 | 21.5 | 3.0 | 49.2 | 22.7 | 22.7 | 5.4 | 50.8 | 47.4 | 44.2 | 8.4 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 24.5 | 21.8 | 3.3 | 49.7 | 22.2 | 22.7 | 5.4 | 50.3 | 46.7 | 44.5 | 8.8 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 24.9 | 21.2 | 2.6 | 48.7 | 23.3 | 22.7 | 5.3 | 51.3 | 48.2 | 43.9 | 7.9 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 26.0 | 19.2 | 3.0 | 48.2 | 26.2 | 21.7 | 3.8 | 51.8 | 52.3 | 40.9 | 6.8 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 24.1 | 22.5 | 3.0 | 49.6 | 21.2 | 23.1 | 6.0 | 50.4 | 45.3 | 45.6 | 9.0 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

# 2 Village, Population and Households Characteristic

**Table 2.2: Dependency ratio**

|  | 0-4 years | 5-14 years | 0-14 years | 15-64 years | 65+ years | Total | Dependency ratio |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 0.7 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 4.8 | 1.2 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 0.8 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 4.7 | 1.1 |
| Remote | 0.7 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 4.8 | 1.2 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.9 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 5.9 | 1.3 |
| Non-poor | 0.7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 4.4 | 1.1 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 0.7 |
| 3-4 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 3.5 | 0.9 |
| 5-6 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 0.2 | 5.5 | 1.4 |
| 7+ | 1.1 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 0.3 | 8.3 | 1.3 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.6 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 4.6 | 1.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 0.7 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 4.8 | 1.2 |
| Self-employed - other | 1.0 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 5.1 | 1.1 |
| Other | 0.4 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 4.2 | 1.3 |
| **Gender of Household Head** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 0.9 | 1.6 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 5.2 | 1.1 |
| Female | 0.4 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 3.6 | 1.5 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

The breakdown by location shows that households located in remote villages are concentrated in the 3-4 and 5-6 members groups, whereas households in accessible villages are more evenly distributed. As a result, both have roughly the same mean household size. Poverty status shows that poor households are significantly bigger than non-poor. Over 40 percent of them has 7 or more members, compared to just 15 percent of non-poor. On the other hand, 5 percent of the poor have at most 2 members, against 22 percent of the non-poor. Regarding socio-economic groups, the self-employed in sectors other than agriculture have the highest mean household size, 5.3 members, while the employees and the self-employed in agriculture have similar means, at 4.7 and 4.8, respectively.

Finally, households headed by males are larger than female headed households: the former have 5.2 members in average, whereas the latter have only 3.6 members. This difference partly owes to the fact that, as shown in Section 2.4, female household heads rarely have a spouse.

**Table 2.3: Percent distribution of households by number of household members**

|  | 1-2 persons | 3-4 persons | 5-6 persons | 7+ persons | Total | household size |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 18.2 | 30.7 | 29.7 | 21.4 | 100.0 | 4.8 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 20.8 | 27.8 | 29.0 | 22.4 | 100.0 | 4.7 |
| Remote | 15.4 | 33.8 | 30.5 | 20.3 | 100.0 | 4.8 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 5.4 | 24.6 | 29.4 | 40.6 | 100.0 | 5.9 |
| Non-poor | 22.2 | 32.7 | 29.8 | 15.3 | 100.0 | 4.4 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | |
| Employed | 19.3 | 30.7 | 35.3 | 14.7 | 100.0 | 4.6 |
| Self-employed - agric | 16.5 | 31.6 | 31.1 | 20.8 | 100.0 | 4.8 |
| Self-employed - other | 16.8 | 25.3 | 30.5 | 27.4 | 100.0 | 5.1 |
| Other | 35.1 | 32.7 | 10.5 | 21.7 | 100.0 | 4.2 |
| **Gender of Household Head** | | | | | | |
| Male | 12.4 | 28.9 | 32.1 | 26.6 | 100.0 | 5.2 |
| Female | 33.5 | 35.5 | 23.4 | 7.6 | 100.0 | 3.6 |

**Table 2.4: Percent distribution of total population by relationship to head of household**

|  | Head | Spouse | Child | Parents | Other relative | Not related | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 21.0 | 12.9 | 47.1 | 1.3 | 17.4 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 21.1 | 13.2 | 45.8 | 0.9 | 18.6 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 20.9 | 12.5 | 48.5 | 1.7 | 16.1 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 16.8 | 12.3 | 50.8 | 1.1 | 18.7 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 22.8 | 13.1 | 45.5 | 1.4 | 16.8 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | |
| 0- 9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 78.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| 10-19 | 0.7 | 2.3 | 67.2 | 0.0 | 29.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| 20-29 | 24.0 | 39.2 | 24.3 | 0.0 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 53.4 | 34.0 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 61.2 | 32.3 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 61.5 | 19.9 | 3.5 | 12.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 73.9 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 31.0 | 0.3 | 51.4 | 0.1 | 16.8 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Female | 11.4 | 25.0 | 43.0 | 2.4 | 18.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

## 2.3 Main Household Characteristics

Table 2.4 shows the percent distribution of total population by relationship to the head of household. The category "other relative" is non-negligible at all, representing 17 percent of the population.

No particular trends emerge by analysing by remoteness or poverty status. When analysing by age-groups, it is clear that the category "other relatives" is mostly under 19 years old. This highlights the importance of the analysis of fostering and orphan status. After 30, most of the population is either head of their own household or spouse to the head of the household.

The gender split-up shows that males are roughly three times more likely to be household heads than females, with shares of 31 and 11, respectively. In turn, spouses and parents are overwhelmingly females.

Overall, 40 percent of the population has never been married. Roughly one third is married and monogamous, and slightly over 7 percent is married and polygamous. Despite only 1 percent being 'officially' divorced, up to 7 percent of the population is 'unofficially' separated. Informal unions constitute only 1.5 percent of the population and 10 percent is widowed.

Poor households and households in accessible villages seem to be slightly more likely to informal unions, but no strong trend is detected between location, poverty, and marital status.

The age breakdown shows that polygamous-married category peaks at the 40-49 group, with 1 out of 4 individuals in that age-group being a member of a polygamous marriage. For the population after 20 years old, married-monogamous is the most common category, except for the population aged 60 and over, where widowed is the most common category. Divorce does not show a trend but, as would be expected, the categories "separated" and "widowed" both increase with age. "Never married" also shows correlation with age, decreasing as the population gets older.

Almost half of the men have never been married, but for women the figure is only one third. While 16 percent of women are widowed, only 2 percent of men are in this category. Furthermore, females tend to be divorced or separated more commonly than men, who are more commonly married.

As shown in Table 2.6, around 25 percent of the population is self-employed in agriculture, with 66 percent in other activities. Individuals living in remote villages seem to be somewhat more likely to be self-employed in agriculture, as non-poor households. Non-poor households are also more likely have employees than poor households.

**Table 2.5: Percent distribution of the total population age 12 an above by marital status**

| | Never married | Married monog | Married polyg | Informal, loose union | Divorced | Separated | Widowed | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 40.0 | 34.3 | 7.4 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 6.8 | 9.5 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 39.3 | 34.6 | 7.9 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 7.3 | 8.3 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 40.6 | 33.9 | 6.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 6.2 | 10.8 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 41.8 | 35.4 | 6.9 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 6.2 | 7.4 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 39.2 | 33.8 | 7.5 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 7.0 | 10.3 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | | |
| 12-14 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 15-19 | 89.5 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 20-24 | 40.4 | 43.3 | 6.6 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 25-29 | 19.0 | 61.7 | 6.5 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 6.5 | 65.5 | 11.1 | 3.2 | 1.4 | 8.5 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 2.2 | 49.2 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 13.5 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 3.6 | 48.5 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 11.8 | 24.6 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 1.6 | 29.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 16.2 | 44.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 48.1 | 36.7 | 7.4 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 3.8 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| Female | 32.8 | 32.1 | 7.3 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 9.4 | 15.9 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

The analysis of the age-groups is particularly interesting. The share of employees increases with age, peaking at 13 percent for the 50-59 cohorts. A similar trend is observed for the self-employed in agriculture, but the peak (63 percent) is reached in the 40 to 49 group. The share of self-employed in other activities first increases with age, peaking at 17 percent for the group between 30 and 39 years old, and then decreases steadily. The category "other" decreases steadily with age, showing a sharp decrease between 15-19 and 20-29, from 90 to 47 percent, then decreases steadily until stabilising at around 20 percent for the population between 40 and 59, and finally increases to 33 percent for the population aged 60 and above.

The gender breakdown shows that males are much more likely to be employees or self-employed in non-agricultural activities than women, with shares of 4.3 and 9.6 percent against 0.4 and 1.8 percent for women, respectively. In turn, females are more likely to be in the "other" category, with a share of almost 73 percent against 59 percent for the males.

Table 2.7 shows the percent distribution of the total population aged 5 and above by highest level of education. Of each ten people, 2 have no formal education, 4 have at most some primary, and 3 have completed primary.

No clear trend emerges from the analysis of cluster location. However, it is clear that members of poor households are more concentrated in lower levels of education than members of non-poor households.

The age breakdown shows that more than 50 percent of the children between 5 and 9 have no formal education, but over 90 percent of the children 10-14 have at least some primary. Rates of no education are lower for the population 10-19 (4.2 and 3.3 percent for the 10-14 and 15-19 groups, respectively) and higher but roughly constant for the older groups except for the population aged 60 and over,

**Table 2.6: Percent distribution of the total population age 5 and above by socio-economic group**

| | Employed | Self-employed Agriculture | Self-employed Other | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 2.3 | 26.3 | 5.6 | 65.8 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 2.4 | 24.4 | 6.6 | 66.5 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 2.2 | 28.2 | 4.6 | 65.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 1.4 | 23.4 | 4.9 | 70.3 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 2.7 | 27.5 | 6.0 | 63.8 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | |
| 5- 9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 10-14 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 99.4 | 100.0 |
| 15-19 | 0.8 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 90.0 | 100.0 |
| 20-29 | 3.9 | 40.2 | 8.8 | 47.1 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 4.9 | 49.1 | 16.5 | 29.5 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 5.3 | 62.7 | 12.7 | 19.3 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 12.5 | 59.8 | 5.9 | 21.8 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 0.7 | 63.5 | 3.5 | 32.3 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | |
| Male | 4.3 | 27.4 | 9.6 | 58.7 | 100.0 |
| Female | 0.4 | 25.2 | 1.8 | 72.6 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

where the share rises to 40 percent. In the groups between 20 and 49 years old, the most common is completed primary. Virtually none has finished secondary education.

The gender breakdown shows that females have a higher share of uneducated population than males: 25 against 17 percent, but at the same time a higher share with complete primary: 31 percent, compared to 27 percent for males. Finally, men are twice as likely of having any education after completing primary, although the shares are pretty small: only 8.3 percent of all the males had any post primary education, share that is only 4 percent for females.

**Table 2.7: Percent distribution of the total population age 5 and above by highest level of education**

| | None | Nursery school | Some primary | Completed primary | Some secondary | Completed secondary | Post secondary | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 20.8 | 4.8 | 39.4 | 28.9 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 18.3 | 5.4 | 38.8 | 29.9 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 23.3 | 4.1 | 40.1 | 27.8 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 23.2 | 5.3 | 42.2 | 26.2 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 19.7 | 4.6 | 38.2 | 30.0 | 3.5 | 0.1 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | | |
| 5- 9 | 55.4 | 23.3 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 10-14 | 4.2 | 2.4 | 92.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 15-19 | 3.3 | 0.7 | 53.7 | 36.2 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| 20-29 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 14.6 | 61.1 | 7.1 | 0.3 | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 13.9 | 0.6 | 8.9 | 67.3 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 59.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 13.7 | 0.0 | 41.5 | 27.8 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 13.9 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 40.3 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 8.6 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 16.8 | 5.7 | 41.8 | 27.2 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| Female | 24.5 | 3.9 | 37.1 | 30.5 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

**Table 2.8: Percent distribution of heads of household by marital status**

| | Never married | Married monogamous | Married polygamous | Informal, loose union | Divorced Separated Widowed | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 3.7 | 49.8 | 10.4 | 2.0 | 34.1 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 2.5 | 49.4 | 11.1 | 3.0 | 34.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 4.9 | 50.1 | 9.8 | 1.0 | 34.3 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.8 | 57.6 | 10.5 | 3.0 | 28.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 4.6 | 47.3 | 10.4 | 1.7 | 36.0 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 48.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 51.4 | 100.0 |
| 20-29 | 8.5 | 72.3 | 7.3 | 5.5 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 3.8 | 66.7 | 7.4 | 4.6 | 17.6 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 1.2 | 47.3 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 30.3 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 1.3 | 48.1 | 11.4 | 0.0 | 39.3 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 2.2 | 26.7 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 62.9 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | |
| Male | 4.4 | 68.1 | 13.5 | 2.8 | 11.3 | 100.0 |
| Female | 1.8 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 94.4 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

## 2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household

Overall, 50 percent of the household heads are married and monogamous, 34 divorced separated or widowed, 10 percent married and polygamous, 4 percent have never been married and 2 and live in an informal union.

The breakdown by cluster location shows a weak relationship between location and marital status. While in remote villages household heads are more likely to be in the "never married" category, in accessible villages they seem to be more likely to be in informal unions.

Regarding poverty status, heads of non-poor households are more likely to be single (never married, divorced, separated or widowed). In turn, heads of poor households are more likely to be monogamously married or in informal unions.

Analysis by age-groups shows that married-monogamous is the category with the highest share of household heads between 20 and 59 years old, whereas divorced, separated or widowed is so for the heads of household over the age of 60. Some trends may be extracted from this panel. For instance, the married-monogamous category decreases with age, as "divorced/separated or widowed" and "never married" increase. Informal unions are seen only in the groups between 20 and 39.

Overwhelmingly, most female household heads are divorced, separated or widowed (94 percent), whereas for males, this category roughly represents 1 out of 10 men. Most male household heads are married, monogamous or polygamous (over 80 percent).

**Table 2.9: Percent distribution of heads of household by socio-economic group**

|  | Employed | Self-employed Agriculture | Self-employed Other | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 7.0 | 71.2 | 14.1 | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 7.8 | 65.9 | 17.4 | 8.9 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 6.1 | 76.8 | 10.6 | 6.4 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 5.9 | 73.1 | 12.6 | 8.4 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 7.3 | 70.6 | 14.6 | 7.5 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 0.0 | 48.6 | 51.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 20-29 | 8.4 | 75.9 | 14.8 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 8.7 | 61.8 | 24.5 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 5.8 | 72.7 | 17.2 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 18.1 | 72.0 | 5.4 | 4.5 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 1.4 | 76.6 | 4.8 | 17.2 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | |
| Male | 9.2 | 66.5 | 18.6 | 5.7 | 100.0 |
| Female | 1.1 | 83.6 | 2.2 | 13.1 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

Table 2.9 shows the percent distribution of household heads by socioeconomic group. As expected, the great majority of the district's household heads is self-employed in agriculture, with a share of 70 percent. Self-employment in non-agricultural activities occupies 15 percent of the household heads and only 8 percent have paid employment.

The analysis by location shows that the share of household heads self-employed in agriculture in remote villages is higher than in accessible villages, with shares of 76 and 66 percent, respectively. In accessible villages, household heads are more likely to be self-employed in non-agricultural activities than heads of households in remote villages, with shares of 19 and 10 percent, respectively.

Poor households are headed by individuals self-employed in agriculture more frequently than non-poor households. On the other hand, the heads of non-poor households are employees or self-employed in non-agricultural activities more often than the heads of poor households.

The breakdown by age of the household head shows interesting insights. First, it is important to notice that the small number of household heads aged 15 to 19 impedes drawing solid statistical conclusions about them, so they will

be excluded from the following discussion. For all age-groups, "self-employed agriculture" is the most important category, occupying 3 out of 4 household heads in the 20-29 and 60+ groups. The "employee" category peaks at 18 percent for the group aged from 50 to 59. The "self-employed – other" category starts at 16

percent for the 15-19 groups, peaks at 25 percent for 20-29, and then decreases steadily until 5 percent for the household heads aged 60 and above. The "other" category gains importance the latter group, with a share 17 percent, as it includes the economically inactive population.

The socioeconomic group of the household shows sharp gender differences. For instance, male household heads are 10 times more likely to come from the "employee" or "self-employed other" categories than female household heads. In turn, a higher share of female household heads belongs to the "self-employment agriculture" category.

Table 2.10 shows the percent distribution of the heads of household by highest level of education. Overall, around only 11 percent of the household heads has any education after primary. Around 20 percent have no education, 25 percent some primary and 44 percent have completed primary.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that, as would be expected, household heads in remote villages are more likely to have no education than the ones from accessible villages, with shares of 25 and 17 percent, respectively. Furthermore, household heads in accessible villages are more likely to have post primary education, with a share of 14 percent against 8 percent of household heads in remote villages.

Poverty status is correlated with the education of the household heads. This should be no surprise, since education of the household head is one of the poverty predictors used to define

**Table 2.10: Percent distribution of heads of household by highest level of education**

|  | None | Some primary | Completed primary | Some secondary | Completed secondary | Post secondary | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 20.8 | 24.1 | 43.7 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 16.9 | 25.1 | 43.5 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 24.9 | 23.0 | 43.8 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 26.7 | 28.2 | 42.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 18.9 | 22.8 | 44.2 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 10.2 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 0.0 | 51.4 | 48.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 20-29 | 12.3 | 20.1 | 60.8 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 16.1 | 10.4 | 63.8 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 16.4 | 8.2 | 60.9 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 13.7 | 34.2 | 34.4 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 35.2 | 43.2 | 10.1 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 11.7 | 23.7 | 50.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 100.0 |
| Female | 44.8 | 25.1 | 26.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

poverty status. However, the difference is still important: while 27 percent of heads of poor households has no education, the share for non-poor is 19 percent. In the other extreme, whereas 10 percent of non-poor household heads has post secondary studies, the share for poor household heads is under 3 percent.

The age breakdown shows that 35 percent of household heads aged 60 or over has no education, and over 40 percent just some primary. Post secondary education goes up with age of the household head, until 59 years old. Completed primary represents around 60 percent for the groups between 20 and 49; but only 35 percent in the 50-59, where "some primary" gains importance.

The analysis by gender shows that female household heads are more likely to have no education. The share is almost 45 percent, against 12 percent of males. Around 50 percent of males have complete primary, against 27 percent of females.

## 2.5 Orphan and Foster Status

Table 2.11 shows the percent distribution of children under 18 years old who have lost at least one parent. Overall, about 5 percent of children under 18 lost both parents, while 5 percent lost only their mother and 10 percent lost only their father. This amounts to 25 percent of all children under 18 who lost at least one parent at the time of the survey.

Children who lost both parents tend to be poor and live in accessible locations. Over 20 percent of children living in remote villages lost at least one of their parents. The age breakdown shows that orphan status is correlated with age: as can be expected older children are more likely to be orphans than younger children. Around 40 percent of the children between 15 and 17 years lost a parent, and one third of the children in that age lost their father. There does not seem to be a gender trend in orphan status.

The percent distribution of children under 18 years old by foster status is shown in Table 2.12. A child is defined as living in a nuclear household when both parents live in the household and as living in a non-nuclear household when at least one parent is absent from the household. Note that this makes it a variable defined at the level of the child, rather than the household (a household may be nuclear with respect to one child, but not with respect to another). The table shows that 40 percent of children under 18 were living in non-nuclear households at the time of the survey.

Households in remote villages have higher shares of children living with their mother only and with no parents. Overall, 43 percent the children from remote clusters live in non-nuclear households. In accessible villages this figure is lower at 39 percent. The breakdown by poverty status gives similar results. Among non-poor households, 43 percent of children live in non-nuclear households. The share for poor households is lower, at 36 percent.

The analysis of age groups shows that the share of children living in non-nuclear households increases with age, but is relatively constant for

children living with one parent only (except for the children aged under 5 living with their father only, who are less than 1 percent of the total children in that cohort).

Although there appears to be no strong correlation between gender and foster status, seemingly girls tend to live with their mother and boys with their father when the parents do not live together. Finally, girls tend to live in non-nuclear households more than boys.

**Table 2.11 - Orphan status of children under 18 years old**

|  | Children who lost mother only | Children who lost father only | Children who lost both father & mother |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 5.1 | 9.5 | 4.8 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | |
| Accessible | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.6 |
| Remote | 4.5 | 13.3 | 4.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | |
| Poor | 4.3 | 9.8 | 5.7 |
| Non-poor | 5.5 | 9.3 | 4.4 |
| **Age** | | | |
| 0-4 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 0.9 |
| 5-9 | 4.7 | 8.0 | 3.0 |
| 10-14 | 8.0 | 11.8 | 7.4 |
| 15-17 | 7.2 | 22.1 | 10.8 |
| **Gender** | | | |
| Male | 5.4 | 8.7 | 5.4 |
| Female | 4.8 | 10.4 | 4.1 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

**Table 2.12 - Foster status of children under 18 years old**

|  | Children living with mother only | Children living with father only | Children living with no parents | Children living in non-nuclear households |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 16.1 | 6.4 | 18.5 | 41.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 13.1 | 6.9 | 18.8 | 38.8 |
| Remote | 19.2 | 5.9 | 18.2 | 43.2 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 11.4 | 7.0 | 17.9 | 36.3 |
| Non-poor | 18.5 | 6.1 | 18.8 | 43.3 |
| **Age** | | | | |
| 0-4 | 15.9 | 0.8 | 8.9 | 25.6 |
| 5-9 | 15.0 | 8.3 | 16.2 | 39.5 |
| 10-14 | 15.7 | 8.5 | 26.9 | 51.1 |
| 15-17 | 20.0 | 9.4 | 24.3 | 53.7 |
| **Gender** | | | | |
| Male | 14.8 | 7.2 | 17.1 | 39.1 |
| Female | 17.6 | 5.4 | 20.1 | 43.1 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

# 3   EDUCATION

This chapter examines selected education indicators in Bukoba Rural. These include literacy rate, access to schools, satisfaction rate, dissatisfaction rate and enrolment.

The first section presents an overview on the selected education indicators. It provides a general picture of the education indicators in the district. The second section takes a closer look at the education indicators. It gives information on dissatisfaction and non-attendance along with the reasons behind them. Later in the chapter, school enrolment and drop-out rates are also discussed. These give a picture on the enrolment patterns according to the age of pupil. The final section of this chapter gives information on adult and youth literacy status within the district.

## 3.1   Overview of Education Indicators

### 3.1.1   Literacy

Literacy is one of the main adult education indicators informed on by the survey. Literacy is defined as the ability to read and write in any language, as reported by the respondent. Individuals who are able to read but cannot write are considered illiterate.

Overall, 80 percent of all adults in the district are literate (Table 3.1). However, literacy rates differ between accessible and remote villages, being 84 percent and 77 percent respectively. There is a small difference in literacy among individuals living in poor and non-poor households. The literacy rate among the non-poor population is 81 percent while individuals living in poor households have a literacy rate of 79 percent.

The results of the survey further indicate that out of the examined household characteristics, socio-economic group and gender are most correlated with literacy rate. The proportion of literate adults in households where the main income earner belongs to the "other" socio-economic group (which consists of unemployed, inactive or individuals involved in

domestic work) is significantly lower than that of adults from households from the "employee" group. Literacy rate is lowest among adults living in households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture followed by those in the self-employed "other" category and the highest literacy rate is observed in households where the main income earner is an employee. There is a large gap in literacy between men and women. The literacy rate among men is about 12 points higher than among women, at 87 and 75 percent respectively.

The breakdown by orphan and foster status shows that the literacy rate is 6 percentage points lower among orphans[1], but does not vary by foster status[2].

## 3.1.2   Primary School Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction

### Access

Primary school access rate is defined as the proportion of primary school-age children (7 to 13 years) reporting to live within 30 minutes of from the nearest primary school.

Almost three quarters (72 percent) of primary school-age children in the district live within 30 minutes of from a primary school. Primary school access is higher in accessible clusters than in remote clusters at 82 and 60 percent respectively. 74 percent of children aged 7 to 13 living in non-poor households live within 30 minutes of to the nearest primary school compared to 67 percent living in poor households. Children living in households from the "self-employed other" sector or in the "other" categories have better access to primary schools compared to children living in households of other socio-economic groups.

---

[1] A child is considered an orphan when he/she has lost at least one parent and is under 18 years.
[2] A child is considered foster none of the parents are present in the household is under 18 years.

3 Education

The data also allows comparing the primary school access rate among orphans and foster children. The primary school access rate among orphans is almost 10 percentage points lower than that of non-orphans. On the other hand, there are no significant differences in access to primary school by foster status.

## Enrolment

There are two main measures of enrolment: the Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) and the Net Enrolment Rate (NER). Both of these measurements are examined in this section.

Gross Enrolment Rate is defined as the ratio of all individuals attending school, irrespective of their age, to the population of school-age children. If there are a large proportion of non-school-age individuals attending school, the Gross Enrolment Rate may exceed 100 percent. Primary school Gross Enrolment Rate informs on the ratio of all individuals in primary school to the population of individuals of primary school-age (7 to 13 years) in the district.

Net Enrolment Rate is defined as the ratio of school-age children currently enrolled at school to the population of school-age children. Therefore, primary school Net Enrolment Rate is the ratio of children between the ages of 7 and 13 years currently in primary school to the population of children in this age-group in the district.

**Table 3.1: Education indicators**

| | Adult Literacy rate | Primary | | | | Secondary | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | access | gross enrollment | net enrollment | satisfaction | access | gross enrollment | net enrollment | satisfaction |
| **Total** | 80.5 | 71.6 | 122.5 | 86.6 | 51.8 | 11.4 | 15.6 | 12.3 | 33.4 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 84.1 | 82.3 | 119.5 | 85.5 | 55.9 | 15.0 | 16.5 | 12.7 | 35.9 |
| Remote | 76.5 | 60.1 | 125.7 | 87.8 | 47.6 | 7.8 | 14.6 | 11.9 | 30.5 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 79.3 | 66.7 | 120.2 | 87.5 | 52.0 | 3.4 | 15.3 | 11.1 | 44.8 |
| Non-poor | 80.9 | 74.0 | 123.7 | 86.2 | 51.7 | 14.9 | 15.7 | 12.8 | 28.6 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 89.3 | 58.9 | 124.3 | 89.9 | 68.5 | 23.7 | 24.9 | 23.1 | 42.0 |
| Self-Employee - agriculture | 79.1 | 71.1 | 122.0 | 85.2 | 52.7 | 10.3 | 12.7 | 10.1 | 31.1 |
| Self-Employee - other | 84.9 | 78.0 | 115.9 | 89.6 | 37.3 | 3.3 | 16.1 | 8.9 | 19.2 |
| Other | 76.2 | 75.8 | 142.0 | 93.3 | 53.3 | 21.3 | 30.7 | 25.4 | 45.4 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 87.1 | 70.7 | 123.6 | 87.9 | 52.1 | 14.6 | 19.8 | 13.1 | 38.0 |
| Female | 74.6 | 72.6 | 121.2 | 85.1 | 51.4 | 8.4 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 25.7 |
| **Orphan status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Orphaned | 91.4 | 65.4 | 139.4 | 84.6 | 47.9 | 9.4 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 37.8 |
| Not-orphaned | 97.4 | 73.8 | 117.0 | 87.5 | 52.8 | 13.3 | 13.4 | 13.4 | 48.7 |
| **Foster status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Fostered | 92.1 | 76.1 | 110.1 | 82.4 | 48.4 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Not-fostered | 96.3 | 71.2 | 119.7 | 87.5 | 52.3 | 12.8 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 45.5 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Literacy is defined for persons age 15 and above.

2. Primary school:

   Access is defined for children of primary school age (7-13) in households less than 30 minutes from a primary school.

   Enrollment (gross) is defined for all persons currently in primary school (Kindergarden, Grade 1 to Grade 8) regardless of age.

   Enrollment (net) is defined for children of primary school age (7-13) currently in primary school (Kindergarden, Grade 1 to Grade 8).

   Satisfaction is defined for all persons currently in primary school who cited no problems with school.

3. Secondary school:

   Access is defined for children of secondary school age (14-19) in households less than 30 minutes from a secondary school.

   Enrollment (gross) is defined for all persons currently in secondary school (Form 1 to Form 5) regardless of age.

   Enrollment (net) is defined for children of secondary school age (14-19) currently in secondary school (Form 1 to Form 5).

   Satisfaction is defined for all persons currently in secondary school who cited no problems with school.

The Net Enrolment Rate provides more information for analysis than the Gross Enrolment Rate. While trends in the actual participation of school-age children in formal education are in part captured by the Net Enrolment Rate, the Gross Enrolment Rate, at best, provides a broad indication of general participation in education and of the capacity of the schools. The Gross Enrolment Rate gives no precise information regarding the proportions of individuals of school and non-school-ages at school, nor does it convey any information on the capacity of the schools in terms of quality of education provided.

The primary school Gross Enrolment Rate in the district is currently at 122 percent. This figure indicates that all individuals who are at primary school constitute 122 percent of all children of primary school-age in the district. The Net Enrolment Rate further shows that 87 percent of all primary school-age children are currently attending school. Both Net Enrolment Rate and Gross Enrolment Rate are higher for clusters located in remote areas than for those in accessible areas.

Disaggregation of the enrolment data by selected household characteristics shows that primary school enrolment rates do not vary much by poverty status or socio-economic group. While there is little variation in the Net Enrolment Rate among the socio-economic groups, the Gross Enrolment Rate is highest among people living in households belonging to the "other" socio-economic group and lowest in households where the main income earner of the household is self-employed in a non-agricultural sector. Variation in primary school enrolment rates among children living in accessible or remote clusters is minimal. The primary school Net Enrolment Rate is lowest among fostered and orphaned children (81 and 85 percent, respectively).

## Satisfaction

The satisfaction rate informs on the proportion of primary school pupils who cited no problems with their schools. Information on satisfaction was obtained by asking respondents to identify problems they faced with their schools.

Currently 52 percent of all primary school pupils are satisfied with the schools they are attending. While pupils living in households located in remote clusters seem to be more satisfied than those living in accessible clusters, at 57 and 47 percent respectively, it is observed that there is no difference in satisfaction between people living in poor and non-poor households (52 percent). The only household characteristic found to significantly correlate with primary school satisfaction is socio-economic group. Respondents living in households headed belonging to self-employed other tend to be least satisfied with their primary schools (37 percent) while households from the employee category have the highest satisfaction rate (69 percent).

Satisfaction rates are higher for not-orphaned and for fostered children.

# 3.1.3 Secondary School Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction

## Access

Secondary school access rate is defined as the proportion of secondary school-age children (14 to 19 years) reporting to live within 30 minutes of from the nearest secondary school.

The sample had 137 pupils who reported to be attending secondary school. Analysis of this data showed that 11 percent of all pupils in secondary school live within 30 minutes of to the nearest secondary school.

There is a significant difference in access to secondary school between people living in accessible and remote clusters, at 14 and 8 percent respectively. The access rate for individuals living in non-poor households is about five times higher (14 percent) than individuals in poor households (3 percent). Data shows that the socio-economic status of the household has a significant correlation with the secondary school access rate. Members living in households from the employee group have the highest access rate to secondary school of 24 percent followed by those whose main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural

activities (21 percent), self-employed in agriculture (10 percent) and the lowest access rate (3 percent) is shown by those living in households where the household belongs to the "other" socio-economic group.

Access rates are higher for non-orphaned, but foster status does not show significant differences in access to secondary school.

## Enrolment

As explained before, Gross Enrolment Rate is defined as the ratio of all individuals attending school, irrespective of their age, to the population of school-age children while the Net Enrolment Rate is defined as the ratio of school-age children currently enrolled at school to the population of school-age children. The secondary school-age is considered between 14 and 19 years of age.

The Gross Enrolment Rate and Net Enrolment Rate at secondary school are very low compared to primary school level. There are only 12 percent of children of secondary school-age currently enrolled in secondary school in the district. There is an additional 3 percent of the population enrolled in secondary school but their age is outside the identified secondary school-age range. This is a very small percentage compared to that of primary school.

Most of the selected household characteristics seem to have slight correlation with secondary school enrolment except socio-economic group. There is no difference in the secondary school Net Enrolment Rate between households located in accessible and remote clusters. Poverty status of the household also shows to have a small correlation with the Net Enrolment Rate as poor households have a Net Enrolment Rate of 11 percent while non-poor households have a Net Enrolment Rate of 13 percent. Furthermore, data shows that the difference in secondary Net Enrolment Rate between males and females in the district is about 2 percent, at 13 and 11 percent respectively.

As mentioned above, there is a high correlation between the socio-economic group of the household and the secondary Net Enrolment Rate and Gross Enrolment Rate. Individuals living in households from the employee group have the highest secondary Net Enrolment Rate at 23 percent, while those living in households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural business have the lowest secondary Net Enrolment Rate, at 9 percent; creating a gap of about 16 percentage points.

The breakdown by orphan and foster status shows that, as would be expected, orphaned and fostered children have significantly lower enrolment rates.

## Satisfaction

About two thirds (66 percent) of the total population enrolled in secondary schools are dissatisfied with their schools. Only one-third (33 percent) of this population are satisfied with the secondary schools they attend. This Satisfaction rate is significantly lower than in primary schools (52 percent). The satisfaction rate for people living in households located in remote clusters is about 5 percent higher than those living in accessible clusters. People living in households where the main income earner of the household is self-employed in a non-agricultural sector have a lower satisfaction rate than people living in households belonging to other socio-economic groups. Among the individuals currently enrolled in secondary schools, males are more satisfied with their schools than females. The satisfaction rate for males is 38 percent while the satisfaction rate for females is 26 percent.

## 3.2   Dissatisfaction

One of the aims of the CWIQ instrument is to inform on perceptions of quality of services received among individuals for whom these services are provided. To obtain this information, primary and secondary school students who were not satisfied with the schools they were attending at the time of the survey were asked to provide reasons for their dissatisfaction. Complaints regarding lack of books and other resources were allocated into the 'Books/Supplies' category, while those relating to quality of teaching and teacher shortages were grouped into the 'Teaching' category. The 'Facilities' category incorporates

complaints regarding overcrowding and bad condition of facilities. The questionnaire allowed a good collection of dissatisfaction data as there were eight options for dissatisfaction including the 'others' category.

Overall, 47 percent of students who are currently enrolled in either primary or secondary school reported dissatisfaction with the schools they were attending. Out of the dissatisfied individuals, above half (52 percent) reported to be dissatisfied due to the lack of teachers (Table 3.2). Besides lack of teachers, about 37 percent of all students reported dissatisfaction with their schools because of lack of books and supplies, lack of space and bad condition of the school facilities.

People living in accessible clusters report less dissatisfaction than those living in remote clusters. However, dissatisfaction rates among the poor and non-poor appear to be the same, at 47 percent. Further

disaggregation of the data shows that reasons for dissatisfaction are irrespective of the household characteristics. The most prominent reasons for dissatisfaction across all socio-economic categories are lack of teachers, lack of school supplies such as textbooks, lack of space and bad facilities.

Reasons for dissatisfaction with schools slightly differ depending on whether the person is in primary and secondary school. Those attending primary school report to be most dissatisfied by the lack of teachers in their schools (54 percent) followed by the lack of space (40 percent) while those attending secondary schools report dissatisfaction with lack of teachers (67 percent) followed by the lack of enough supplies such as text books. Furthermore, 38 percent of the primary school population report dissatisfaction due to lack of school supplies and bad condition of facilities. In contrast 39 percent of those in secondary school report dissatisfaction

**Table 3.2: Percentage of students currently enrolled in school by reasons for dissatisfaction**

| | Percent dissatisfied | Reasons for dissatisfaction | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | Books/ supplies | Poor Teaching | Lack of teachers | Teachers absent | Lack of space | Facilties in bad condition | High fees | Other |
| **Total** | 46.7 | 38.2 | 14.2 | 51.1 | 6.4 | 37.7 | 36.0 | 4.7 | 0.5 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 41.8 | 45.2 | 13.0 | 52.6 | 6.7 | 39.2 | 38.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| Remote | 52.1 | 32.2 | 15.2 | 49.8 | 6.1 | 36.3 | 34.2 | 5.2 | 0.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 45.6 | 25.3 | 15.0 | 57.6 | 5.3 | 35.2 | 42.1 | 3.4 | 0.6 |
| Non-poor | 47.3 | 44.1 | 13.9 | 48.2 | 6.9 | 38.8 | 33.2 | 5.2 | 0.4 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 35.6 | 44.1 | 0.0 | 56.2 | 0.0 | 25.3 | 27.5 | 12.9 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 45.6 | 40.8 | 17.6 | 50.1 | 8.2 | 38.7 | 32.7 | 4.6 | 0.6 |
| Self-employed - other | 59.0 | 27.6 | 1.0 | 55.3 | 0.0 | 38.3 | 55.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
| Other | 45.6 | 34.3 | 23.2 | 47.8 | 8.5 | 34.7 | 26.8 | 2.6 | 0.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 46.2 | 42.1 | 13.7 | 51.9 | 6.8 | 42.0 | 33.5 | 4.0 | 0.3 |
| Female | 47.3 | 33.8 | 14.8 | 50.3 | 5.9 | 32.7 | 38.8 | 5.4 | 0.6 |
| **Type of school** | | | | | | | | | |
| Primary | 47.7 | 38.9 | 16.1 | 53.1 | 6.6 | 41.5 | 37.4 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| Government | 48.1 | 38.6 | 16.2 | 53.4 | 6.6 | 41.7 | 37.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Private | 54.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Secondary | 66.6 | 38.8 | 2.7 | 66.8 | 10.8 | 11.0 | 12.5 | 32.8 | 0.0 |
| Government | 69.9 | 39.8 | 3.0 | 69.5 | 11.7 | 11.9 | 13.5 | 29.4 | 0.0 |
| Private | 59.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 45.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 23.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 30.9 | 30.9 | 8.2 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 47.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 |
| Government | 37.0 | 27.4 | 4.5 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 39.6 | 52.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Private | 29.7 | 41.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.1 | 42.6 | 0.0 |
| Other | 12.7 | 36.8 | 63.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base for column 1 is enrolled students, for columns 2 to 9, dissatisfied students

due to lack of supplies and only 13 percent raise complaints on bad conditions of facilities.

Only one percent of individuals attending government primary schools raised complaints about having high fees while 29 percent of those attending government secondary schools reported dissatisfaction due to high school fees.

Finally, satisfaction with secondary school is clearly lower among fostered and orphaned children.

## 3.3 Non-Attendance

Table 3.3 shows the percentage of individuals of primary or secondary school-age (7 to 19 years) currently not attending school and the reasons for not attending. The non-attendance rate is defined as the proportion of individuals of school-age who previously participated in formal education and had stopped attending school by the time of the survey

The district has about 11 percent of 7 to 19 year olds who are currently not attending school. Just above one third of this population (34 percent) do not attend

school because they have completed standard seven, O-level or A-level. Thirty percent of respondents in this category reported non-attendance because of high expenses associated with education while 25 percent failed standard four, seven or form four exams. None of the respondents reported non-attendance due to pregnancy or distance to schools.

There is correlation between the cluster location and the reasons for not attending school. A large percentage of respondents located in both accessible and remote clusters report expenses as the most prominent reason for not attending school. However, more complaints are reported by people living in households located in remote clusters (35 percent) than those living in accessible clusters (25 percent). While 24 percent of those living in remote cluster are not attending school because they think it is useless or uninteresting, only 13 percent from accessible clusters report this. One quarter of school-aged individuals living in accessible clusters report to be out of school because of marriage while only 6 percent of those living in remote clusters report marriage as a factor for not attending school.

There is no difference in the non-

**Table 3.3: Percentage of children 6-17 years who ever attended school by reason not currently attending**

| | Percent not attending | Completed school | Distance | Cost | Work | Illness | Pregnancy | Got married | Useless/ uninteresting | Failed exam | Awaits admission | Dismissed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 11.2 | 34.2 | 0.0 | 29.9 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 18.1 | 25.0 | 1.1 | 4.4 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 10.8 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 3.4 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 22.9 | 12.6 | 21.0 | 2.2 | 2.8 |
| Remote | 11.6 | 32.4 | 0.0 | 34.7 | 3.8 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 23.5 | 29.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 11.4 | 36.6 | 0.0 | 18.7 | 10.7 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 13.5 | 36.9 | 17.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
| Non-poor | 11.1 | 33.0 | 0.0 | 35.5 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 8.6 | 29.1 | 1.7 | 4.9 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | 10.1 | 29.6 | 0.0 | 58.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 11.4 | 34.2 | 0.0 | 31.4 | 2.5 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 22.0 | 27.2 | 1.5 | 4.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 12.7 | 35.9 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.4 | 11.5 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 7.3 | 34.1 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 35.4 | 0.0 | 30.5 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 8.8 | 21.0 | 0.0 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 24.8 | 24.2 | 0.0 | 10.5 |
| Female | 13.9 | 43.5 | 0.0 | 26.1 | 6.2 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 20.4 | 13.4 | 25.6 | 1.9 | 0.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7-13 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 45.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 54.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14-19 | 28.0 | 35.4 | 0.0 | 30.9 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 16.8 | 25.9 | 1.1 | 4.5 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base for column 1 is school-age children, for columns 2 to 13, not enrolled school children

attendance rate among children living in poor and non-poor households. However, differences appear when the two groups are broken down by reasons for not attending school. The major reasons for non-attendance for individuals living in poor households besides completing school are being uninterested (37 percent) followed by high expenses (19 percent). Individuals living in non-poor households report high expenses most commonly followed by failing exams.

Nearly all the primary school-aged children attend school, as their non-attendance rate is only 1 percent. On the other hand, only 72 percent of secondary school-aged individuals attend school. 31 percent of secondary school-aged people not attending secondary school claims that it is because of high expenses while 26 percent say it is because they failed exams.

## 3.4    Enrolment and Drop-out rates

This section takes a closer look at the primary and secondary school enrolment and drop-out rates. Rather than looking at primary or secondary school-aged children as a whole, data will be categorised by age and gender. Drop-out rates are calculated by dividing the number of children who left school in the current year by the total number of children enrolled this year plus those that dropped out (children who left school/ (children currently enrolled + children who left school)).

## Primary School

The drops out rates at primary level are generally very low. The primary school drop-out rate in Kagera Rural in 2004 was about 0.5 percent according to the 2004 Kagera Rural CWIQ. At the time of the survey the primary school drop-out rate was 0 percent. Therefore, only enrolment rates will be analysed.

**Table 3.4: Primary school enrollment and drop out rates by gender**

|  | Net enrollment rates | | | Drop out rates | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| **Total** | 87.9 | 85.1 | 86.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 7 | 55.9 | 51.0 | 53.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 8 | 77.2 | 60.5 | 69.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 9 | 90.1 | 98.0 | 93.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 10 | 94.4 | 100.0 | 97.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 11 | 97.7 | 96.7 | 97.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 12 | 98.6 | 92.2 | 95.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 13 | 92.9 | 95.4 | 94.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base for table is primary school age population (age 7-13)

**Table 3.5: Secondary school enrollment and drop out rates by gender**

|  | Net enrollment rates | | | Drop out rates | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| **Total** | 13.1 | 11.5 | 12.3 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 7.2 |
| 14 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 3.2 | 4.4 | 2.4 | 3.3 |
| 15 | 8.3 | 9.4 | 8.7 | 5.3 | 16.2 | 9.4 |
| 16 | 14.2 | 5.8 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 9.6 | 9.9 |
| 17 | 25.3 | 29.0 | 27.1 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 8.4 |
| 18 | 18.0 | 14.6 | 16.0 | 10.1 | 3.6 | 6.2 |
| 19 | 30.7 | 15.9 | 22.4 | 0.0 | 12.1 | 6.7 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base for table is the secondary school age population (age 14-19)

Overall, 87 percent of primary school-aged children are currently enrolled. Out of those within the primary school-age range (7 to 13 years), 85 percent of girls and 88 percent of boys are enrolled. The required age at which children should start standard one is 7 years. However, data on primary school enrolment shows that at the time of the survey, only half (53 percent) of all seven year olds were enrolled. Most children are likely to be in school by ages 9 or 10, where the Net Enrolment Rate is at 93 and 99 percent respectively.

## Secondary School

**Table 3.6 - Adult literacy rates by gender**
**(persons age 15 and above)**

|  | Male | Female | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 87.1 | 74.6 | 80.5 |
| 15-19 years | 95.5 | 93.1 | 94.3 |
| 20-29 years | 84.2 | 79.6 | 81.6 |
| 30-39 years | 80.8 | 84.3 | 82.6 |
| 40-49 years | 89.3 | 73.8 | 81.2 |
| 50-59 years | 91.8 | 80.1 | 86.4 |
| 60+ years | 83.0 | 39.7 | 55.3 |
| **Accessible** | 89.6 | 79.2 | 84.1 |
| 15-19 years | 95.2 | 94.3 | 94.8 |
| 20-29 years | 87.6 | 83.2 | 85.0 |
| 30-39 years | 84.6 | 85.9 | 85.2 |
| 40-49 years | 90.2 | 84.4 | 87.5 |
| 50-59 years | 100.0 | 85.7 | 93.7 |
| 60+ years | 85.3 | 48.2 | 62.4 |
| **Remote** | 84.3 | 69.7 | 76.5 |
| 15-19 years | 95.9 | 91.7 | 93.8 |
| 20-29 years | 80.8 | 75.2 | 77.8 |
| 30-39 years | 76.9 | 82.6 | 79.7 |
| 40-49 years | 88.0 | 64.5 | 73.9 |
| 50-59 years | 84.3 | 75.5 | 80.1 |
| 60+ years | 80.0 | 30.4 | 46.8 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base for table is population age 15+

Secondary school enrolment rates are much lower than those at primary level. Only 12 percent of secondary school children are currently enrolled compared primary school at 87 percent. For a person following a normal school curriculum i.e. started standard one with 7 years of age, he/she is expected to start form one at age 14. Table 3.5 shows secondary net enrolment patterns by age. From this table it is observed that net enrolment rates increase gradually with age. However, the biggest difference in enrolment rate is observed between age 16 and 17, which suggests that many children in the district join secondary school at the age of 17 lagging 3 years from a person who follows a normal school curriculum. Furthermore, 27 percent of 17 year olds report to be enrolled at the time of the survey. It is also observed that there are no boys enrolled in secondary school at the age of 14 while there are 6 percent of girls enrolled in secondary school at that age.

Secondary school drop-out rates among individuals of secondary school-age (14 to 19 years) are substantially higher compared to those of primary school. 7 percent of children of secondary school-age had dropped out of school in the year prior the survey (Table 3.5). In general, the highest drop-out rate is observed among 16 year olds. The highest drop-out rates among males are between ages 16 and 18 while female drop-out rates are highest at ages 15 and 19.

## 3.5    Literacy

Literacy is defined as the ability to read and write in at least one language. Those who can read but not write were counted as illiterate. The information on literacy was solely obtained by asking the respondent if he/she was able to read and write. Besides this information, no further tests on their ability to read or write were taken. Further, questions that helped determine adult literacy were only asked for person of 15 years or older. Conclusively, this section looks at adult and youth literacy rates by gender, age and residential location.

## Adult Literacy

Overall, 80 percent of the population aged 15 and above in the district are literate. The difference in literacy rates among men and women is about 12 percentage points at 87 and 75 percent respectively. Individuals with ages ranging between 15 and 19 years have the highest literacy rate of 94 percent while only 55 percent of those who are above 60 years know how to read and write. In addition, there is a huge difference in literacy among men and women above 60 years. While 83 percent of men within this age range are literate, only 40 percent of women belonging to this group are literate. On the other hand, there is virtually no difference in literacy rates among males and females aged 15 to 19.

The literacy rate in accessible clusters is about 7 percentage points higher than in remote clusters. There is no significant difference in literacy rates among 15 to 19 year olds in remote and accessible clusters. In contrast, there is a big difference in the literacy rates among individuals of other age-groups depending on whether they live in remote and accessible clusters. Furthermore, it is observed that 50 to 59 year olds living in accessible clusters have the same literacy rate as 15 to 19 year olds (94 percent) where virtually all the men (100 percent) and 86 percent of the women are literate. In remote clusters, the literacy rate among

50 to 59 year olds is about 14 percentage points lower than that of 15 to 19 year olds.

## Youth Literacy

This subsection looks at literacy rates among youth by age, gender and residential location. Youth literacy rate is calculated for all persons between 15 and 24 years of age. 88 percent of individuals in this group are literate. The literacy rate among men in this age range is 91 percent while for women it is 86 percent.

When youth are grouped by age, it appears that 15 to 17 year olds have the highest literacy rate where 98 percent know how to read and write. Youth of 15 to 17 years in both remote and accessible areas have the highest literacy rates. Only 3 percent of those belonging to this group in accessible clusters are illiterate while 1 percent of individuals living in households located in remote clusters are illiterate.

**Table 3.7 - Youth literacy rates by gender**
**(persons age 15-24 years)**

|  | Male | Female | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 91.4 | 86.4 | 88.8 |
| 15-17 years | 98.9 | 96.9 | 98.0 |
| 18-20 years | 87.3 | 84.7 | 85.7 |
| 21-22 years | 84.5 | 68.2 | 75.0 |
| 23-24 years | 79.8 | 85.0 | 82.5 |
| **Accessible** | 92.0 | 87.7 | 89.7 |
| 15-17 years | 97.8 | 96.4 | 97.2 |
| 18-20 years | 87.4 | 90.2 | 89.1 |
| 21-22 years | 85.1 | 76.1 | 79.8 |
| 23-24 years | 85.9 | 77.9 | 80.6 |
| **Remote** | 90.7 | 85.0 | 87.8 |
| 15-17 years | 100.0 | 97.4 | 98.8 |
| 18-20 years | 87.2 | 78.0 | 81.4 |
| 21-22 years | 84.0 | 60.6 | 70.6 |
| 23-24 years | 76.3 | 100.0 | 84.5 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base for table is population age 15-24 years

3 Education

# 4   Health

This chapter examines health indicators for the population in Bukoba Rural. First, selected health indicators are examined for the whole population. The second section analyses the reasons for dissatisfaction with health services. Section three shows the reasons for not consulting a health provider. This section is followed by analysis of the ill population by specific type of illness. A subgroup of those who had consulted a health provider is then taken from the ill population. In section five, this group is disaggregated by the type of health provider used. Section six presents an analysis of child deliveries. The chapter concludes with an analysis of child nutrition indicators.

## 4.1. Health Indicators

Throughout this report, a household is said to have access to medical services if it is located within 30 minutes travel from the nearest health facility. Judgment of the time it takes to travel to the facility as well as what is classed as a health facility is left to the discretion of the respondent. In second place, an individual is classed as having experienced need for medical assistance if he/she reports incidence of illness in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. It must be noted that need is based on self-reported occurrence of illness,

**Table 4.1 - Health Indicators**

|  | Medical Services | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Access | Need | Use | Satisfaction |
| **Total** | 40.6 | 36.1 | 31.9 | 79.3 |
| **Cluster Location** |  |  |  |  |
| Accessible | 47.3 | 36.5 | 30.9 | 82.7 |
| Remote | 33.5 | 35.7 | 33.0 | 75.8 |
| **Poverty Status** |  |  |  |  |
| Poor | 30.7 | 36.8 | 32.7 | 79.4 |
| Non-poor | 44.8 | 35.8 | 31.5 | 79.2 |
| **Socio-economic group** |  |  |  |  |
| Employed | 38.9 | 24.7 | 27.1 | 89.8 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 40.0 | 36.6 | 32.6 | 78.4 |
| Self-employed - other | 43.9 | 35.2 | 32.8 | 81.5 |
| Other | 40.2 | 43.7 | 27.1 | 73.8 |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 40.7 | 33.3 | 30.1 | 78.1 |
| Female | 40.4 | 38.8 | 33.7 | 80.2 |
| **Age** |  |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 40.1 | 49.2 | 63.0 | 76.7 |
| 5-9 | 41.2 | 26.8 | 22.9 | 86.2 |
| 10-14 | 40.9 | 26.3 | 19.2 | 85.4 |
| 15-19 | 43.4 | 25.1 | 19.3 | 83.1 |
| 20-29 | 38.6 | 31.1 | 26.0 | 77.4 |
| 30-39 | 36.7 | 34.2 | 29.9 | 79.5 |
| 40-49 | 39.5 | 34.5 | 25.5 | 72.8 |
| 50-59 | 44.3 | 81.9 | 81.9 | 65.1 |
| 60+ | 43.8 | 59.8 | 40.8 | 78.1 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Access is defined for persons in households less than 30 minutes from a health facility.
2. Need is defined for persons sick or injured in the four week period preceding the survey.
3. Use is defined for persons who consulted a health practitioner in the four week period preceding the survey.
4. Satisfaction is defined for persons who consulted a health practitioner in the four week period preceding the survey and who cited no problems.
5. Base of Table is total population. For satisfaction, population that used medical services.

rather than a diagnosis by a health professional. Thirdly, the rate of health facility use is defined as the proportion of individuals who had consulted a health service provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey regardless of their health status. Finally, the rate of satisfaction with health services is represented by the proportion of people who had consulted a health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and cited no problems with the service received.

Table 4.1 shows indicators regarding medical services by cluster location, poverty status, socio-economic status, gender and age. Overall, 41 percent of the households have access to medical services. Conversely, 59 percent of the households in the district do not have access to medical services.

As would be expected, household in accessible villages have higher access to medical services than households in remote villages. Both show similar proportions of need and use, but households in accessible villages report higher satisfaction rates (83 percent) than households in remote villages (at 76 percent).

Non-poor households have higher access rates than poor households, with shares of 45 and 31 percent, respectively. The breakdown by poverty status does not show sharp differences by need, use or satisfaction.

Regarding socio-economic status, the self-employed in non-agricultural activities show the highest access, at 44 percent. The other categories show rates of around 40 percent. Employees showed the lowest rate of need, with only 1 in 4 households, but the highest satisfaction, at 90 percent. Households where the main income earner was self-employed in agriculture showed the lowest satisfaction rate, at 77 percent.

There are no gender differences in access, with both genders at 40 percent. Females report higher need rates than males (39 and 33 percent, respectively), a slightly higher rate of use, and similar satisfaction.

Access does not vary widely by age-groups, but the rate of need does. It starts at 50 percent for children under 5, reduces to around 25 percent for the population aged between 5 and 19, and then starts going up again, peaking at 82 percent for the 50-59 group. The rate of use follows a similar trend: it starts decreasing with age but then increases for the older cohorts. Satisfaction is lowest for the 50-59 group, the heaviest users of the service; and highest for the 5-19 groups, the groups who have the lowest use.

## 4.2 Reasons for Dissatisfaction

Table 4.2 shows the percentage of population who consulted a health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and were not satisfied. Overall, 1 in 5 users of healthcare facilities is dissatisfied, mostly because of long waits (64 percent) and the cost (24 percent). Surprisingly, lack of success in the treatment was reported just by 5 percent of the users. It should be noticed that this does not imply that treatments were successful in 95 percent of the cases, but that in 95 percent of the cases the result of the treatment was not a cause for dissatisfaction.

The analysis by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages are more commonly dissatisfied by the cost of the treatment (30 percent, against 20 percent for households in accessible villages), whereas households in remote villages report long waits more often (73 percent, against 52 percent of the households in accessible villages).

The breakdown by poverty status shows similar dissatisfaction rates. However, the reasons for dissatisfaction are different: whereas poor households are more dissatisfied by the cost of the treatment than non-poor households (30 and 22 percent, respectively), the latter are relatively more dissatisfied by the long wait (65 against 61 percent).

Employees are the socio-economic group with the lowest dissatisfaction rate. Furthermore, 2 out of 3 report dissatisfaction by cost, and 1 in 3 by the long wait. The other socio-economic groups report the long wait more often, with cost as second reason.

**Table 4.2 - Percentage of persons who consulted a health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and were not satisfied, and the reasons for dissatisfaction.**

| | Percent dissatisfied | Facilities not clean | Long wait | No trained professionals | Cost | No drugs available | Treatment unsuccessful | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 20.7 | 4.7 | 63.9 | 9.3 | 24.3 | 8.6 | 5.1 | 3.3 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 17.3 | 2.1 | 51.7 | 11.7 | 29.9 | 10.8 | 5.9 | 6.7 |
| Remote | 24.2 | 6.5 | 72.5 | 7.6 | 20.3 | 7.0 | 4.4 | 0.9 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 20.6 | 12.2 | 60.9 | 10.0 | 30.0 | 7.9 | 5.8 | 0.0 |
| Non-poor | 20.8 | 1.4 | 65.2 | 9.0 | 21.8 | 8.8 | 4.7 | 4.8 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | 10.2 | 0.0 | 34.1 | 0.0 | 65.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 21.6 | 3.5 | 68.7 | 10.7 | 25.6 | 9.9 | 6.0 | 0.7 |
| Self-employed - other | 18.5 | 14.4 | 46.4 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 3.8 | 19.8 |
| Other | 26.2 | 0.0 | 59.3 | 0.0 | 40.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 21.9 | 3.8 | 67.4 | 9.3 | 24.3 | 11.8 | 3.3 | 3.8 |
| Female | 19.8 | 5.5 | 60.5 | 9.2 | 24.3 | 5.4 | 6.7 | 2.8 |
| **Type of provider** | | | | | | | | |
| Public hospital | 26.8 | 3.1 | 81.4 | 10.3 | 12.4 | 9.4 | 2.6 | 0.0 |
| Private hospital | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Religous hospital | 33.2 | 8.3 | 24.0 | 4.4 | 58.8 | 8.7 | 7.0 | 16.5 |
| Village health worker | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Private Doctor/Dentist | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pharmacist | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 80.7 | 0.0 | 19.3 | 0.0 |
| Trad. Healer | 3.1 | 59.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.5 | 0.0 |
| Other | 25.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. For column 1, the base is population that used medical services. For the rest, the base is the dissatisfied population.

Dissatisfaction does not vary by gender, but the reasons do so. Males point out the long waits and the lack of medicine more often than females (67 and 12 percent against 61 and 5 percent, respectively). In turn females are more likely to point out unsuccessful treatment and hygiene problems in the facilities (7 and 6 percent against 3 and 4 percent, respectively).

Regarding health provider, the main cause of dissatisfaction in public hospitals is the long wait, whereas in private and religious hospitals, as well as in pharmacists, the cost of healthcare. Furthermore, religious hospitals show the highest rates of dissatisfaction.

## 4.3 Reasons for Not Consulting When Ill

The distribution of the population who did not consult a health provider in the four weeks preceding the survey is shown Table 4.3. The table shows that overall, 70 percent of the population did not consult a health provider, typically because there was no need (90 percent of the cases). However, 10 percent of the people who did not consult a health provider had other reasons, mainly the cost of healthcare.

Neither cluster location nor poverty status seems to be correlated with the reasons for not consulting. Nevertheless, the division by socio-economic shows such differences. For the employees, 97 percent of the people who did not consult health facilities had no need to do so, whereas in "other" the share was 75 percent. The main reason was cost (for 18 percent of the households in "other").

**Table 4.3: Percentage of persons who did not consult a health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and the reasons for not consulting**

| | Percent not consulting | Reasons for not consulting | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No need | Cost | Distance | No confidence | Other |
| **Total** | 68.1 | 90.0 | 7.9 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.4 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 69.1 | 89.4 | 9.0 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 1.2 |
| Remote | 67.0 | 90.6 | 6.6 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 1.6 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 67.3 | 91.7 | 6.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
| Non-poor | 68.5 | 89.3 | 8.5 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 1.4 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | |
| Employed | 72.9 | 97.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 67.4 | 89.8 | 8.1 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.3 |
| Self-employed - other | 67.2 | 94.9 | 4.5 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 72.9 | 75.0 | 17.9 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 5.4 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | |
| Male | 69.9 | 92.2 | 6.4 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.9 |
| Female | 66.3 | 87.8 | 9.4 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 1.8 |
| **Type of sickness/injury** | | | | | | |
| Fever/malaria | 16.7 | 21.3 | 72.4 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.8 |
| Diarrhea/abdominal pains | 23.3 | 20.3 | 61.9 | 13.2 | 4.9 | 11.1 |
| Pain in back, limbs or joints | 39.3 | 10.1 | 67.0 | 17.6 | 4.5 | 12.8 |
| Coughing/breathing difficulty | 34.0 | 28.6 | 52.8 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 11.0 |
| Skin problems | 19.4 | 0.0 | 68.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.9 |
| Ear, nose, throat | 8.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Eye | 47.5 | 9.4 | 70.6 | 24.5 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
| Dental | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Accident | 27.3 | 13.5 | 68.8 | 17.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. For column 1, the base is total population. For columns 2 to 6, population that not consulted medical services.

The gender breakdown shows that for 92 percent of the males who did not consult health facilities reported no need. Females show a lower share, at 88 percent. Around 9 percent of females reported cost as the reason for not consulting health providers, whereas the share for men was 6 percent.

The split-up by type of illness shows that for most infirmities, fever (including malaria) diarrhea, pain, and coughing, the main cause for not consulting a health practitioner is cost. It is worth noticing the relatively low percentage of people not receiving attention (17%) for fever/malaria.

## 4.4 Type of Illness

Table 4.4 shows the percentage of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, fever or malaria is the most common sickness, affecting almost 64 percent of the total population. In turn, pain in back, joints or limbs or diarrhea, abdominal pain come in second and third place, with 13 and 14 percent of the population. Coughing and breathing difficulties affected 9 percent of the ill population, whereas other illnesses had minor shares.

The gender breakdown reveals that females make up a higher share of sick or injured population: 39 vs. 34 percent of males, but there are no stark differences by type of illness. The age breakdown shows that the share of sick/injured population starts at around 50 percent for children under 5, decreases for the 5-9 cohort, stabilizes between 25 and 30 percent, and then starts increasing again for the 30-49 cohort, peaking at for the population aged 65 and over (57 percent for males, and 80 percent for females in that group). The share of ill population affected by malaria comes down with age but other problems emerge.

**Table 4.4: Percentage of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks preceding the survey,**
   **and of those sick or injured the percentage  by type of sickness/injury, gender and age**

| | Sick or injured | Fever or malaria | Diarrhea/ abdominal pain | Pain in back, limbs or joints | Coughing/ breathing difficulty | Skin problem | Ear, nose, throat, | Eye | Dental | Accident | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 36.1 | 63.9 | 12.5 | 13.6 | 8.6 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 5.2 |
| **Male Total** | 33.9 | 63.2 | 12.6 | 12.4 | 8.2 | 2.6 | 7.6 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 5.2 | 4.9 |
| 0-4 | 48.4 | 78.5 | 10.0 | 1.2 | 14.4 | 5.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 3.9 |
| 5-9 | 26.4 | 57.2 | 22.1 | 1.3 | 9.4 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 3.9 |
| 10-14 | 24.6 | 73.7 | 12.6 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 5.1 | 5.9 |
| 15-29 | 29.2 | 58.7 | 8.5 | 13.6 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 8.7 | 3.3 |
| 30-49 | 33.0 | 64.7 | 9.8 | 14.5 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 8.7 | 3.5 |
| 50-64 | 46.8 | 55.6 | 19.8 | 27.8 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 70.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.3 |
| 65+ | 57.4 | 28.4 | 12.9 | 55.1 | 17.5 | 5.2 | 4.4 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 12.0 |
| **Female Total** | 38.8 | 63.8 | 12.8 | 14.7 | 8.9 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 5.4 |
| 0-4 | 50.0 | 86.8 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
| 5-9 | 27.2 | 65.4 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 3.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 |
| 10-14 | 28.1 | 66.2 | 7.9 | 5.6 | 4.3 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.7 |
| 15-29 | 28.7 | 66.8 | 15.7 | 10.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 6.9 | 3.1 | 4.4 |
| 30-49 | 37.4 | 60.0 | 15.1 | 13.7 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 8.6 | 1.4 | 7.6 |
| 50-64 | 53.7 | 58.1 | 11.4 | 29.7 | 8.5 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 4.8 |
| 65+ | 78.8 | 37.9 | 17.8 | 45.0 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Percentage by type of sickness/injury may add to more than 100% because respondents may report multiple categories.

2. Base of Table is population sick.

**Table 4.5: Percent distribution of health consultations in past 4 weeks by type of health provider**
**consulted**

| | Public hospital | Private hospital | Religious hospital | Village health worker | Private doctor, dentist | Pharmacistch emist | Traditional healer | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 56.1 | 3.3 | 12.5 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 16.7 | 8.9 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 57.2 | 4.6 | 12.6 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 15.1 | 7.6 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 55.0 | 2.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 10.2 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 44.3 | 4.2 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23.0 | 9.2 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 61.3 | 2.8 | 10.9 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 13.9 | 8.8 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | 62.4 | 3.2 | 12.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 8.7 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 59.5 | 2.6 | 11.6 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 13.7 | 10.0 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 40.5 | 4.9 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 29.2 | 5.0 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Other | 49.7 | 6.9 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.7 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base of Table is population who consulted a health provider

## 4.5 Health Provider

Table 4.5 shows the percent distribution of health consultations in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, 56 percent of the consultations were made in a public hospital, 17 percent to a pharmacist or chemist, 12 percent in a religious hospital, and 9 percent to traditional healers.

Private hospitals were consulted just in 3 percent of the cases.

The breakdown by location shows no strong correlation with health provider, but households in accessible villages seem to go more often to hospitals (public and private) than households in remote villages, and the latter to chemists and traditional healers.

Non-poor households make their consultations in public hospitals more often than poor households, with shares of 61 and 44 percent, respectively. In turn, members of poor households tend to consult chemists and religious hospitals more often (23 and 16 vs. 14 and 11 percent, respectively).

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that employees and the self-employed in agriculture go to public hospitals more often than the rest (with rates of around 60 percent) while the rest of socio-economic groups go to religious hospitals and chemists more often (17 and 39 percent, respectively).

## 4.6. Child Deliveries

Table 4.6 shows the percentage of women aged 12 to 49 who had a live birth in the year preceding the survey. Overall, 15 percent of women in this age-group gave birth in the past year. No girls aged 14 or under gave birth in the district. Around 9 percent of the females between 15 and 19 gave birth. The rate peaks at 36 percent for the 20-24 group, and then goes down, ending in 4 percent for the group aged 40 to 49. In addition, 99 percent of pregnant women received prenatal care.

The breakdown by cluster location shows no strong difference between remote and accessible villages. Households in remote villages show higher rates for women between 15 and 39 years old, whereas households in accessible villages show higher rates for the 40-49 cohorts.

The analysis by poverty status reveals that 19 percent of women from poor households had a live birth in the year preceding the survey, higher than the share for non-poor, at 14 percent. Furthermore, in poor households, 1 out of 2 women between 25 and 29 years old had a child in the 12 months preceding the survey.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that the highest rates correspond to the self-employed, with shares of 16 and 18 for agricultural and non-agricultural, respectively, whereas the employees

**Table 4.6: Percentage of women aged 12-49 who had a live birth in the year preceding the survey by age of the mother and the percentage of those births where the mother received pre-natal care**

|  | 12-14 yrs | 15-19 yrs | 20-24 yrs | 25-29 yrs | 30-39 yrs | 40+ yrs | Total | Pre-natal care |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 0.0 | 9.4 | 36.1 | 31.4 | 17.7 | 3.6 | 15.3 | 99.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 0.0 | 6.8 | 31.2 | 30.2 | 13.7 | 7.7 | 14.4 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 0.0 | 12.2 | 41.3 | 32.9 | 22.1 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 98.1 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 9.7 | 39.2 | 49.1 | 31.6 | 10.1 | 19.1 | 97.5 |
| Non-poor | 0.0 | 9.2 | 35.1 | 25.7 | 10.2 | 1.7 | 13.5 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | 0.0 | 6.3 | 12.2 | 0.0 | 13.2 | 15.4 | 7.1 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 0.0 | 9.8 | 35.8 | 36.9 | 18.4 | 1.3 | 16.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 0.0 | 7.9 | 44.4 | 30.8 | 19.1 | 0.0 | 18.1 | 100.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 11.8 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 73.3 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base of Table is Females aged 12 or older.

shows the lowest share, of just 7 percent overall. Self-employed in non-agricultural activities show highest rates: 44 percent for women between 20 and 24 years old; and in second place self-employed in agriculture 37 percent for the 25-29 cohort.

Table 4.7 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey. Roughly, 50 percent of births in the 5 years preceding the survey took place in a hospital, almost 30 percent at home, 15 percent at a dispensary. The ordering remains across cluster location, poverty status, and socio-economic group of the household head.

While households in remote villages had more births in hospitals, households in accessible villages had more births in dispensaries. Both groups show similar rates of deliveries at home, 28 and 30 percent, respectively.

The breakdown by poverty status shows slight differences, whereas non-poor had more deliveries in dispensaries (with shares of 17 and 15 percent, \respectively), poor households had more deliveries at home (31 and 28 percent, respectively).

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that hospitals are the most common place for deliveries, with shares of around 50 percent for all but the "other" category (43 percent). Home and dispensaries take the second and third place. While home represents 32 percent of deliveries for employees and self-employed in agriculture, 24 percent of deliveries for the "other" category

occurred in dispensaries.

Table 4.8 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by person who assisted in the delivery of the child. Overall, 4 of 5 deliveries were attended by a health professional, mostly nurses and midwives (57 percent of births). Traditional birth assistants (TBA) and trained TBA accounted for 17 and 12 percent, whereas doctors attended 11 percent of the deliveries in the district.

The analysis by cluster location shows that TBA were more common in remote villages (15 vs. 19 percent), whereas other forms of deliveries were more common in accessible villages (4 against 1 percent).

As expected, the non-poor show a higher share of deliveries attended by a professional, 82 percent, against 79 for the poor. In turn, poor households report slightly higher share of deliveries attended by doctors (13 and 11 percent, respectively).

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households in the "self-employed in agriculture" category report the highest share of deliveries attended by professionals: 82 percent, against 79, 78 and 70 of employees, self-employed in non-agricultural activities and other. In turn, the self-employed in non-agricultural activities show the lowest share of deliveries attended by a doctor or nurse, and the highest for midwives.

**Table 4.7: Percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by place of birth**

|  | Hospital | Health centre | Dispensary | Health post | At home | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 50.3 | 3.4 | 15.9 | 0.7 | 28.7 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 47.8 | 4.0 | 17.4 | 0.8 | 28.0 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 53.0 | 2.7 | 14.3 | 0.5 | 29.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 50.1 | 3.8 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 30.8 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 50.4 | 3.2 | 16.5 | 0.9 | 27.9 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | |
| Employed | 50.6 | 0.0 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 31.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 49.9 | 3.7 | 14.0 | 0.3 | 31.5 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 53.4 | 1.9 | 23.8 | 2.2 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 42.6 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 23.7 | 14.0 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base of Table is total number of children under 5.

## 4.7 Child Nutrition

Two standards of physical measurement of growth that describe the nutritional status of a child are presented in this chapter:
- Height-for-age (stunting)
- Weight-for-height (wasting)

The level of malnutrition in a population is determined by comparing the weight and height measurements within the population of interest to those of a well nourished population. Children are considered malnourished if their weight and/or height measurements fall outside the distribution of weight and height measurements of the well nourished population. The reference population used, as recommended by the World Health Organisation (WHO), is that of the United States National Centre for Health Statistics (NCHS).

Height-for-age is a measure of linear growth. A child who is below minus two standard deviations from the median of the reference population is considered to be too short for his/her age – stunted. Stunting is a consequence of long term malnutrition; it is indicative of long term inadequacy of nutrient intake, and is commonly associated with poor economic conditions and chronic or repeated infections.

Weight-for-height is a measure of body mass in relation to body height and is an indicator of immediate nutritional status. A child who is below minus two standard deviations from the median of the reference population is classed as too thin for his/her height – a condition called wasting. Wasting is an immediate indicator of acute malnutrition and reflects insufficiency in tissue and fat mass compared to the amount expected according to the child's height. Wasting occurs as a result of inadequate intake of nutrients immediately preceding the survey. Therefore, wasting is not necessarily the result of insufficient food intake, but could also be, for instance, the result of recent severe illness. Occurrence of wasting may be subject to seasonal variations.

Another measurement commonly used is weight-for-age. A child who is below minus two standard deviations from the median of the reference population is considered to be underweight. However, a child may be underweight because he/she is stunted, wasted or both. Interpretation of this indicator is complex and inconclusive; for this reason it was not incorporated into this report.

Overall, 4 percent of all the children are wasted, and 38 percent are stunted. More than half the children (57 percent) participate in nutrition programs.

Cluster location and poverty status are correlated with nutrition. Households in remote villages have higher rates of wasted and stunted children than households in accessible villages, with rates of (5 and 42 percent against 2 and 34 percent, respectively). Similar differences are observed between poor and non-poor

**Table 4.8: Percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by person who assisited in delivery of child**

| | Doctor Nurse | Midwife | Trained T.B.A. | T.B.A. | Other Self | Don't know | Total | Delivery by health prof. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 11.3 | 57.3 | 11.9 | 16.6 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 80.6 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 11.8 | 57.6 | 11.5 | 14.9 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 80.8 |
| Remote | 10.9 | 57.1 | 12.4 | 18.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 80.4 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 13.3 | 55.1 | 10.1 | 18.3 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 78.5 |
| Non-poor | 10.5 | 58.3 | 12.7 | 16.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 81.5 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | 11.0 | 57.3 | 10.2 | 21.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 78.5 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 13.1 | 54.5 | 14.4 | 15.9 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 82.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 5.2 | 68.9 | 4.3 | 19.7 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 78.4 |
| Other | 10.3 | 52.0 | 7.3 | 9.0 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 69.7 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base of Table is total number of children under 5.

**Table 4.9: Nutritional status indicators and program participation rates**

| | Nutritional status indicators | | Program participation | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Stunted | Wasted | Nutrition | Weigh-in | Vaccinated |
| **Total** | 40.2 | 2.7 | 54.7 | 96.1 | 94.5 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 37.8 | 0.7 | 51.2 | 96.3 | 94.6 |
| Remote | 42.7 | 4.9 | 58.5 | 95.9 | 94.3 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 43.3 | 5.2 | 40.9 | 96.1 | 96.1 |
| Non-poor | 38.8 | 1.6 | 60.5 | 96.0 | 93.8 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 52.7 | 15.0 | 63.1 | 91.4 | 91.4 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 44.4 | 2.3 | 55.8 | 96.2 | 95.2 |
| Self-employed - other | 22.7 | 0.0 | 47.6 | 96.0 | 92.2 |
| Other | 27.1 | 5.5 | 58.3 | 100.0 | 95.9 |
| **Gender and age in completed years** | | | | | |
| **Male** | 42.1 | 2.8 | 56.6 | 94.2 | 94.8 |
| 0 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 46.9 | 92.5 | 89.8 |
| 1 | 35.1 | 2.5 | 69.8 | 100.0 | 98.6 |
| 2 | 50.8 | 5.2 | 46.6 | 90.6 | 97.6 |
| 3 | 41.0 | 2.4 | 57.2 | 89.2 | 89.6 |
| 4 | 63.2 | 3.5 | 61.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 38.2 | 2.6 | 52.8 | 97.9 | 94.1 |
| 0 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 44.7 | 98.9 | 90.5 |
| 1 | 51.8 | 4.8 | 53.0 | 97.1 | 93.3 |
| 2 | 37.8 | 2.0 | 45.8 | 97.4 | 97.4 |
| 3 | 52.2 | 7.9 | 67.3 | 95.2 | 95.2 |
| 4 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 59.5 | 100.0 | 95.9 |
| **Orphan status** | | | | | |
| Orphaned | 48.4 | 8.4 | 56.8 | 83.8 | 75.7 |
| Not-orphaned | 39.8 | 2.5 | 55.0 | 96.7 | 95.4 |
| **Foster status** | | | | | |
| Fostered | 41.3 | 0.0 | 87.6 | 95.1 | 97.2 |
| Not-fostered | 39.4 | 2.6 | 52.9 | 96.0 | 94.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base of Table is total number of children under 5.

households. Poor households show 6 percent of wasted children and 41 percent of stunted children, whereas the figures for non-poor households are 3 and 37 percent.

Regarding socio-economic status, households in the employee category show the highest rates for wasted children, at 14 percent, whereas households from the category "other" show the highest rate of stunted children, at 68 percent. Children from households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities show the lowest rates of wasted and stunted, at 0 and 19 percent, respectively. The gender breakdown shows no difference in rates of wasted children, but higher the rate of stunted males is higher than that of stunted females (41 against 35 percent, respectively).

Table 4.10 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by type of vaccination received[1]. Overall, 80 percent

[1] BCG: Anti-tuberculosis; DPT: Diphtheria, Pertusis and Tetanus OPV: Oral Polio Vaccination,

of children under 5 have vaccination against measles, 96 against BCG, and roughly between 90 and 95 percent received vaccinations against DPT and OPV. Finally, 72 percent of the children in the district receive vitamin A supplements.

There are no differences by cluster location, poverty status. The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that vaccination rates in most cases are highest for children from the "employee" category, and lowest for children from the "self-employed other" category.

The gender breakdown shows that males have higher vaccination rates against measles (84 against 75 percent), but similar shares than women for the rest of vaccines. The age breakdown shows that the share of children consuming vitamin A increases with age. Finally, the vaccination rates for children aged 3 are roughly 5 to 10 percent lower than for the rest of children.

The breakdown by orphan status shows important differences between orphans and non-orphans. A child is considered orphan if he/she is under 18 years old and has lost at least one parent. Orphaned children show systematically higher rates of stunting and wasting than non-orphans, as well as lower participation in weigh-ins and lower rates of vaccinations.

A child is considered fostered when at least one of his/her parents does not leave at home. The split-up by foster status reveals similar trends: foster children are more likely to be stunted and wasted, and a lower share of them participates in weigh-ins or receive vaccinations.

Table 4.11 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by source of information. Overall, the information for 95 percent of the vaccinated children was supported by a vaccination card.

There is no difference by cluster location

**Table 4.10: Percent Distribution of Children Vaccinated by Type of Vaccination Received**

|  | Measles | BCG | DPT1 | DPT2 | DPT3 | OPV0 | OPV1 | OPV2 | OPV3 | Vitamin A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 79.5 | 95.8 | 94.3 | 91.2 | 88.4 | 87.5 | 92.6 | 91.0 | 86.7 | 71.9 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 78.8 | 93.5 | 92.7 | 90.6 | 87.2 | 86.6 | 91.6 | 89.4 | 86.7 | 70.1 |
| Remote | 80.2 | 98.4 | 96.0 | 91.9 | 89.8 | 88.6 | 93.7 | 92.7 | 86.8 | 73.8 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 77.0 | 93.0 | 94.1 | 89.8 | 88.2 | 89.7 | 91.3 | 90.3 | 86.2 | 73.4 |
| Non-poor | 80.5 | 97.0 | 94.3 | 91.8 | 88.6 | 86.6 | 93.2 | 91.2 | 86.9 | 71.2 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.7 | 94.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.8 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 79.3 | 96.2 | 94.0 | 91.2 | 88.0 | 86.7 | 92.6 | 91.6 | 86.4 | 71.3 |
| Self-employed - other | 73.0 | 94.0 | 94.0 | 88.4 | 87.6 | 85.9 | 90.6 | 85.9 | 84.5 | 64.3 |
| Other | 87.7 | 92.7 | 92.7 | 92.7 | 92.7 | 100.0 | 92.7 | 92.7 | 92.7 | 82.8 |
| **Gender and age in completed years** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 84.1 | 95.7 | 95.2 | 92.4 | 88.9 | 86.2 | 93.6 | 91.8 | 86.5 | 71.4 |
| 0 | 26.7 | 93.4 | 85.5 | 70.4 | 54.9 | 92.8 | 80.3 | 70.8 | 49.1 | 24.7 |
| 1 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 97.4 | 93.7 | 96.9 | 96.9 | 94.5 | 75.9 |
| 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 82.6 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 76.0 |
| 3 | 91.5 | 89.0 | 91.5 | 91.5 | 91.5 | 78.4 | 91.5 | 91.5 | 89.0 | 85.6 |
| 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 83.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.1 |
| **Female** | 74.9 | 96.0 | 93.3 | 90.0 | 88.0 | 88.8 | 91.7 | 90.2 | 86.9 | 72.4 |
| 0 | 18.0 | 88.6 | 79.0 | 67.5 | 60.2 | 91.1 | 73.3 | 69.8 | 61.3 | 27.1 |
| 1 | 94.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 91.2 | 100.0 | 96.6 | 91.3 | 87.5 |
| 2 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 86.6 |
| 3 | 93.1 | 95.2 | 95.2 | 95.2 | 95.2 | 87.7 | 95.2 | 95.2 | 95.2 | 90.8 |
| 4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 78.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 95.4 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base of table is total number of children under 5.

or poverty status. The main difference by socio-economic group is that all vaccinated children from the "employee" category had vaccination cards, whereas in the other categories the share was around 95 percent.

Further, all children aged 1 and above had vaccination cards. Children between 0 and 11 months had vaccination cards in 74 and 84 percent of the cases, for females and males, respectively.

**Table 4.11: Percent Distribution of Children Vaccinated by Source of Information**

|  | Health Card | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 94.9 | 5.1 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | |
| Accessible | 95.3 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 94.4 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | |
| Poor | 96.2 | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 94.4 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | |
| Employed | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 94.1 | 5.9 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 96.7 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Other | 92.7 | 7.3 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age in completed years** | | | |
| **Male** | 97.0 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| 0 | 84.1 | 15.9 | 100.0 |
| 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 92.8 | 7.2 | 100.0 |
| 0 | 74.3 | 25.7 | 100.0 |
| 1 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base of table is total number of children under 5 vaccinated.

# 4 Health

# 5. Employment

This chapter examines employment indicators for the population of Bukoba Rural. The first section analyses the employment status of the adult population. The second section of the chapter focuses on the working adults, with a special focus on the underemployed population. Trends examined include type of employment, employment sector and employer of the working adults. In the third section, the economically inactive subgroups of the adult population are examined. Next, household activities are studied. Analysis of child labour concludes this chapter..

## 5.1 Employment Status of Total Adult Population

The adult population of Bukoba Rural is categorised into two main groups: working and non-working. The working population includes all adults who had engaged in any type of work in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Within the working population, a distinction is made between those employed to capacity and those who are underemployed. The underemployed are those individuals who report willingness to take on additional work. This category reflects the population that is not working as much as they want, so they reflect surplus in the labour supply.

The non-working population consists of individuals who had not engaged in any type of work in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. This group is further subdivided into those who are unemployed and those who are economically inactive. While the economically inactive are individuals who had not engaged in any work in the 4 weeks preceding the survey due to illness, disability, age or school, unemployed individuals are those who were not working due to lack of employment opportunities but were actively looking for a job.

## 5.1.1 Work Status

Table 5.1 shows that roughly 2/3 of the working adult population is employed and 1/3 underemployed. Unemployment is lower than 1 percent. Around 30 percent of the adult population was looking for ways to increase their income. This shows that underemployment is a bigger problem in the area than unemployment. Households in accessible villages show higher employment rates and lower underemployment than remote villages. In turn, poor households show higher employment and lower underemployment rates. For both genders, underemployment peaks for the cohort aged between 30 and 49. Around 49 percent of the males in this group are underemployed, whereas the share for females is 37 percent

5 Employment

**Table 5.1 - Percentage distribution of the population by work status (age 15 and above)**

| | Working | | | Not working | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Employed | Under emp. | Total | Unemploy. | Inactive | Total | |
| **Total** | 62.5 | 30.8 | 93.2 | 0.6 | 6.1 | 6.8 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 64.6 | 28.1 | 92.6 | 0.9 | 6.5 | 7.4 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 60.2 | 33.7 | 93.9 | 0.3 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 67.9 | 27.1 | 95.1 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 60.4 | 32.1 | 92.6 | 0.9 | 6.6 | 7.4 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 55.4 | 38.5 | 93.9 | 0.8 | 5.3 | 6.1 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 63.3 | 33.4 | 96.7 | 0.4 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 46.6 | 49.2 | 95.8 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 52.5 | 43.8 | 96.3 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 50.6 | 19.1 | 69.7 | 0.0 | 30.3 | 30.3 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 68.6 | 24.1 | 92.7 | 0.5 | 6.8 | 7.3 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 73.2 | 22.9 | 96.1 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 58.0 | 37.1 | 95.2 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 74.7 | 19.7 | 94.4 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 70.5 | 4.5 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Underemployed includes persons who sought to increase earnings in the seven days preceding the survey.

2. Unemployed includes persons who did not work in the four week period preceding the survey and who
   looked for work in the same period. The inactive population, primarily students and retired persons,
   is not included in unemployment.

The adult population that was no working in the 4 weeks preceding the survey was mostly inactive, rather than unemployed. This means that most of them were students, sick people, etc. rather than people looking for work and ready for it. For the population under 65 years, inactivity fluctuates around 5 percent. For the population over 65 the number of inactive population goes up, as would be expected, reaching 25 percent for females and 30 percent for males.

## 5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads

Table 5.2 shows the principal labour force indicators for the adult population compared to the household heads. Activity rates are similar for total population and household heads, but underemployment is higher among the latter. Remote and poor households have higher underemployment rates than their accessible and non-poor counterparts. The difference by cluster location is larger for the household heads.

The gender breakdown shows that almost half of male household heads are underemployed, whereas the rate for all males is 38 percent. In turn, the rate for all females and for female household heads is similar, around 25 percent in both cases.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that almost 2 out of 3 male household heads aged between 15 and 29 are underemployed. There is a clear negative relationship between underemployment and age, the former reducing as the latter increases.

**Table 5.2 - Principal labour force indicators (persons age 15 and above)**

| | Total population | | | Heads of household | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Active population | Unemployment rate | Underemploy-ment rate | Active population | Unemploy-ment rate | Underemploy-ment rate |
| **Total** | 93.9 | 0.7 | 32.8 | 93.4 | 0.4 | 45.3 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 93.5 | 1.0 | 30.0 | 93.8 | 0.7 | 41.4 |
| Remote | 94.2 | 0.3 | 35.8 | 93.0 | 0.0 | 49.6 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 95.1 | 0.0 | 28.5 | 96.9 | 0.0 | 40.4 |
| Non-poor | 93.4 | 0.9 | 34.4 | 92.3 | 0.5 | 46.9 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 94.7 | 0.9 | 40.6 | 94.1 | 0.5 | 51.9 |
| 15-29 | 97.0 | 0.4 | 34.4 | 98.9 | 0.0 | 65.1 |
| 30-49 | 97.8 | 2.0 | 50.3 | 98.2 | 1.0 | 53.6 |
| 50-64 | 96.3 | 0.0 | 45.5 | 97.4 | 0.0 | 45.7 |
| 65+ | 69.7 | 0.0 | 27.4 | 68.7 | 0.0 | 26.0 |
| **Female** | 93.2 | 0.5 | 25.8 | 91.7 | 0.0 | 27.2 |
| 15-29 | 97.2 | 1.1 | 23.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 51.9 |
| 30-49 | 95.2 | 0.0 | 39.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 48.0 |
| 50-64 | 94.4 | 0.0 | 20.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 26.2 |
| 65+ | 75.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 80.8 | 0.0 | 5.8 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Underemployed includes persons who sought to increase earnings in the seven days preceding the survey.

2. Unemployed includes persons who did not work in the four week period preceding the survey and who
   looked for work in the same period. The inactive population, primarily students and retired persons,
   is not included.

**Table 5.3 - Percentage distribution of the population by work status (age 15-24)**

| | Active population | | | | Active | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Employed | Under emp. | Working | Unemployed | Total | Inactive |
| **Total** | 74.8 | 22.1 | 96.9 | 0.5 | 97.3 | 2.7 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 77.2 | 19.6 | 96.8 | 0.0 | 96.8 | 3.2 |
| Remote | 72.3 | 24.7 | 97.0 | 0.9 | 97.9 | 2.1 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 81.5 | 14.7 | 96.2 | 0.0 | 96.2 | 3.8 |
| Non-poor | 72.1 | 25.0 | 97.2 | 0.6 | 97.8 | 2.2 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 71.3 | 26.1 | 97.4 | 0.5 | 97.8 | 2.2 |
| 15-16 | 91.6 | 5.9 | 97.6 | 0.0 | 97.6 | 2.4 |
| 17-19 | 68.7 | 27.6 | 96.3 | 0.0 | 96.3 | 3.7 |
| 20-21 | 58.7 | 39.5 | 98.3 | 0.0 | 98.3 | 1.7 |
| 22-23 | 46.0 | 51.7 | 97.7 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Female** | 78.1 | 18.4 | 96.5 | 0.4 | 96.9 | 3.1 |
| 15-16 | 93.8 | 6.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 17-19 | 78.9 | 15.6 | 94.5 | 0.0 | 94.5 | 5.5 |
| 20-21 | 75.6 | 19.5 | 95.1 | 2.0 | 97.1 | 2.9 |
| 22-23 | 60.5 | 35.7 | 96.2 | 0.0 | 96.2 | 3.8 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Underemployed includes persons who sought to increase earnings in the seven days preceding the survey.

2. Unemployed includes persons who did not work in the four week period preceding the survey and who
   looked for work in the same period. The inactive population, primarily students and retired persons,
   is not included.

# 5 Employment

**Table 5.4 - Percentage distribution of the working population by type of payment in main job**

|  | Employed | Self-employed | Unpaid | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 4.0 | 52.8 | 43.0 | 0.2 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 4.4 | 50.3 | 44.8 | 0.5 |
| Remote | 3.6 | 55.4 | 41.1 | 0.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 2.7 | 50.7 | 46.2 | 0.4 |
| Non-poor | 4.5 | 53.6 | 41.7 | 0.2 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | |
| **Male** | 7.8 | 64.5 | 27.1 | 0.5 |
| 15-29 | 4.7 | 40.8 | 53.9 | 0.6 |
| 30-49 | 11.0 | 84.4 | 3.9 | 0.7 |
| 50-64 | 14.1 | 82.3 | 3.7 | 0.0 |
| 65+ | 3.2 | 95.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
| **Female** | 0.6 | 42.3 | 57.1 | 0.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.5 | 23.0 | 76.5 | 0.0 |
| 30-49 | 0.7 | 55.0 | 44.2 | 0.0 |
| 50-64 | 1.6 | 64.9 | 33.6 | 0.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 68.0 | 32.0 | 0.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base is working population age 15+

## 5.2 Working population

Table 5.4 shows that the vast majority of the working population is formed by self-employed (53 percent) or unpaid workers (43 percent). Moreover, employees only account for 4 percent of the working population. The self-employed population is somewhat higher in remote villages and non-poor households. In poor households, less than 3 percent of the underemployed has a position as an employee. In turn, self-employed and unpaid workers are most common (50 and 46 percent, respectively).

The gender breakdown shows that a higher share of males works as employees or is self-employed, whereas almost 60 percent of females are unpaid. The cut down by age-groups shows that the share of employees peaks for males in the 50-64 age-group, the self-employed for 65+ males and unpaid for 15-29 females.

## 5.1.3 Youth Employment

Table 5.3 shows the distribution of the youth (ages 15 to 24) by work status. This group has higher rates of activity than the overall population, at 97 percent. Moreover, underemployment is lower: only 1 of every 5 workers is underemployed, as opposed to 1 of every 3 workers for the overall population. Furthermore, the youth from non-poor households and the youth from households in remote villages have higher underemployment than their counterparts.

A breakdown by gender shows that underemployment is higher among the male youths than female youths, with rates of 25 and 18 percent, respectively. By dividing the cohort into two groups, it can be seen that underemployment is higher in the 20-24 group, and much higher for males (46 percent, compared to 26 percent of

The percentage distribution of the working population by employer is analysed in Table 5.5. The table shows that the private sector (formal or informal) employs more than 50 percent of the working population, which combined with individuals who work for their own households represent up to 98 percent of the working population.

As would be expected, positions in State/NGO are more common in accessible villages and in non-poor households. Households employ higher shares of workers in accessible villages and poor households; and the private sector employs higher shares of workers in remote villages and non-poor households.

**Table 5.5 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employer**

| | State/NGO/ Other | Private | Household | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 1.9 | 55.1 | 43.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 2.6 | 53.2 | 44.2 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 1.2 | 57.1 | 41.7 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 0.6 | 52.2 | 47.2 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 2.4 | 56.2 | 41.4 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | |
| **Male** | 3.9 | 67.6 | 28.5 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 1.1 | 43.8 | 55.1 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 5.6 | 91.2 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 10.1 | 85.9 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 3.9 | 88.2 | 7.9 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 0.2 | 44.0 | 55.8 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 24.3 | 75.7 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 0.0 | 55.8 | 44.2 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 1.7 | 67.3 | 31.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 71.5 | 28.5 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

The population working in the State/NGO peaks for males aged 50-64 at 10 percent; whereas 3 out of every 4 young females (15-24) work for the household. In contrast, most men after 30 work for either the private sector or State/NGO, whereas when they are aged between 15 and 29 more than half work for a household. Finally, the share of females working in the private sector increases gradually with age, but is always lower than the respective shares of males.

Table 5.6 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by main activity. The categories are agriculture; mining, manufacturing, energy and construction; services (transport, trade, private and public services); domestic duties; and other. The most important result is that agriculture and domestic duties together account for 87 percent of the working population. 66 percent of the

**Table 5.6 - Percentage distribution of the working population by activity**

| | Agriculture | Mining/manuf/ energy/constr | Pub & priv services | Domestic duties | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 65.7 | 4.3 | 6.3 | 21.7 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 64.9 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 20.7 | 3.4 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 66.4 | 3.5 | 6.6 | 22.7 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 63.5 | 4.1 | 6.0 | 24.6 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 66.5 | 4.3 | 6.4 | 20.5 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 60.7 | 8.8 | 10.0 | 16.0 | 4.5 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 52.8 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 32.0 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 61.3 | 14.5 | 15.6 | 1.3 | 7.3 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 78.1 | 7.9 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 83.5 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 2.4 | 6.1 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 70.1 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 26.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 58.1 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 38.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 77.3 | 0.8 | 3.2 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 88.6 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 82.3 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

# 5 Employment

**Table 5.7 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employment status, sex and activity**

|  | Employee | | Self-Employed | | Unpaid Worker | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| **Total** | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Agriculture | 17.0 | 20.0 | 73.5 | 93.3 | 44.6 | 55.3 | 60.9 | 71.1 |
| MMEC | 43.7 | 35.0 | 17.1 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 1.1 |
| Services | 36.7 | 45.1 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 4.5 | 1.9 |
| Domestic duties | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 55.0 | 43.9 | 15.2 | 25.8 |
| Other | 1.0 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 0.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base is working population age 15+

**Table 5.8 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employer, sex and activity**

|  | Government/NGO | | Private | | Household | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| **Total** | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Agriculture | 9.8 | 0.0 | 69.9 | 92.9 | 45.9 | 54.6 | 60.9 | 71.1 |
| MMEC | 9.1 | 0.0 | 20.6 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 1.1 |
| Services | 59.5 | 100.0 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 4.5 | 1.9 |
| Domestic duties | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 53.7 | 44.9 | 15.2 | 25.8 |
| Other | 21.6 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 0.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base is the working population age 15+

population is engaged in agriculture, and 22 percent in household activities.

The split up by remoteness of the village and poverty status of the household does not reveal clear trends of the main activity.

The gender breakdown shows that the most common activities for females are agriculture and household duties, accounting for 97 percent of the working population. These are the main activities for men as well, but they are less concentrated, with 25 percent in other activities.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that younger cohorts have higher shares dedicated to household duties. Nearly 16 percent of males aged 30 to 49 works in services, and a further 15 percent in mining, manufacturing, energy or construction. The share of women in agriculture increases steadily with age until 64, and then reduces slightly, as household duties for this group increases.

Table 5.7 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by employment status, gender and activity. Female employees are almost equally split between agriculture; mining, manufacturing, energy and construction; and services. Almost half male employees (46 percent) work in services, and the remaining is roughly evenly split between agriculture and mining, manufacturing, energy and construction. The self-employed work mostly in agriculture (73 percent of males, 93 percent of females). Mining, manufacturing, energy and construction, and services each employ around 10 percent of the male the self-employed labour force. The other activities are almost negligible.

The unpaid population is almost equally divided between agriculture and domestic duties, with other activities virtually at zero. Around 55 percent of unpaid males are dedicated to domestic duties and 44 are dedicated to agriculture. The figures for females are the reverse: 44 percent are dedicated to domestic duties and 55 percent to agriculture.

The percentage distribution of the working population by employer, gender, and activity is depicted in Table 5.8. The working population employed by the government is mostly dedicated to services. The labour force working for private employers (whether formal or informal) is mostly dedicated to agriculture. Nearly 70 percent of males and over 90 percent of females are in this category. There is also a

**Table 5.9 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by
employment status**

| | Employee | Self-employed | Unpaid worker | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 4.6 | 73.5 | 21.9 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 5.3 | 72.4 | 22.3 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 3.8 | 74.6 | 21.6 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 4.6 | 69.0 | 26.4 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 4.5 | 75.0 | 20.5 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | |
| **Male** | 7.6 | 85.2 | 7.2 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 3.8 | 78.1 | 18.0 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 6.4 | 93.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 21.1 | 78.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 13.5 | 86.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 0.3 | 57.4 | 42.2 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 42.8 | 57.2 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 0.0 | 68.1 | 31.9 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 3.8 | 67.5 | 28.7 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base is the underemployed population age 15+

significant share of males in mining, manufacturing, energy and construction, reaching 20 percent of the male labour force working for a private agent. As in the case of unpaid workers, individuals whose main activity is household duties either work in agriculture or undertake domestic tasks.

# 5.3 Underemployed Population

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status is shown in Table 5.9. Overall, 74 percent of the underemployed population is self-employed, 32 percent unpaid, and only 5 percent are employees. Even though self employed are just over 50 percent of the population, they represent almost 75 percent of the underemployed. This may reflect the fact that the self-employed depend on them, so they are always looking for ways to increase their income.

Remote and accessible villages do not show significant differences, but poverty seems to be correlated with the employment status of the underemployed. The poor have a higher share of unpaid, whereas the non-poor show a higher share of self-employed.

The gender breakdown reveals that females are almost equally split between self employed and unpaid (with rates of 57 and 42 percent, respectively), whereas underemployed males are mostly concentrated on the self-employed category, with a share of 85 percent.

For the underemployed females, the share of self-employment increases with age, and the share in the unpaid category decreases with age. Virtually no underemployed females work as employees. For males, the "employee" category increases with age, reaching 21 percent for the 50-64 cohort, but are mostly self-employed. Only male youths appear to be unpaid workers.

Table 5.10 shows the percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer. Overall, the underemployed population mostly works for a private employer, and in second place in household. Less than 3 percent of the underemployed population works for the government or NGO.

The division between remote and accessible villages does not show wide differences. However, the division by poverty status is more enlightening.

43

# 5 Employment

Over 77 percent of the underemployed population in non-poor households works for a private employer and almost 20 percent work in the household, compared to 71 and 29 percent, respectively, for the underemployed population in poor households. Hence, of the underemployed population, non-poor individuals tend to work more often for private agents, and poor individuals tend to work for the household.

The gender breakdown reveals that the male population is vastly concentrated in private employers. In turn, underemployed females are split, with 60 percent working for a private agent and 40 percent dedicated to household duties.

The age-group analysis shows that

30 to 49 are in the private sector; whereas 15 percent of the 50-64 and 65+ groups work for the government or an NGO. The share of underemployed population working in the household is highest for young females, almost 60 percent. Inside the male group, only the youths work in the household, with a share of 20 percent. The rest of underemployed males work mostly for private agents and a small group work for the government or an NGO. Females are split between private and household: for the groups 30 or over, underemployed females are more likely to work for a private agent, but for the group between 15 and 29 years old the main employer is the household.

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by main economic activity is presented in Table 5.11. The most outstanding conclusion is that 3 out of 4 underemployed

**Table 5.10 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer**

|  | State/NGO/Other | Private | Household | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 2.5 | 76.0 | 21.5 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 3.5 | 75.7 | 20.8 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 1.6 | 76.2 | 22.2 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 70.9 | 29.1 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 3.3 | 77.5 | 19.2 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | |
| **Male** | 4.1 | 87.6 | 8.3 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 79.4 | 20.6 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 3.4 | 96.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 15.3 | 84.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 13.5 | 86.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 0.4 | 59.7 | 39.9 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 42.9 | 57.1 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 0.0 | 72.1 | 27.9 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 3.8 | 67.5 | 28.7 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base is working population age 15+

virtually all underemployed males aged

workers are dedicated to agriculture.

**Table 5.11 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by activity**

| | Agriculture | Mining/manuf/ energy/constr | Public & private services | Domestic duties | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 76.9 | 3.9 | 8.4 | 8.0 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 74.0 | 4.8 | 11.3 | 4.7 | 5.2 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 79.5 | 3.1 | 5.7 | 11.1 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 76.2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 15.3 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 77.1 | 3.9 | 9.8 | 5.8 | 3.5 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 73.8 | 6.7 | 11.0 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 73.3 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 9.3 | 4.5 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 69.2 | 9.9 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 85.0 | 0.0 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 86.5 | 0.0 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 81.2 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 78.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 89.7 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 70.6 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base is the underemployed population age 15+

In remote villages, 80 percent of the underemployed populations work in agriculture, and 10 replace in households. In accessible villages, the share of unemployed population in agriculture is somewhat lower, but still high (72 percent). The "mining, manufacturing, energy and construction" sector takes the second place, with 11 replace of the underemployed population.

Regardless of poverty status, around three quarters of the underemployed work in agriculture. The main difference, however, is the second most important activity: "mining, manufacturing, energy and construction" for non-poor, "household" for the poor (with shares of 15 and 10 percent, respectively).

**Table 5.12 - Percentage distribution of the unemployed population by reason**

| | No work available | Seasonal inactivity | Student | HH/Family duties | Age: too old | Age: too young | Retired | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 24.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 67.6 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 89.3 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Non-poor | 24.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 67.6 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 20.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 79.4 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Female** | 29.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.8 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 29.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.8 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 50-64 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base is the unemployed population age 15+

5 Employment

The gender breakdown shows that after agriculture, men are more concentrated on the mining, manufacturing, energy and construction sectors, whereas women are so on households. For instance, the mining, manufacturing, energy and construction sectors occupies around 18 percent of the male underemployed labour force between the ages of 30 and 49, whereas 20 percent of underemployed women in the 15 to 29 age-group work in the
The analysis of age-groups also shows that the share of males in public services increases with age. Furthermore, underemployed males work in the household only in the young cohort (15 to 29).

## 5.4 Unemployed and Inactive Population

Unemployment refers to a person who is actively looking for a job and is ready to work. If the individual is not working but is not looking for a job or is not ready to work, he or she is part of the inactive population. For instance, a full-time student, an ill individual or a retired person are not unemployed, because they either are not looking for a job (the student and the retired), or are not able to work (the ill person).

Table 5.12 shows the main causes for unemployment. In the whole sample only 0.6 percent of the adult population is unemployed, resulting in a sample size too small to draw solid statistical conclusions. However, it is still striking that they are all from non-poor households and mostly between 15 and 29 years old.

Table 5.13 shows the main causes of economic inactivity. Overall, infirmity is the main reason for inactivity, affecting almost half of the inactive population (46 percent). The categories "too old" and "retired" together explain most of the remaining share. Being a student and finding no work available are minor causes for inactivity. This may reflect that most students are economically active, meaning that most of them undertake economic activities.

Infirmity is almost double in remote villages than in accessible ones (60 and 35 percent, respectively). In turn, being too old or being a student are more important in accessible than in remote villages (with shares of 12 and 33 percent, against 4 and 11 percent, respectively). In poor households, being a student or being retired are more important causes of inactivity than in non-poor households. Being too old is more important in non-poor household.

**Table 5.13 - Percentage distribution of the economically inactive population by reason**

|  | No work available | Seasonal inactivity | Student | HH/Family duties | Age: too old | Age: too young | Retired | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 2.9 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 25.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.3 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 3.3 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 36.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 2.4 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 11.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.7 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.2 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 3.7 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 30.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.5 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 75.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 58.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 4.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 32.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.8 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.1 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.6 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base is the inactive population age 15+

Infirmity is the main cause of inactivity for both genders, whereas the second most important for women is being too old (30 percent), and for males, being a student (20 percent).

The breakdown by age-groups shows that infirmity occurs across the whole inactive population (apparently lower for males in the 15-29 and 50-64 cohorts). The second most important causes ("too old" for females and "student" for males) are absolutely concentrated in age-groups: in the 15-29 groups for males, and in the 65+ groups for females

## 5.5 Household Tasks

Table 5.14 shows the activities normally undertaken in the household by its members. First the population aged 15 and above is analysed. The most common activities for the population aged 15 and above are taking care of the sick, elderly, and children. All the activities are undertaken by more than 50 percent of the members.

In remote villages, household activities are undertaken by a higher share of the population than in accessible villages. Poverty status does not seem to be correlated with the share of population undertaking particular household activities.

The most important differences are shown in the gender and age-breakdown. Males are more likely to fetch firewood, whereas women tend fetch water, and to do the rest of the activities. There is virtually no gender difference in taking care of the elderly.

The analysis of age-groups shows that for males the shares decrease with age in all activities. The share of females fetching water or firewood or cleaning toilets decreases with age, but remains high and steady in cooking, taking care of children, the sick and the elderly.

**Table 5.14 - Activities normally undertaken in the household (age 15 and over)**

|  | Fetching water | Fetching firewood | Cleaning toilet | Cooking | Care of children | Care or elderly/sick |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 61.9 | 58.5 | 70.4 | 68.4 | 74.2 | 89.2 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 60.1 | 54.0 | 70.1 | 66.0 | 70.5 | 88.4 |
| Remote | 64.0 | 63.5 | 70.9 | 71.1 | 78.2 | 90.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 61.2 | 60.4 | 71.7 | 67.1 | 76.6 | 92.4 |
| Non-poor | 62.2 | 57.8 | 70.0 | 68.9 | 73.3 | 88.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 51.6 | 76.6 | 53.1 | 39.3 | 63.7 | 87.9 |
| 15-29 | 79.7 | 95.0 | 74.6 | 59.7 | 61.1 | 91.5 |
| 30-49 | 32.6 | 71.8 | 42.3 | 23.2 | 71.8 | 93.0 |
| 50-64 | 22.5 | 51.8 | 26.9 | 24.0 | 64.1 | 81.9 |
| 65+ | 14.4 | 31.3 | 16.0 | 12.6 | 46.9 | 59.6 |
| **Female** | 70.9 | 42.8 | 85.6 | 93.8 | 83.3 | 90.3 |
| 15-29 | 94.1 | 53.5 | 95.0 | 98.4 | 85.0 | 96.5 |
| 30-49 | 75.6 | 42.7 | 92.1 | 97.1 | 94.9 | 95.1 |
| 50-64 | 36.2 | 30.7 | 78.5 | 94.6 | 80.5 | 86.4 |
| 65+ | 13.9 | 18.3 | 47.0 | 71.2 | 56.1 | 63.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base is population aged 15 and over

**Table 5.15 - Activities normally undertaken in the household (age 5 to 14)**

|  | Fetching water | Fetching firewood | Cleaning toilet | Cooking | Care of children | Care or elderly/sick |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 94.1 | 74.3 | 64.4 | 66.2 | 64.0 | 73.6 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 93.6 | 74.3 | 60.6 | 65.4 | 58.0 | 65.8 |
| Remote | 94.6 | 74.3 | 68.3 | 67.0 | 70.2 | 81.6 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 90.7 | 73.3 | 63.5 | 61.5 | 72.9 | 71.2 |
| Non-poor | 95.9 | 74.8 | 64.8 | 68.6 | 59.2 | 74.9 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 93.4 | 83.3 | 61.0 | 60.6 | 61.4 | 71.5 |
| 5-9 | 90.9 | 68.8 | 41.9 | 36.5 | 53.4 | 61.6 |
| 10-14 | 95.4 | 95.0 | 76.4 | 80.1 | 67.9 | 79.5 |
| **Female** | 94.9 | 64.0 | 68.2 | 72.5 | 66.9 | 76.0 |
| 5-9 | 93.0 | 54.2 | 42.8 | 45.9 | 56.1 | 60.4 |
| 10-14 | 96.3 | 71.3 | 86.8 | 92.0 | 74.9 | 87.4 |
| **Orphan status** | | | | | | |
| Orphaned | 92.8 | 82.4 | 64.6 | 74.8 | 57.3 | 73.6 |
| Not-orphaned | 94.8 | 72.5 | 64.4 | 63.6 | 66.3 | 74.0 |
| **Foster status** | | | | | | |
| Fostered | 93.9 | 81.4 | 77.6 | 75.9 | 38.4 | 85.9 |
| Not-fostered | 94.4 | 71.9 | 60.7 | 61.9 | 68.5 | 70.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base is children aged 5 to 14

## 5.6 Child Labour

Table 5.15 shows that the most common activities for children between 5 and 14 years old are fetching water, firewood, and taking care of the sick and elderly. It is interesting to notice that the shares for children fetching water or firewood are higher than for the rest of the population. Children from remote villages are more likely to clean toilets and take care of children, sick and elderly. Children from non-poor households, in turn, are more likely to fetch water, help cooking, and take care of the sick or elderly, while children from poor households are more likely to take care of children.

Almost all males fetch firewood and water. Females have lower rates in fetching firewood, similar rates in fetching water and higher rates in the other tasks. The analysis by age-groups shows that the 10-14 cohorts have higher rates than the youngest children, for all household tasks.

The breakdown by orphan and foster status shows no differences in the share of children fetching water, but higher shares of orphaned and fostered children fetching firewood and cooking.

The main descriptive statistics for child labour are presented in Table 5.16. The most important result of the table is that almost 60 percent of the children are economically active. Their main economic activity is mostly household duties, and in second place agriculture. The share of working children does not vary by cluster location or poverty status. The particular activity does not show evident correlation with remoteness, poverty status, or even gender.

The main difference is given by the age breakdown. The almost all working children between 5 and 9 years old work in the household, with rates of 93 and 97 percent for boys and girls, respectively. The 10-14 groups, despite still having household duties as their main economic activity, have an increasing presence in agriculture, with 16 and 21 percent. Virtually all the children work in the household, with counted exceptions working for a private employer.

The breakdown by orphan and foster status shows stark differences.

Orphaned children are more likely to be working than non orphaned children, at rates of 82 and 55 percent, respectively. In turn, fostered children are more likely to be working than non-fostered children, but the difference is somewhat lower (64 and 53 percent). Orphaned children are more likely to work in agriculture whereas non-orphaned children are more likely to work in household duties.

**Table 5.16 - Child labour (age 5 to 14)**

| | Working | Main activity | | | Employer | |
| | | Agriculture | Household | Other | Private | Household |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 59.3 | 12.7 | 86.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 99.6 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 59.8 | 14.0 | 85.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 99.5 |
| Remote | 58.8 | 11.4 | 87.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 99.8 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 61.5 | 13.2 | 85.6 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 58.3 | 12.4 | 87.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 99.5 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 60.6 | 12.1 | 86.7 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 99.5 |
| 5-9 | 39.8 | 6.9 | 93.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 10-14 | 98.8 | 15.9 | 82.0 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 99.2 |
| **Female** | 58.0 | 13.4 | 86.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 99.7 |
| 5-9 | 37.9 | 3.5 | 96.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 10-14 | 95.0 | 20.7 | 79.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 99.6 |
| **Orphan status** | | | | | | |
| Orphaned | 82.1 | 15.5 | 82.2 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 98.4 |
| Not-orphaned | 54.9 | 11.7 | 88.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Foster status** | | | | | | |
| Fostered | 71.5 | 15.7 | 84.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Not-fostered | 55.2 | 11.0 | 88.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base for column 1 is children aged 5 to 14. For columns 2 to 6, base is working population aged 5 to 14

5 Employment

# 6 Perceptions on Welfare and Changes within Communities

This chapter presents the perceptions on welfare status and changes in Bukoba Rural. The first section shows perceptions of changes in the economic situation both of the communities and of the households. Section two summaries self-reported difficulties in satisfying a set of household needs. In section three asset ownership and occupancy status, as well as occupancy documentation are analysed. Section four gives information related to agriculture: use of agricultural inputs, landholding, and cattle ownership. Section five shows perceptions of crime and security in the community. Section six shows the main income contributor to the household. A brief analysis of ownership of selected household items concludes the chapter.

## 6.1    Economic Situation

The analysis of this section is based solely on the perception of the interviewees. The main respondent for this part of the questionnaire was the household head. In cases where the household head was not able to respond i.e. was travelling, sick or had little information on the household's daily practices, then the best-informed household member responded. The respondents were asked to comment on whether the situation had changed for the better/worse or remained the same compared to the year prior the survey.

### 6.1.1    Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Community

Table 6.1 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of the economic situation of the community compared to the year before the survey. Results show that only 23 percent of all households in the district perceive a positive change in the economic situation of their community. Around one fourth (24 percent) of the population reported observing no changes in their community's economic situation. Even though the majority reported the community economic condition to be worse (49 percent), only 18 percent reported the situation to be much worse while the rest reported it to be worse.

Looking at the overall community economic situation by household characteristics, it is observed that less than half (44 percent) of the people living in household located in accessible clusters report a worse condition in their community's economic situation while more than half (54 percent) of those living in remote clusters share this perception. Poverty status of the household shows little correlation with the perceived economic change, as there is a difference of only 7 percentage points between the poor and non-poor who reported worse conditions. The data shows a gradual increase in the percentage of households reporting worse conditions and better conditions as household size increases

# 6 Perceptions on Welfare and Changes within Communities

**Table 6.1: Percent distribution of households by the perception of the economic situation of the community compared to the year before the survey**

| | Much Worse | Worse | Same | Better | Much Better | Don't Know | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 18.2 | 30.7 | 23.5 | 21.5 | 1.4 | 4.6 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 17.2 | 26.8 | 25.9 | 21.3 | 2.0 | 6.8 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 19.3 | 34.9 | 20.9 | 21.8 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 19.7 | 34.6 | 19.4 | 19.2 | 2.0 | 5.1 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 17.7 | 29.5 | 24.8 | 22.3 | 1.3 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 16.5 | 31.8 | 23.5 | 16.5 | 0.0 | 11.7 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 14.4 | 32.9 | 32.2 | 18.1 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 17.1 | 31.6 | 17.9 | 26.0 | 2.5 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 26.6 | 25.6 | 18.7 | 24.6 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 16.3 | 52.1 | 13.7 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 18.7 | 39.5 | 19.8 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 21.3 | 26.9 | 28.1 | 21.0 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 16.3 | 33.7 | 21.7 | 19.9 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 15.9 | 24.5 | 20.8 | 33.2 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 19.0 | 6.4 | 34.2 | 37.1 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 17.6 | 32.6 | 25.0 | 18.9 | 2.1 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 18.7 | 29.2 | 22.7 | 25.2 | 0.4 | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 20.7 | 29.4 | 15.3 | 23.9 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 100.0 |
| Both | 17.5 | 26.3 | 24.5 | 22.3 | 2.5 | 6.8 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 17.0 | 36.7 | 14.2 | 24.2 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 20.2 | 31.3 | 22.8 | 19.5 | 1.6 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 6.8 | 26.4 | 34.8 | 32.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 22.2 | 28.4 | 17.7 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 19.2 | 28.0 | 23.5 | 23.8 | 1.6 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 15.5 | 38.1 | 23.5 | 15.7 | 1.0 | 6.3 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Single | 19.5 | 32.7 | 15.1 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 22.3 | 25.7 | 21.1 | 26.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 15.7 | 38.3 | 22.9 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 0.0 | 25.9 | 42.5 | 31.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 13.9 | 35.8 | 27.0 | 15.5 | 0.8 | 6.9 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 13.7 | 31.9 | 25.9 | 20.0 | 2.7 | 5.9 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 19.8 | 33.3 | 22.6 | 19.7 | 0.6 | 4.1 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 16.9 | 13.5 | 24.6 | 35.6 | 4.1 | 5.3 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

Households that own little land report worse conditions in the community's economic situation. 68 percent of households owning no land and 58 percent of households owning less than one hectare of land report worse economic situations of their community while only a quarter (25 percent) of those owning six or more hectares of land report this condition. There seems to be no correlation between the type of livestock owned by the household and the perception of change in the community's economic situation. Independently of the type of livestock owned by the household, about 50 percent of all households reported worse economic conditions in their communities while a quarter reported better conditions.

The responses on the change in the community's economic situation depending on the type of livestock owned by the household do not show much difference between household owning no

**Table 6.2: Percent distribution of households by the perception of the economic situation**
**of the household compared to the year before the survey**

| | Much Worse | Worse | Same | Better | Much Better | Don't Know | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 23.1 | 32.5 | 22.1 | 22.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 20.3 | 29.8 | 25.1 | 24.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 25.9 | 35.4 | 18.8 | 19.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 27.5 | 32.0 | 22.7 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 21.7 | 32.7 | 21.9 | 23.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 21.4 | 25.8 | 27.0 | 25.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 22.0 | 39.5 | 22.7 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 24.1 | 32.5 | 20.4 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 24.5 | 28.1 | 19.3 | 26.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 18.0 | 32.5 | 26.4 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 39.1 | 32.5 | 17.8 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 25.3 | 32.3 | 20.4 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 16.0 | 33.5 | 25.3 | 24.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 19.5 | 28.8 | 25.3 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 16.5 | 35.2 | 15.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 25.3 | 32.7 | 21.7 | 19.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 22.6 | 31.5 | 24.2 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 27.2 | 24.9 | 24.2 | 23.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Both | 6.8 | 41.9 | 14.7 | 36.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 11.6 | 49.1 | 17.6 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 25.6 | 30.1 | 22.5 | 21.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 10.2 | 37.8 | 19.9 | 32.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 33.0 | 29.8 | 26.1 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 22.4 | 33.9 | 21.5 | 21.8 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 24.9 | 28.9 | 23.6 | 22.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Single | 26.2 | 23.2 | 19.0 | 31.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 22.9 | 28.0 | 23.8 | 24.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 25.2 | 48.1 | 14.3 | 12.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 9.6 | 56.1 | 28.6 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 23.0 | 34.0 | 21.9 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 23.2 | 34.9 | 21.4 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 23.6 | 32.3 | 23.9 | 20.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 19.3 | 29.6 | 12.4 | 35.8 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

livestock, small livestock, large livestock or both small and large livestock.

Responses on the change in economic situation of the community show correlation with the gender of the household head. While 24 percent of male and female-headed households report same economic conditions compared to the year prior the survey, a larger percentage of female-headed households report worse economic conditions in their communities than male-headed households.

## 6.1.2 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Household

Table 6.1 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of their economic situation compared to the year before the survey. In the same fashion as the perception of change in the community economic situation, many households expressed negative views on the changes in the economic conditions of their households. Only two fifths of the households reported same or better economic conditions compared to the year preceding the survey.

Individuals living in remote clusters were less optimistic about the change in economic situation in their households than those living accessible clusters. While 61 percent of those living in remote clusters reported economic deterioration in their households, 50 percent of those living in accessible clusters shared this opinion. The same pattern is observed among the poor and non-poor. The poor express more negative views on their economic condition than the non-poor do.

The data shows that the percentage of households reporting much worse economic conditions is higher for larger households. Households owning large portions of land report better economic conditions than households with little or no land.

In contrast to the perception of the economic situation at the community level, livestock ownership is correlated with the perception of the economic situation at the household level. The percentage of households reporting better conditions is highest for households owning both types of livestock, and lowest for households owning only small livestock.

About three quarters (73 percent) of household heads who practice polygamy report deterioration in their households' economic conditions while only 12 percent report some improvement. Furthermore, two thirds (66 percent) of household heads who have a loose union (not officially married) report

deterioration in their economic condition while only 6 percent report better conditions.

The educational level of the household head shows positive correlation with the perceived change in the household economic situation. 39 percent of household heads who have a secondary education or more appear to be optimistic about the economic conditions of their households compared to 20 percent of those who have some primary education or no education at all.

## 6.2 Self-reported Difficulties in Satisfying Household Needs

This section analyses the difficulties households faced in satisfying household needs during the year prior the survey. These household needs are such as food, school fees, house rent, utility bills and healthcare. For each household, the respondent was asked to say whether they never, seldom, often or always experience difficulties in satisfying the specified household need.

## 6.2.1 Food Needs

Table 6.3 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in satisfying the food needs of the household during the year before the survey. Overall, almost three quarters of the district's households never/seldom experience food shortages while the remaining population experience food shortages more frequently (often/always). Out of the households, which have less experience with food shortages, only 29 percent claim to have never had trouble getting enough food.

Food needs among people living in remote and accessible clusters of the district are almost of equal proportions. However, this is not the case among the poor and non-poor. While 11 percent of the poor often/always experience food shortages, 28 percent of the non-poor report frequent problems satisfying food needs.

**Table 6.3: Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in satisfying
the food needs of the household during the year before the survey**

|  | Never | Seldom | Often | Always | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 28.6 | 47.2 | 19.2 | 4.9 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 27.9 | 49.0 | 17.0 | 6.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 29.4 | 45.4 | 21.5 | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 23.3 | 65.8 | 9.1 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 30.3 | 41.4 | 22.4 | 5.9 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 39.0 | 37.8 | 12.6 | 10.6 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 28.2 | 46.2 | 21.3 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 24.4 | 47.9 | 22.7 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 26.3 | 55.9 | 17.0 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 16.6 | 43.6 | 30.8 | 9.0 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 19.6 | 46.4 | 22.5 | 11.5 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 27.7 | 47.8 | 22.8 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 30.5 | 47.0 | 17.3 | 5.1 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 33.7 | 49.9 | 12.8 | 3.5 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 45.0 | 45.4 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 24.2 | 47.7 | 20.6 | 7.4 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 31.8 | 46.4 | 21.1 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 22.7 | 57.2 | 12.0 | 8.1 | 100.0 |
| Both | 50.3 | 38.3 | 9.5 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 55.0 | 36.1 | 6.5 | 2.4 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 28.5 | 46.3 | 20.2 | 4.9 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 23.9 | 57.3 | 15.6 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Other | 14.6 | 47.5 | 28.0 | 10.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 28.9 | 47.5 | 18.8 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| Female | 28.0 | 46.4 | 20.3 | 5.2 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Single | 42.2 | 38.3 | 10.6 | 8.9 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 33.4 | 46.9 | 16.6 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 15.2 | 45.2 | 31.6 | 7.9 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 9.6 | 59.2 | 31.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 25.5 | 48.7 | 19.4 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | |
| None | 17.5 | 52.8 | 20.3 | 9.3 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 30.7 | 45.5 | 20.6 | 3.2 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 36.8 | 47.6 | 8.9 | 6.7 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

The data shows that as the area of land owned by a household increases, the rates of food security increase. At the time of the survey, only 10 percent of households owning six or more acres of land reported food insecurity compared to 40 percent who own no land at all. Furthermore, there is also a positive correlation between livestock ownership and satisfying food needs. Households that own some livestock (small or large) report less problems in satisfying food needs.

**Table 6.4: Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying school fees during the year before the survey**

|  | Never | Seldom | Often | Always | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 88.6 | 7.3 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 87.9 | 7.9 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 89.4 | 6.7 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 89.6 | 8.7 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 88.3 | 6.9 | 3.3 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 98.4 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 92.9 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 88.3 | 7.1 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 74.5 | 19.2 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 91.9 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 95.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 90.4 | 5.6 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 86.3 | 10.0 | 3.2 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 81.0 | 12.1 | 4.7 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 86.8 | 4.6 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 91.7 | 4.9 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 90.0 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 76.1 | 18.2 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Both | 75.6 | 22.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 83.6 | 8.0 | 6.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 89.3 | 6.5 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 91.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 82.6 | 10.8 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 88.0 | 8.1 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| Female | 90.4 | 5.1 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Single | 93.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 87.8 | 9.0 | 2.6 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 87.7 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 88.9 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | |
| None | 94.0 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 88.5 | 7.7 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 79.9 | 16.2 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

The socio-economic group of the household is also correlated with the household's ability to satisfy its food needs. Households from the employee category tend to be more food secure than households belonging to other socio-economic groups, as 90 percent are food secure (never/seldom). At the time of the survey, 30 percent of the households belonging to the "other" socio-economic group (unemployed, inactive, involved in domestic work) reported having food shortages often/always.

Disaggregation of the data shows no differences among male and female-headed households in satisfying food needs. Single and monogamous household heads report higher food security than household heads that have a loose union, practice polygamy or widows/divorced/separated. It is also observed that only 16 percent of households where the household head has secondary education or more report often/always having food problems compared to 30 percent of households where the household head has no education.

## 6.2.2 Paying School Fees

Table 6.4 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying school fees during the year before the survey. At the time of the survey, 89 percent of households in the district reported that they never had problems paying school fees and only 4 percent of the households reported that they often/always had problems paying school fees. It is worth noticing that children in primary state schools do not pay fees.

While children in secondary state schools do pay fees, the secondary school enrolment rates are very low (for more details, see chapter 3).

The ability to pay school fees is independent on the location of the household (accessible or remote) and the poverty status of the household (poor or non-poor). Large households (7 or more people) tend to have more difficulty in paying school fees than small households. While 93 percent of households with three to four members never have any problems

**Table 6.5: Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying house rent during the year before the survey**

|  | Never | Seldom | Often | Always | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 98.2 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 96.5 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 98.8 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 98.0 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 95.7 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 99.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 98.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 98.6 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 61.9 | 8.1 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 98.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 98.7 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 97.1 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 99.1 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Both | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 95.8 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 99.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 92.4 | 2.1 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 98.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 96.6 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Single | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 98.2 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 97.3 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | |
| None | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 97.3 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

paying school fees, 75 percent of households with seven or more members claim they never have problems paying fees.

Household characteristics such as the amount of land owned and type of livestock owned don't show any correlation with the household's ability to pay school fees. Independent of whether the household owns livestock or not, the proportions on the difficulties in paying school fees are about the same between the two. Similar trends are observed for the socio-economic group of the household, and the gender and marital status of the household head. However, the data shows that the educational level of the household head has some correlation to the household's ability to pay school fees. Households where the household head has secondary education or more claim to have problems paying school fees more often than households where the household head has a primary education or no education.

**Table 6.6: Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying utility bills during the year before the survey**

|  | Never | Seldom | Often | Always | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 97.7 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 97.4 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 98.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 99.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 97.4 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 95.7 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 99.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 98.7 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 96.3 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 83.7 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 98.6 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 97.0 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 96.6 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 97.8 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 98.3 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Both | 93.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 95.8 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 98.4 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 94.1 | 3.8 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 98.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 94.8 | 3.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Single | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 98.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 97.2 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 95.8 | 2.9 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | |
| None | 98.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 97.3 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

## 6.2.3 Paying House Rent

Table 6.5 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying house rent during the year before the survey. Only 1 percent of households in the district report that they often or always have problems paying house rent. Although a small percentage (4 percent) of households located in accessible clusters report that they seldom or often have problems paying house rent.

Moreover, land ownership seems to have a great impact on a household's ability to pay rent, as households that own no land at all are the only ones that have trouble paying house rent (38 percent). Other selected household characteristics such as household size, livestock ownership, socio-economic group, gender, marital status and educational level do not show any correlation with the ability to pay house rent.

## 6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills

Table 6.6 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying utility bills during the year before the survey. The outcome on household's ability to pay utility bills is similar to those of paying house rent. 98 percent of households in the district independent of their location, poverty status or household size do not face problems paying utility bills. Landless households are the only ones that report some difficulties paying utility bills (16 percent). Besides land ownership, there is no observable relationship between other household characteristics and a household's ability to pay utility bills.

## 6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare

Table 6.7 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying for healthcare during the year before the survey. About 40 percent of the households interviewed at the time of the survey stated that they never had problems paying for healthcare the year preceding the survey. Overall, almost equal proportions of households never/seldom experience problems paying for healthcare independent of whether the household is located in a remote or accessible cluster or whether the household is classified as poor or non-poor.

**Table 6.7: Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying for health care during the year before the survey**

|  | Never | Seldom | Often | Always | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 39.9 | 34.8 | 18.4 | 7.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 44.0 | 31.8 | 15.4 | 8.8 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 35.4 | 37.9 | 21.5 | 5.1 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 31.0 | 41.0 | 19.7 | 8.3 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 42.7 | 32.8 | 17.9 | 6.6 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 44.7 | 25.6 | 12.6 | 17.1 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 38.5 | 32.4 | 24.9 | 4.1 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 38.5 | 35.3 | 21.8 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 39.5 | 45.1 | 9.1 | 6.3 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 25.9 | 20.8 | 25.2 | 28.2 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 30.9 | 28.6 | 21.7 | 18.7 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 39.9 | 35.5 | 22.8 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 42.2 | 40.4 | 12.6 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 50.8 | 30.7 | 16.7 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 38.5 | 33.5 | 20.7 | 7.3 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 36.2 | 32.6 | 22.3 | 8.9 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 37.6 | 39.3 | 18.3 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 54.5 | 27.6 | 7.1 | 10.8 | 100.0 |
| Both | 58.8 | 37.8 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 52.6 | 28.8 | 15.8 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 38.5 | 35.8 | 19.1 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 46.3 | 36.1 | 14.4 | 3.2 | 100.0 |
| Other | 29.5 | 27.9 | 20.8 | 21.8 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 41.8 | 35.0 | 18.1 | 5.1 | 100.0 |
| Female | 34.6 | 34.1 | 19.2 | 12.1 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Single | 37.6 | 33.4 | 20.1 | 8.9 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 44.8 | 34.4 | 17.4 | 3.4 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 30.0 | 37.6 | 26.7 | 5.8 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 42.5 | 25.9 | 9.6 | 21.9 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 35.7 | 35.2 | 17.6 | 11.5 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | |
| None | 31.1 | 34.3 | 18.9 | 15.7 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 40.7 | 34.6 | 19.7 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 50.9 | 36.8 | 9.4 | 2.8 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

Households that own larger acreages of land report less difficulties paying for healthcare. While just over half (53 percent) of households owning no land state that they often/always have problems paying for healthcare, just over one fourth (28 percent) of households owning six acres or more share this problem. In contrast to paying house rent and utility bills, owning livestock shows correlation with a household's ability to pay for healthcare. Households that own both types of livestock (small and big)

experienced less problems paying for healthcare followed by households with big livestock, small livestock and finally households with no livestock at 3, 18, 22 and 31 percent respectively.

Similar patterns are observed when analysis on the ability to pay for healthcare is done by looking at the level of education of the household head. Only 12 percent of household's has acquired secondary education or more often/always have problems paying for healthcare whereas 35 percent of households are head of household's has no education report similar conditions.

## 6.3    Assets and Household Occupancy Status

This section discusses ownership of some selected assets and household occupancy status. The selected assets are such as houses, land, livestock, vehicles, motorcycles, bicycles and wheelbarrows. This section will also provide detailed information on asset ownership by household characteristics. Household occupancy status describes the type of arrangement the household has in terms of their current dwelling. Respondents were asked whether they own, rent, live free or temporarily live in their current dwelling,

and if they held any documentation to support the occupancy status. Besides the respondent's testimony, the survey did not use any further methods to verify this information.

### 6.3.1 Asset Ownership

Table 6.8 shows the percent distribution of households owning a selected group of assets. Overall, 93 percent of the district's households own their dwellings while 96 percent own some land. Almost 40 percent of all households own livestock whereas most households own small livestock (32 percent). While 40 percent of all households own a bicycle, only 3 percent own a motorbike or car.

Table 6.9 shows the percent distribution of households by occupancy status. Proportions of households owning these assets are about the same, independent of the cluster location and poverty status. Male-headed households report higher rates of ownership in most assets than female-headed households. Disaggregation of the data shows that 95 percent of male heads and 88 percent of female heads own their dwellings, a difference of 7 percent. At the same time 50 percent of male-headed households, own bicycles while only 14 percent of female-headed households own bicycles.

**Table 6.8: Percentage of households owning certain assets**

| | Home | Land | Livestock | | | Vehicle | Motor-cycle | Bicycle | Wheel barrow |
| | | | Small | Large | Both | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 93.3 | 96.4 | 31.7 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 39.9 | 3.5 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 90.9 | 94.0 | 26.3 | 9.5 | 9.2 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 39.7 | 4.9 |
| Remote | 95.8 | 98.9 | 37.5 | 5.2 | 7.1 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 40.1 | 2.1 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 94.8 | 97.3 | 34.8 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 39.8 | 3.2 |
| Non-poor | 92.8 | 96.1 | 30.7 | 7.5 | 8.4 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 39.9 | 3.7 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 88.4 | 94.7 | 21.9 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 20.3 | 4.6 |
| 3-4 | 91.1 | 97.4 | 26.6 | 7.1 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.7 | 1.0 |
| 5-6 | 95.8 | 96.0 | 36.3 | 6.4 | 13.9 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 49.7 | 5.7 |
| 7+ | 97.1 | 97.1 | 41.0 | 12.5 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 59.1 | 3.3 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 90.8 | 93.8 | 21.2 | 10.3 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 36.3 | 10.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 95.0 | 98.8 | 32.9 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 37.8 | 2.5 |
| Self-employed - other | 85.7 | 86.0 | 35.1 | 11.6 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 6.3 | 52.3 | 6.6 |
| Other | 93.2 | 95.8 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 39.6 | 2.2 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 95.2 | 97.1 | 36.3 | 9.6 | 7.9 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 49.7 | 4.4 |
| Female | 88.2 | 94.5 | 19.5 | 1.7 | 8.7 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 14.1 | 1.2 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

## 6.3.2 Occupancy Documentation

The percent distribution of households by type of occupancy documentation is shown in Table 6.10. Most residents in the district don't have any documentation to verify their occupancy status. Only 6 percent of the households possess formal occupancy documentation, which include a title deed, renting contract or payment receipt. 62 percent of households in this district have no documentation at all.

## 6.4    Agriculture

This analysis in this section focuses on the distribution of households by use of certain agricultural inputs, land ownership, and cattle ownership.

## 6.4.1   Agricultural Inputs

Table 6.11 shows the percent distribution of households using agricultural inputs and the percentage using certain inputs. This information is complemented by Table 6.12, which shows the main source of the agricultural inputs. The survey collected information on agricultural

practices. Data gathered was on usage of farm inputs and the main source from which the farmers got the inputs. Respondents were asked to give information on whether they use any agricultural inputs in their farms.

**Table 6.9: Percent distribution of households by occupancy status**

|  | Own | Rent | Free | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 93.5 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accessible | 90.9 | 3.2 | 4.9 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 96.2 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poor | 94.8 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 93.0 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-2 | 89.4 | 4.4 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 91.1 | 1.9 | 4.1 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 95.8 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 97.1 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employee | 90.8 | 4.2 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 95.0 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 85.7 | 7.6 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 95.7 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 95.2 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| Female | 88.8 | 2.9 | 6.6 | 1.7 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

**Table 6.10: Percent distribution of households by type of occupancy documentation**

|  | Title deed | Renting contract | Payment receipt | Other document | No document | Total | Secure tenure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 3.4 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 31.5 | 62.4 | 100.0 | 6.2 |
| **Cluster Location** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accessible | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 31.7 | 63.5 | 100.0 | 4.8 |
| Remote | 5.6 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 31.2 | 61.1 | 100.0 | 7.6 |
| **Poverty Status** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poor | 5.4 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 26.7 | 65.9 | 100.0 | 7.4 |
| Non-poor | 2.7 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 33.0 | 61.2 | 100.0 | 5.8 |
| **Household size** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-2 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 31.4 | 60.9 | 100.0 | 7.7 |
| 3-4 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 29.5 | 65.6 | 100.0 | 4.9 |
| 5-6 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 33.6 | 59.2 | 100.0 | 7.1 |
| 7+ | 4.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 31.4 | 63.3 | 100.0 | 5.3 |
| **Socio-economic Group** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employee | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 32.0 | 63.8 | 100.0 | 4.2 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 4.3 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 32.7 | 60.7 | 100.0 | 6.6 |
| Self-employed - other | 1.1 | 2.1 | 4.1 | 25.6 | 67.1 | 100.0 | 7.3 |
| Other | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.2 | 67.6 | 100.0 | 2.2 |
| **Gender of the head of household** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 3.1 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 30.8 | 63.1 | 100.0 | 6.1 |
| Female | 4.1 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 33.4 | 60.4 | 100.0 | 6.2 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

**Table 6.11: Percentage of households using agricultural inputs and**
**and the percentage using certain inputs**

| | % of hhs using | Fertilizer | Improved seedling | Fingerlings | Hooks and nets | Insecticides | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 36.3 | 80.0 | 26.2 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 4.9 | 0.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 40.8 | 76.0 | 30.7 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 5.8 | 0.0 |
| Remote | 31.5 | 85.5 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 21.2 | 83.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Non-poor | 41.1 | 79.5 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 5.7 | 0.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 25.7 | 83.1 | 23.7 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 6.9 | 0.0 |
| 3-4 | 28.3 | 71.1 | 26.9 | 0.0 | 12.9 | 1.3 | 0.0 |
| 5-6 | 43.7 | 86.5 | 24.5 | 0.0 | 10.9 | 8.1 | 0.0 |
| 7+ | 46.4 | 78.0 | 28.9 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 2.8 | 0.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 38.6 | 93.8 | 43.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.9 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 34.3 | 80.2 | 26.5 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 50.6 | 73.3 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 36.1 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
| Other | 26.2 | 83.5 | 22.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 39.9 | 80.2 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 13.5 | 5.0 | 0.0 |
| Female | 26.8 | 79.4 | 29.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base for 1 is all households, and for columns 2 to 7 is all households using agricultural inputs

**Table 6.12: Percentage distribution of households using agricultural inputs**
**by the main source of the inputs**

| | Open market | Government | Donor agency | Coop. | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 33.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 59.9 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 39.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 53.6 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 24.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 5.8 | 68.6 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 23.6 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 3.9 | 69.7 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 34.5 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 4.6 | 58.3 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 65.7 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 33.8 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 4.6 | 60.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 62.2 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 33.3 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 5.7 | 54.1 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | |
| Employee | 40.8 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 55.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 26.6 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 6.0 | 64.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 54.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 42.8 | 100.0 |
| Other | 25.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 74.3 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | |
| Male | 32.6 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 5.1 | 60.7 | 100.0 |
| Female | 34.4 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 2.3 | 56.9 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base is all households using agricultural inputs

About one-third (36 percent) of all farmers apply agricultural inputs to their farms and the majority of those who use farm inputs apply fertilizers. The percentage of non-poor households using agricultural inputs is nearly twice that of poor households, at 41 and 21 percent respectively. Data also shows that as the number of household

members increases the usage of agricultural inputs also increases.

Many households that use agricultural inputs obtain them by preparing them themselves (60 percent) or purchasing them at an open market (33 percent). 8 percent of the households get their inputs from donor agencies and cooperatives

while none report the government as their main source.

## 6.4.2 Landholding

Table 6.13 shows the distribution of households by the area of land owned. Around half the households owns less than

**Table 6.13: Percent distribution of households by the area (in ha) of land owned by the household**

|  | None | < 1 ha | 1-1.99 | 2-3.99 | 4-5.99 | 6+ ha | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 3.6 | 17.2 | 27.4 | 33.9 | 11.8 | 6.1 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 6.0 | 15.2 | 33.0 | 32.6 | 8.8 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 1.1 | 19.4 | 21.6 | 35.2 | 14.9 | 7.9 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 2.7 | 21.1 | 15.2 | 39.7 | 15.1 | 6.2 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 3.9 | 16.0 | 31.3 | 32.0 | 10.7 | 6.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 5.3 | 22.6 | 27.9 | 29.1 | 8.6 | 6.6 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 2.6 | 22.6 | 37.5 | 27.7 | 6.6 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 4.0 | 10.6 | 25.0 | 37.0 | 16.9 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 2.9 | 14.3 | 16.0 | 42.5 | 14.9 | 9.4 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 6.2 | 5.0 | 28.8 | 35.1 | 14.2 | 10.6 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 1.2 | 16.8 | 28.4 | 37.4 | 11.1 | 5.2 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 14.0 | 20.1 | 24.8 | 20.8 | 9.9 | 10.4 | 100.0 |
| Other | 4.2 | 27.5 | 22.1 | 23.8 | 19.8 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 2.9 | 13.8 | 27.9 | 34.3 | 13.3 | 7.9 | 100.0 |
| Female | 5.5 | 26.4 | 26.2 | 32.6 | 7.9 | 1.4 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

**Table 6.14: Percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned by the household**

|  | None | 1 | 2-10 | 11-20 | 21-50 | 50+ | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 84.4 | 5.3 | 9.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 81.4 | 6.3 | 12.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 87.7 | 4.3 | 6.8 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 85.6 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 84.1 | 4.8 | 10.1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 93.1 | 2.4 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 89.1 | 0.8 | 8.3 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 79.7 | 10.3 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 77.1 | 7.4 | 14.7 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 71.3 | 12.7 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 85.6 | 3.4 | 9.9 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 82.4 | 10.8 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 89.2 | 6.3 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 82.5 | 5.3 | 11.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 89.7 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

two has (including 4 percent of landless households), one 34 percent owns between 2 and 4 ha, and the remaining own 4 or more acres.

Landless households are more common in accessible villages, and households owning large portions of land are more common in remote villages. However, the breakdown by poverty status does not show the same trend.

Regarding household size, larger households seem to own larger landholdings more frequently than households with less members
.

The self-employed other are the socio-economic category with highest share of landless households (14 percent), and the self-employed in agriculture the one with the lowest share (1 percent).

**Table 6.15: Percent distribution of households by the perception of the crime and security situation of the community compared to the year before the survey**

| | Much Worse | Worse | Same | Better | Much Better | Don't Know | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 10.1 | 14.3 | 32.9 | 31.1 | 10.9 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 10.0 | 14.7 | 33.8 | 35.5 | 4.8 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 10.3 | 14.0 | 32.0 | 26.4 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 13.3 | 19.5 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 9.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 9.1 | 12.7 | 34.2 | 31.7 | 11.4 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 7.2 | 9.1 | 46.0 | 24.6 | 9.4 | 3.6 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 8.4 | 17.8 | 31.3 | 33.5 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 8.8 | 13.1 | 30.9 | 31.1 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 16.8 | 15.5 | 27.1 | 33.2 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 0.0 | 25.6 | 19.1 | 38.2 | 8.1 | 9.0 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 9.4 | 12.3 | 44.5 | 23.7 | 10.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 5.8 | 17.1 | 31.3 | 34.8 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 14.7 | 13.5 | 30.7 | 30.2 | 9.9 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 14.7 | 8.4 | 33.8 | 29.8 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 3.4 | 17.1 | 26.5 | 38.5 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 10.7 | 15.3 | 35.8 | 27.9 | 9.7 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 9.5 | 14.3 | 30.6 | 29.5 | 15.0 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 8.3 | 9.5 | 26.5 | 51.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Both | 10.4 | 12.4 | 29.4 | 39.9 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 8.2 | 10.5 | 41.0 | 30.4 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 9.6 | 14.5 | 33.0 | 29.5 | 12.9 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 9.7 | 13.5 | 28.4 | 41.5 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 17.8 | 18.1 | 33.1 | 26.9 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 10.4 | 13.4 | 32.0 | 33.4 | 10.4 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Female | 9.4 | 16.9 | 35.4 | 25.1 | 12.0 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Single | 15.6 | 20.3 | 26.5 | 17.8 | 19.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 10.0 | 12.4 | 30.1 | 33.5 | 13.4 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 14.6 | 19.3 | 27.4 | 37.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 13.7 | 11.3 | 21.4 | 53.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 8.2 | 15.2 | 40.2 | 25.8 | 9.7 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 8.5 | 15.2 | 35.2 | 24.8 | 14.7 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 10.2 | 14.3 | 30.9 | 33.9 | 10.2 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 12.9 | 13.0 | 40.9 | 25.5 | 7.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

Finally, male-headed households have larger landholdings than households headed by females.

## 6.4.3 Cattle Ownership

Table 6.14 shows the percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned. 85 percent of households own no cattle at all, and virtually no households own more than 10 heads of cattle.

Households in remote villages are more likely to own no cattle, but the breakdown by poverty status does not show a difference. The breakdown by household size shows that larger households are more likely to have some cattle. In fact, up to 15 percent owns between 2 and 10 heads, whereas the share for households with one or two members is 4 percent.

Employees are the socio-economic group with highest shares of households owning more than 2 heads, and "other" are the corresponding group with the highest share of households owning no cattle at all. Finally, male-headed households, on average, own more cattle than female-headed households.

## 6.5 Perception of Crime and Security in the Community

This section gives an overview of how the district residents perceive the current crime and security situation compared to the year preceding the survey. Respondents were asked to categories the current crime and security situation as the same, better or worse than the previous year. Results are shown in Table 6.15. Around 42 percent of the households thought it was better, 33 percent said it was the same while 24 percent perceived it as worse. The perception of crime and security level appears to be independent of the selected household characteristics as the views expressed are of similar proportions.

## 6.6 Household Income Contributions

Table 6.16 shows the percentage distribution of households by principal contributor to household income. The survey includes information on household income contributions by listing all the income contributors in the households and then identifying the household member who contributes the largest portion. For the great majority (91 percent) of households, the head is the main contributor.

Households, from the "other" socio-economic category (unemployed, inactive, involved in domestic work) are the socio-economic group with the highest dependency on the spouse, children or other people for income contributions.

While in 7 percent of male-headed households the main contributor is the spouse, the share in female-headed households is practically null. In turn, the latter get more assistance from their children and other household members (8 percent) than the former (3 percent).

## 6.7 Other Household Items

Table 6.17 shows the percentage distribution of households owning selected household items. Around 83 percent of households own at least one mattress or bed, almost 58 percent own a radio, 54 percent own a watch or clock and 20percent own an electric iron. Although no household owns a fixed line phone, 12 percent own a mobile phone.

**Table 6.16: Percentage distribution of households by principal contributor to household income**

| | Principal contributor of income | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Head | Spouse | Child | Other | Total |
| **Total** | 90.8 | 5.1 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 91.1 | 4.4 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 90.4 | 5.7 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 88.8 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 91.4 | 5.0 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 96.0 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 89.9 | 6.4 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 90.0 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 88.7 | 8.6 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 96.5 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 92.9 | 3.9 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 96.7 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 55.3 | 28.4 | 6.7 | 9.6 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 90.4 | 7.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Female | 91.7 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 3.4 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

65

# 6 Perceptions on Welfare and Changes within Communities

Households in accessible villages and non-poor households have higher rates of ownership in almost every selected item, the largest differences being in ownership of a mattress or bed and of a mobile phone.

The breakdown by household size shows that the shares of ownership are larger for larger households and for households headed by males. In addition, employees and self-employed in non-agricultural activities show higher rates of ownership.

**Table 6.17: Percentage of households owning selected household items**

| | Electric iron | Refrigerator | Sewing machine | Modern stove | Mattress or bed | Watch or clock | Radio | Televison | Fixed line phone | Mobile phone |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 20.2 | 0.9 | 7.9 | 6.9 | 82.7 | 53.7 | 57.9 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 11.9 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 22.9 | 1.2 | 7.8 | 9.3 | 89.8 | 54.1 | 60.5 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
| Remote | 17.4 | 0.5 | 7.9 | 4.3 | 75.1 | 53.3 | 55.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 18.4 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 2.4 | 76.5 | 55.4 | 50.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 |
| Non-poor | 20.8 | 0.8 | 10.1 | 8.3 | 84.6 | 53.2 | 60.2 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 13.8 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 12.8 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 6.9 | 73.7 | 39.8 | 36.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 10.4 |
| 3-4 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 5.4 | 78.1 | 46.8 | 49.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 |
| 5-6 | 19.0 | 1.1 | 13.0 | 8.3 | 84.7 | 57.1 | 62.6 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 11.6 |
| 7+ | 36.9 | 1.2 | 10.6 | 7.2 | 94.2 | 70.8 | 81.8 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 18.5 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 39.3 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 12.7 | 92.0 | 61.3 | 67.7 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 30.2 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 16.4 | 0.5 | 7.2 | 4.8 | 80.6 | 51.6 | 56.2 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 6.1 |
| Self-employed - other | 32.4 | 4.0 | 7.3 | 15.2 | 93.8 | 65.8 | 69.6 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 29.3 |
| Other | 15.5 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 5.8 | 72.9 | 44.4 | 43.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.3 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 22.4 | 0.4 | 9.3 | 8.2 | 85.0 | 58.5 | 66.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 13.3 |
| Female | 14.5 | 2.1 | 4.1 | 3.4 | 76.5 | 41.2 | 34.6 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 8.3 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

# 7    Household Amenities

This chapter analyses the household main amenities. The first section presents the main materials used to construct the dwelling, and the type of housing unit the household lives in. Section two reports the main source of drinking water and main type of toilet. In section three, the fuel used by the household is analysed, both for cooking and lighting. Section four reports the distance of the households to facilities as source of drinking water, schools, and food markets. In section five the anti-malaria measures taken by households are analysed.

## 7.1    Housing Materials and Type of Housing Unit

Table 7.1 shows the distribution of households according to the main material used in the roof of the house. Overall, 61 percent of households have iron sheets as their main roof material, and 38 percent thatch.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote villages are more likely to use thatch than households in accessible villages, with shares of 43 and 33 percent, respectively. In turn, households in accessible villages tend to use iron sheets more often, with a rate of 66 percent, 12 percentage points above households in remote villages. Conversely, poor households tend to use thatch more often, and non-poor households, iron sheets.

Regarding household size, it comes up that smaller households tend to use thatch, and that bigger households use iron sheets for their roofs.

The split up by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed in agriculture is the category with highest share of households using thatch for the roof (at 42 percent), and that employees are the group with the lowest use of thatch.

The breakdown by gender shows that female-headed households use iron

**Table 7.1: Percent distribution of households by material used for roof of the house**

|  | Mud | Thatch | Wood | Iron Sheets | Cement/ concrete | Roofing tiles | Asbestos | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 0.0 | 38.1 | 0.0 | 61.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 0.0 | 33.4 | 0.0 | 65.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 0.0 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 57.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 53.5 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 0.0 | 33.2 | 0.0 | 66.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 0.0 | 47.2 | 0.0 | 52.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 0.0 | 46.0 | 0.0 | 54.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 0.0 | 32.3 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 0.0 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 71.7 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 86.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 0.0 | 42.5 | 0.0 | 57.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 0.0 | 29.6 | 0.0 | 66.3 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 35.7 | 0.0 | 64.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 0.0 | 38.7 | 0.0 | 60.5 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 0.0 | 36.5 | 0.0 | 63.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba DC

# 7 Household Amenities

**Table 7.2: Percent distribution of households by material used for walls of the house**

|  | Mud/ mud bricks | Stone | Burnt bricks | Cement/ sandcrete | Wood/ bamboo | Iron sheets | Cardboard | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 75.8 | 1.5 | 18.1 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 73.4 | 2.5 | 18.5 | 5.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 78.4 | 0.4 | 17.6 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 84.6 | 0.4 | 11.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 73.1 | 1.8 | 20.1 | 4.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 82.3 | 0.5 | 12.2 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 83.5 | 1.6 | 12.2 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 71.0 | 2.9 | 19.4 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 66.2 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 55.6 | 0.0 | 29.9 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 81.3 | 1.0 | 14.7 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 63.4 | 3.5 | 25.6 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 66.4 | 3.6 | 24.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 74.4 | 1.9 | 17.8 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 79.6 | 0.3 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba DC

sheets more often than male, at rates of 64 and 61 percent, respectively. Table 7.2 shows the distribution of households by type of material used in the walls. Overall, 3 out of 4 houses are built with mud or mud bricks. Burnt bricks occupy the second place, with a share of 18 percent.

The analysis of cluster location reveals

**Table 7.3: Percent distribution of households by material used for floors of the house**

|  | Mud/ earth | Wood/ plank | Tiles | Concrete/ cement | Grass | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 65.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 18.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.6 | 62.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 21.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.3 | 67.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 23.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 68.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 18.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 63.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 31.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 54.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 74.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 17.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.1 | 65.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 16.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23.6 | 60.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 28.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.6 | 39.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 21.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 67.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 15.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.6 | 58.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.5 | 73.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 21.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.8 | 64.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 17.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.6 | 67.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba DC

**Table 7.4: Percent distribution of households by main source of drinking water**

| | Pipe borne treated | Pipe borne untreated | Bore hole/hand pump | Protected well | Unprotected well | Rain water | River, lake or pond | Vendor, truck | Other | Total | Safe source |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 6.0 | 6.6 | 13.2 | 16.1 | 44.7 | 0.5 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 35.3 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 6.3 | 5.5 | 8.7 | 14.1 | 54.3 | 0.9 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 29.0 |
| Remote | 5.8 | 7.8 | 17.9 | 18.2 | 34.4 | 0.0 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 41.9 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 4.2 | 6.4 | 10.9 | 14.5 | 50.3 | 0.0 | 13.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 29.6 |
| Non-poor | 6.6 | 6.7 | 13.9 | 16.6 | 42.9 | 0.6 | 12.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 37.1 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 4.6 | 7.8 | 16.0 | 15.1 | 45.6 | 1.5 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 35.7 |
| 3-4 | 6.6 | 5.5 | 13.5 | 12.9 | 46.6 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 33.1 |
| 5-6 | 5.4 | 8.2 | 11.7 | 20.4 | 41.5 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 37.5 |
| 7+ | 7.2 | 5.0 | 12.4 | 15.5 | 45.4 | 0.9 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 35.1 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 7.3 | 4.4 | 12.4 | 4.6 | 42.1 | 6.8 | 22.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 24.3 |
| Self-employed - agric | 4.7 | 7.0 | 13.9 | 15.5 | 47.7 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 34.1 |
| Self-employed - other | 11.9 | 6.6 | 7.7 | 21.0 | 29.9 | 0.0 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 40.6 |
| Other | 6.6 | 5.3 | 17.0 | 22.7 | 46.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 46.3 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 6.2 | 6.7 | 13.6 | 15.0 | 44.0 | 0.7 | 13.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 34.8 |
| Female | 5.4 | 6.4 | 12.1 | 18.9 | 46.5 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 36.5 |

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba DC

that households in remote villages have a higher share of mud and mud bricks than households in accessible villages. The rates are 78 and 73 percent, respectively. Other materials show no significant difference by cluster location. Likewise, poor households use mud or mud bricks more often than non-poor households (85 and 73 percent, respectively). Further, non-poor households use burnt bricks in 20 percent of the sample, 9 percentage points above the share of poor households

The split up by household size shows that smaller households tend to have mud or mud bricks more often, from 82 percent for households with up to 2 members, to 66 percent for households with 7 members or more. Conversely, the share of houses with burnt bricks increases with the number of members, from 12 for the smallest households to 29 percent for the largest.

Self-employed in agriculture is the socio-economic category with the highest share living in houses made of mud or mud bricks, whereas employees have the highest share living in houses made of burnt bricks and cement.

The gender breakdown shows that households headed by females use mud or mud bricks more often than male headed households, at rates of 80 and 74 percent of males. Further, 6 percent of the latter use cement or concrete, against virtually none of the former.

The distribution of households by type of material used in the floor is shown in Table 7.3. Overall, the floor in 20 percent of households is made of mud or dirt, 15 percent of concrete, and 65 percent of grass.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages, with a rate of 19 percent, have more houses with concrete floor than households in remote villages, with a rate of 11 percent. Conversely, poor households have more houses with mud or earth floor (24 percent, against 19 percent of the non-poor households) and less made of concrete. The latter shares are 8 and 17 percent for the poor and non-poor, respectively.

The analysis of size reveals clear trends. The share of households with mud or earth floor decreases with

number of household members, whereas concrete and grass increase with the size of the household.

The split up by socio-economic group of the household shows that employees have the highest shares of mud or earth and concrete, with just 41 percent of households living in houses with floor made of grass.

Finally, households headed by males have a higher share of mud or earth floor than female-headed households, with rates of 21 and 17 percent.

Table 7.4 shows the percent distribution of households by type of housing unit they occupy. Overall, 95 percent of households occupy the whole building where they live.

There are no differences by cluster location, but poverty status seems to be correlated with type of housing unit. Around 96 percent of non-poor households occupy the whole building, whereas the share for poor households is 91 percent. Conversely, 9 percent of poor households occupy some rooms in the building, whereas the share for non-poor households is 4 percent

Small households, those with up to 2

members, have 4 percent living in a single room; while households with 3 or more members have 5 percent living in two or more rooms. All groups have nearly 95 percent living in a whole building.

The analysis of socio-economic groups shows that all the groups but the employees have of between 91 and 97 percent occupying a whole building. However, the share for employees is just 80 percent, with 10 percent of employees living in a single room, and 10 percent in two or more.

Finally, the type of housing unit does not differ between male and female-headed households.

## 7.2 Water and Sanitation

The percentage distribution of households by source of drinking water is shown in Table 7.5. Overall, 35 percent of households have a safe source of water, whereas 44 percent of them get it from an unprotected well. Safe sources of drinking water are treated pipes, bore holes, hand pumps, and protected wells.

The analysis of cluster location shows

**Table 7.5: Percent distribution of households by main type of toilet**

| | None (bush) | Flush to sewer | Flush to septic tank | Pan/ bucket | Covered pit latrine | Uncovered pit latrine | Ventilated pit latrine | Other | Total | Safe sanitation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 2.9 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 67.7 | 27.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 29.2 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 1.2 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 67.4 | 28.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 31.4 |
| Remote | 4.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68.0 | 26.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 26.8 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 2.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 59.4 | 35.9 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 37.1 |
| Non-poor | 3.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 70.3 | 24.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 26.6 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 56.9 | 28.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 29.9 |
| 3-4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 70.2 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 28.2 |
| 5-6 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 66.8 | 30.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 32.2 |
| 7+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 74.5 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 25.5 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 57.8 | 32.4 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 38.2 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68.3 | 28.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 28.7 |
| Self-employed - other | 3.6 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 67.4 | 20.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 29.1 |
| Other | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.5 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 25.3 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 2.5 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 68.3 | 27.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 28.9 |
| Female | 3.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 66.2 | 28.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 29.9 |

**Table 7.6: Percent distribution of households by fuel used for cooking**

| | Firewood | Charcoal | Kerosene/oil | Gas | Electricity | Crop residue/ sawdust | Animal waste | Other | Total | Non-wood fuel for cooking |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 97.6 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 96.7 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Remote | 98.6 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Non-poor | 96.9 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 94.5 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 3-4 | 98.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 5-6 | 98.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 7+ | 98.8 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 95.8 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 98.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 92.1 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 97.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 98.2 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Female | 96.2 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba DC

that 42 percent of households in remote villages have a safe source of drinking water, whereas the share of households in accessible villages is just 29 percent. 18 percent of households in remote villages have a bore, and a further 18 percent have a protected well; whereas the shares for households in accessible

**Table 7.7: Percent distribution of households by fuel used for lighting**

| | Kerosene/ paraffin | Gas | Mains electricity | Solar panels/ generator | Battery | Candles | Firewood | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 95.8 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 94.0 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 97.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 97.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 95.2 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 84.8 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 99.1 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 98.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 97.5 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 91.9 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 97.1 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 91.9 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 94.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 96.5 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| Female | 94.1 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba DC

# 7 Household Amenities

villages are 9 and 14 percent, respectively. The shares of households with unprotected wells are 54 percent for accessible and 34 percent for households in remote villages.

Poverty status of the household shows important differences in access to safe water. In each safe source of drinking water there are slight differences in favour of non-poor households, resulting in 37 percent of non-poor households using safe sources of water, against 30 percent of poor households. In turn, 50 percent of poor households get their drinking water from unprotected wells, 7 percentage points above the share of non-poor households in that condition.

When analysing by household size, no strong trends emerge. The split up by gender of the household head does not show striking differences either, but the breakdown by socio-economic group of the household does. Employees have lowest rates of safe source, and the groups in "other" have the highest, followed by self-employed in non-agricultural activities.

Table 7.6 shows the percentage distribution of households by main type of toilet. Only 29 percent of households

have safe sanitation, whereas up to 68 percent use a covered pit latrine.

The cluster breakdown shows that 31 percent of households in accessible villages have safe sanitation, while in households in remote villages the share is 27 percent.

The analysis by poverty status shows that 70 percent of non-poor households use covered pit latrines, driving the share with safe sanitation down to 27 percent, 10 percentage points below poor households.

Households with 7 or more members have lowest percentage of safe sanitation, at 26 percent. The rates for other groups fluctuate 30 percent. Furthermore, 3 out of 4 households with 7 or more members use covered pit latrines. Uncovered pit latrines gain importance in households with 6 or less members. It stands out that up to 13 percent of households with up to 2 members have no toilet.

Employees have highest rate of safe sanitation, at 34 percent. The rates for other socio-economic groups fluctuate around 30 percent. The main type of toilet is covered pit latrines, and in second place uncovered pit latrine.

**Table 7.8: Percent distribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach nearest drinking water supply and health facility**

| | Drinking water supply | | | | | Health facility | | | | |
| | <= 15 | 16-30 | 31-60 | 61+ | Total | <= 15 | 16-30 | 31-60 | 61+ | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 59.0 | 31.5 | 8.4 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 16.9 | 21.5 | 25.5 | 36.1 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 69.0 | 26.5 | 4.1 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 13.8 | 29.0 | 33.1 | 24.1 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 48.4 | 36.9 | 12.9 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 20.1 | 13.6 | 17.5 | 48.8 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 51.7 | 32.8 | 13.8 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 11.2 | 16.4 | 18.0 | 54.5 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 61.3 | 31.1 | 6.7 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 18.7 | 23.1 | 27.9 | 30.2 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 56.3 | 33.9 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 9.4 | 23.5 | 34.1 | 33.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 55.3 | 35.6 | 6.6 | 2.5 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 16.3 | 30.7 | 38.7 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 66.2 | 25.7 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 25.7 | 21.6 | 21.4 | 31.3 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 56.6 | 31.7 | 10.4 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 14.7 | 27.2 | 16.6 | 41.5 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 62.8 | 27.3 | 5.5 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 22.5 | 12.9 | 28.0 | 36.6 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 58.5 | 31.2 | 9.2 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 17.7 | 20.5 | 23.8 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 54.3 | 35.3 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 11.9 | 29.7 | 29.6 | 28.8 | 100.0 |
| Other | 68.4 | 31.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 13.9 | 23.7 | 31.8 | 30.6 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 57.4 | 32.7 | 8.9 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 15.1 | 21.6 | 26.9 | 36.4 | 100.0 |
| Female | 63.3 | 28.6 | 7.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 21.6 | 21.3 | 21.8 | 35.3 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba DC

The analysis by gender of the household heads reveals no strong differences in the main type of toiled of the house

## 7.3 Type of Fuel

Table 7.7 shows the distribution of households by fuel used for cooking. Overall, 98 percent of households use firewood, with no important difference by cluster location or poverty status.

The breakdown by household size shows that small households (those with 1 or 2 members) tend to use charcoal slightly more often than the rest, but with a share of under 5 percent. There is no difference between the other households, with around 98 percent using wood.

The split up by socio-economic group of the household head shows that 8 percent of households which head is self-employed in non-agricultural activities use charcoal as main fuel for cooking. The share for employees is 4 percent and employees, whereas the shares for the other two groups are negligible.
The gender breakdown shows slight differences, with 4 percent of the female-headed households using charcoal. The share for male-headed households is 2 percent.
Table 7.8 shows the distribution of households according to the fuel used for lightning. Overall, 96 percent of the households in the district use kerosene or paraffin, and just 2 percent use electricity. Gas, solar panels, batteries, and candles are virtually not used for lighting in the district.

The analysis of cluster location shows that all households using electricity are located in accessible villages, but still represent only 5 percent of households in accessible villages in the district. Virtually no household in remote villages uses electricity. A similar trend is observed in the split-up by poverty status. All the households that use electricity are non-poor, but only represent 3 percent of non-poor households. No poor household uses electricity.

The breakdown by household size reveals that in households with up to 2 members, firewood and electricity are more likely to be used as sources of lighting, with shares of 5 and 7 percent. The use of electricity declines with the size of the household, from 7 percent for the smallest households to 1 percent for households with 7 or more

**Table 7.9: Percent distribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach nearest primary and secondary school**

| | Primary school | | | | | Secondary school | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | <= 15 | 16-30 | 31-60 | 61+ | Total | <= 15 | 16-30 | 31-60 | 61+ | Total |
| **Total** | 36.4 | 35.6 | 20.1 | 7.9 | 100.0 | 6.8 | 14.7 | 28.1 | 50.4 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 41.8 | 40.3 | 14.7 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 10.1 | 22.3 | 35.0 | 32.6 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 30.7 | 30.7 | 25.8 | 12.7 | 100.0 | 3.4 | 6.6 | 20.8 | 69.3 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 23.2 | 40.7 | 24.4 | 11.7 | 100.0 | 2.0 | 10.4 | 27.1 | 60.4 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 40.6 | 34.0 | 18.7 | 6.7 | 100.0 | 8.4 | 16.0 | 28.4 | 47.2 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 40.0 | 37.0 | 14.2 | 8.8 | 100.0 | 5.8 | 18.3 | 35.3 | 40.6 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 35.0 | 34.1 | 23.2 | 7.8 | 100.0 | 6.6 | 12.5 | 27.7 | 53.1 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 42.0 | 32.5 | 18.4 | 7.1 | 100.0 | 7.6 | 15.0 | 22.9 | 54.4 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 27.6 | 41.1 | 23.0 | 8.3 | 100.0 | 6.9 | 14.3 | 29.7 | 49.1 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 28.6 | 38.3 | 20.7 | 12.5 | 100.0 | 8.1 | 14.2 | 33.2 | 44.5 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 38.5 | 31.6 | 21.9 | 8.1 | 100.0 | 7.2 | 13.9 | 27.4 | 51.5 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 34.2 | 50.6 | 11.0 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 6.6 | 19.0 | 25.3 | 49.1 | 100.0 |
| Other | 28.3 | 43.5 | 19.9 | 8.4 | 100.0 | 3.2 | 14.5 | 34.6 | 47.7 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 33.3 | 37.5 | 20.4 | 8.8 | 100.0 | 7.4 | 14.3 | 29.3 | 49.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 44.6 | 30.7 | 19.3 | 5.5 | 100.0 | 5.4 | 15.7 | 24.9 | 54.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba DC

members.

The analysis by socio-economic group of the household shows that employees and self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the highest rates of use of electricity, with rates of 8 and 6 percent, respectively. On the other hand, household headed by an individual self-employed in agriculture have the highest rate of use of kerosene and paraffin, with 97 percent.

Finally, 4 percent female-headed households use electricity, 2 percent points above households headed by males, where the rate is 2 percent.

## 7.4 Distances to Facilities

Table 7.9 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest drinking water supply and health facility. Although each table gives more detailed information, the analysis of this section will be focused on the 30 minute threshold that was used to define access to a facility. It must be kept in mind that distance to public transportation is one of the variables used to define a cluster as accessible or remote, so it must come

as no surprise that distance to public transportation and cluster location are strongly correlated. However, the rest of the variables, despite not being used to define cluster location, also show strong correlations.

Overall, 90 percent of households are located under 30 minutes from a drinking water supply. Conversely, this means that 10 percent of the households in the district do not have access to drinking water. In addition, 39 percent of the households are located under 30 minutes from a health facility, meaning that 61 percent of households do not have access to health facilities.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that 69 percent of households in accessible villages are located less than 15 minutes away from a drinking water source, whereas the share for households in remote villages is 48 percent. The cluster analysis shows that 43 percent of households in accessible villages are located within 30 minutes from a health facility, compared to 34 percent of households in remote villages. Furthermore, the latter have almost 50 percent of households located over an hour away from health facility. When split up by poverty

**Table 7.10: Percent distribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach nearest food market and public transportation**

| | Food market | | | | | Public transportation | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | <= 15 | 16-30 | 31-60 | 61+ | Total | <= 15 | 16-30 | 31-60 | 61+ | Total |
| **Total** | 34.4 | 24.3 | 23.0 | 18.4 | 100.0 | 59.1 | 21.0 | 11.5 | 8.4 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 41.4 | 20.3 | 23.4 | 14.9 | 100.0 | 72.6 | 20.9 | 4.3 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 26.9 | 28.5 | 22.5 | 22.1 | 100.0 | 44.9 | 21.1 | 19.1 | 14.9 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 29.7 | 18.1 | 27.6 | 24.6 | 100.0 | 49.9 | 15.4 | 20.1 | 14.7 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 35.9 | 26.2 | 21.5 | 16.4 | 100.0 | 62.1 | 22.8 | 8.7 | 6.4 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 29.0 | 24.8 | 28.1 | 18.1 | 100.0 | 54.8 | 26.8 | 12.2 | 6.2 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 31.0 | 24.4 | 26.0 | 18.6 | 100.0 | 61.7 | 22.1 | 8.6 | 7.6 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 39.5 | 23.2 | 19.6 | 17.6 | 100.0 | 60.0 | 16.8 | 15.1 | 8.1 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 36.6 | 25.1 | 18.9 | 19.3 | 100.0 | 57.9 | 20.2 | 10.0 | 11.9 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 44.2 | 16.2 | 25.9 | 13.7 | 100.0 | 65.6 | 21.1 | 9.0 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 33.7 | 22.5 | 22.4 | 21.3 | 100.0 | 61.2 | 17.6 | 11.0 | 10.2 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 35.5 | 33.9 | 24.1 | 6.5 | 100.0 | 50.9 | 36.9 | 8.9 | 3.4 | 100.0 |
| Other | 29.5 | 30.0 | 23.5 | 17.0 | 100.0 | 49.4 | 23.3 | 22.8 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 32.6 | 26.0 | 23.6 | 17.8 | 100.0 | 58.9 | 22.7 | 10.9 | 7.5 | 100.0 |
| Female | 39.2 | 19.7 | 21.2 | 19.9 | 100.0 | 59.6 | 16.6 | 13.0 | 10.8 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba DC

status, 54 percent of poor households live over 60 minutes away from health facilities, whereas 42 percent of non-poor live under 30 minutes. The breakdown by poverty status shows a similar trend, with non-poor households being located closer to water supplies than poor households.

The breakdown by household size shows no strong correlation with distance to water sources, but households headed by self-employed individuals have higher rates of access to health facilities. The analysis of socio-economic groups shows that households in which the main income earner is an employee are located closer to water sources, despite 4 percent of them being located more than 60 minutes away from them. Household size does not appear to be correlated with distance to health facilities.

Households headed by females are located closer to water sources and health facilities, with 63 percent living less than 15 min from drinking water supplies, 6 percent points above male headed households. Furthermore, 43 percent of female-headed households are located within 30 minutes of health facilities, compared to 36 percent for male-headed households.
Table 7.10 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest school, differenced by primary and secondary school. Overall, 72 percent live within 30 min from a primary school, but just 22 percent of households live within 30 min of a secondary school. Moreover, 50 percent of households are located 60 min or more away from the nearest secondary school. Access to school was also analysed in chapter 3, but with a different focus. In chapter 3, access to school was analysed at child level, i.e. the access rate of each child. In this section the focus is the distance of the house to the nearest school.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 82 percent of households in accessible villages have access to primary school, against 61 of remote. For secondary school, the rates go down to 32 and 10 percent, respectively.
74 percent of poor households are located within 30 minutes from a primary school, 11 percentage points

above non-poor households. However, the rates for secondary school are the reverse: 12 poor live within 30 min of secondary school, against 24 percent of non-poor.
The size of the household does not appear to be correlated with access to school, either primary or secondary.

The breakdown by socio-economic shows that households in the category "self-employed other" are located closest to primary and secondary schools, with access rates of 86 and 27 percent, respectively. Households in the category "other" are located the farthest away from schools, with access to primary schools at 60 and to secondary schools at 10 percent. Self-employed in agriculture and employees are in between. Whereas the former show 71 and 21, the latter show rates of 65 and 24 percent of access to primary and secondary schools, respectively.

Households headed by females are located closer to primary schools, with access rates of 75 percent, against 71 percent of males. There is no gender difference for secondary schools, with both groups showing access rates of around 21 percent.

Table 7.11 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest food market and public transportation. Overall, 59 percent of households have access to a food market, and 80 percent to public transportation.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 62 percent of households in accessible villages live within 30 minutes of a food market and, against 55 of households in remote villages. The shares for public transportation are 93 for accessible and 66 percent for households in remote villages.

Poverty status is strongly correlated with distance to food markets and public transportation. Poor households have lower rates of access to food markets, with a rate of 48 percent, against 62 of non-poor. The difference is even higher regarding access to public transportation, of 20 percentage points. While 85 percent of non-poor have access to public transportation, only 65 percent of poor have so.

**Table 7.11: Percent distribution of households by type of housing unit**

| | Single room | Flat | Two or more rooms | Whole building | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 1.7 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 94.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 2.5 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 95.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 0.7 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 93.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.8 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 91.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 1.9 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 95.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 96.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 94.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 93.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 95.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | |
| Employee | 8.9 | 0.0 | 10.9 | 80.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 0.6 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 96.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 91.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | |
| Male | 1.5 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 93.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 96.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba DC

Household size does not seem to be correlated with distance to these facilities. Access rates to food markets fluctuate between 53 and 55 percent. Regarding public transportation, households with up to 4 members see to be located closer to it.

Self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the highest rates of access to food markets and public transportation, with rates of 69 and 88 percent. Employees are in second place, with rates of 60 and 87 percent, respectively, to each facility. The self-employed in agriculture show rates of 56 and 79 percent, and the "other" shows rates of 59 and 73 percent, respectively.

There does not appear to be a gender bias in access to food markets, but households headed by males have a higher share located close to public transportation (82 against 76 percent of households headed by females).

## 7.5 Anti-Malaria Measures

The percentage of households taking anti-malaria measures and the specific measures they take are shown in Table 7.12. Overall, 80 percent of households take measures against malaria. The most commonly taken are herbs (70 percent of households), good sanitation (35 percent), insecticide treated net (34 percent) and bed nets (18 percent).

The analysis of cluster location shows that 83 percent of households in remote villages take measures against malaria, compared to 76 percent of households in accessible villages. Nets are more widespread among accessible, whereas good sanitation and herbs are more reported by households in remote villages.

Poor households tend to use bed-nets and herbs more often than non-poor, with shares of 21 and 73 percent, against 17 and 69 percent, respectively. In turn, non-poor households use insecticide-treated nets and sanitation with higher frequency (36 and 36 percent against 25 and 31 percent, respectively).

The use of insecticide-treated nets increases and the use of herbs decreases with household size. Insecticide-treated nets run from 24 for households with 1 or 2 members, to 41 percent, for households with 7 or more members. In turn, the use of herbs goes from 70 percent, for small households, to 61 percent for the group of largest households.

The analysis of socio-economic status shows that 88 percent of households in the category "self-employed other" takes measures, 85 percent of employees, 81 percent of se agriculture, and only 43 percent of "other". Employees are the heaviest users of bed-nets (25 percent) self-employed in non-agricultural activities are the heaviest users of insecticide- treated nets (55 percent), self-employed in agriculture of good sanitation (37 percent) and "other" of herbs (84 percent).

Finally, households headed by males are more likely to take measures against malaria than households headed by females, 82 against 72 percent.

21 and 38 percent of the cases, female headed households do so in 10 and 21 percent of the cases, respectively. In turn, female-headed households rely more on good sanitation (41 against 32 percent) and herbs (83 against 65 percent).

**Table 7.12: Percentage of households taking anti-malaria measures, by measures taken**

| | Share taking measures | Use bed net | Insect-icide | Anti-malaria drug | Fumi-gation | Insecticide treated net | Maintain good drainage | Maintain good sanitation | Herbs | Burn leaves | Window/ door net |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 79.5 | 18.1 | 4.0 | 7.2 | 0.4 | 33.6 | 0.3 | 34.5 | 69.7 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 76.4 | 20.9 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 39.9 | 0.0 | 24.0 | 56.2 | 2.0 | 1.8 |
| Remote | 82.7 | 15.3 | 3.3 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 27.4 | 0.7 | 44.8 | 83.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 77.8 | 21.1 | 1.1 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 24.6 | 1.5 | 30.8 | 73.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Non-poor | 80.0 | 17.2 | 4.9 | 7.8 | 0.5 | 36.3 | 0.0 | 35.7 | 68.7 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 60.2 | 17.7 | 5.7 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 34.8 | 70.4 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
| 3-4 | 75.2 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 26.0 | 0.0 | 32.8 | 73.7 | 1.9 | 0.5 |
| 5-6 | 86.7 | 15.8 | 6.1 | 7.1 | 1.3 | 39.2 | 0.0 | 37.1 | 72.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
| 7+ | 92.0 | 19.1 | 5.0 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 40.5 | 1.4 | 33.0 | 61.2 | 1.7 | 0.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 83.5 | 19.5 | 9.0 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 44.5 | 0.0 | 31.0 | 58.5 | 0.0 | 10.2 |
| Self-employed - agric | 80.2 | 17.7 | 2.7 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 28.9 | 0.0 | 36.1 | 77.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Self-employed - other | 93.2 | 18.4 | 8.4 | 6.0 | 2.5 | 53.7 | 2.1 | 28.1 | 41.2 | 3.4 | 0.0 |
| Other | 44.0 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 14.6 | 0.0 | 38.8 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 82.2 | 20.9 | 5.0 | 7.2 | 0.5 | 37.9 | 0.5 | 32.2 | 65.3 | 0.7 | 1.2 |
| Female | 72.1 | 9.6 | 1.0 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 20.6 | 0.0 | 41.4 | 83.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba DC

1. Base for column 1 is total population, for columns 2 to 11, households using anti-malaria measures

Whereas male headed households use bed-nets and insecticide treated nets in

7 Household Amenities

# 8. Governance

The PMO-RALG CWIQ expanded the standard CWIQ survey instrument with several questions on governance. This chapter discusses the responses to these questions. The first section discusses attendance at kitongoji, village, ward and district meetings. Section 2 shows the results of questions aimed at measuring satisfaction with leaders at each of these levels. Section 3 concerns public spending at kitongoji, village, ward and district level and discusses to what extent financial information reaches households, as well as their satisfaction with public spending at each level.

## 8.1 Attendance at Meetings

Table 8.1 summarises responses to the following question "Did you or anyone in your household attend a meeting at [...] level in the past 12 months". This question was repeated 4 times with the dots replaced by kitongoji, village, ward and district. The results show that 92 percent of households had at least one member attending at least one kitongoji meeting in the past 12 months. Attendance at village meetings was slightly lower at 88 percent. Ward and district level meetings did not attain attendance of the majority of households at 37 and 10 percent respectively.

Looking at the breakdown of the results by poverty status, it can be seen that while there is no difference in attendance at kitongoji and village meetings, the poor seem to have better attendance rates at ward and district level meetings. Analysis of the results by socio-economic group shows that the 'other' socio-economic category -a small group of households consisting mainly of households where the main income earner is neither an employee nor self-employed- consistently have lower attendance rates than the other socio-economic groups. The employees, self-employed agriculture and self-employed other groups have similar attendance rates at kitongoji level. Village, ward and district level meetings, however, are characterised by lower

**Table 8.1: Percentage distribution of attendance of meetings (any household member within past 12 months)**

|  | Kitongoji Meeting | Village Meeting | Ward Meeting | District Meeting |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 92.1 | 87.5 | 36.8 | 10.2 |
| **Cluster Location** |  |  |  |  |
| Accessible | 88.4 | 85.7 | 37.2 | 12.2 |
| Remote | 95.9 | 89.5 | 36.4 | 8.2 |
| **Poverty Status** |  |  |  |  |
| Poor | 93.0 | 87.0 | 44.7 | 13.3 |
| Non-poor | 91.8 | 87.7 | 34.3 | 9.3 |
| **Socio-economic Group** |  |  |  |  |
| Employee | 94.0 | 91.2 | 34.5 | 12.8 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 94.4 | 90.6 | 41.0 | 11.2 |
| Self-employed - other | 93.1 | 84.7 | 31.5 | 9.4 |
| Other | 66.9 | 60.9 | 9.9 | 0.0 |
| **No. of Obs.** | 435 | 435 | 435 | 435 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

attendance rates of the self-employed in non-agricultural activities compared to those who are self-employed in agriculture and those who are employees.

## 8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders

The main respondent was asked whether he or she considered the leaders at kitongoji, village, ward and district levels of government to be polite and helpful. For those who were not satisfied or answered that they did not know, the reasons for this were asked. For district councillors the question was phrased slightly differently and respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with their work and for those who responded 'no' or 'don't know' the reason for this response was asked.

The results, displayed in Table 8.2, show a clear trend of satisfaction with leaders going up as the level of government goes down. While, respectively, 84 percent and 82 percent of respondents say they are satisfied with kitongoji and village leaders, only 47 percent say the same of district leaders. This does not, however,

# 8 Governance

**Table 8.2: Distribution of leaders' satisfaction ratings and reasons for dissatisfaction**

| | Kitongoji Leaders | Village Leaders | Ward Leaders | District Leaders | District Councillor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | | | | | |
| Satisfied | 83.5 | 81.8 | 70.9 | 47.3 | 60.0 |
| Not Satisfied | 15.1 | 16.2 | 16.3 | 15.1 | 26.5 |
| Don't Know | 1.4 | 2.0 | 12.8 | 37.6 | 13.5 |
| **Share Satisfied by Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 77.9 | 75.6 | 61.5 | 41.1 | 57.8 |
| Remote | 89.5 | 88.4 | 80.9 | 54.1 | 62.3 |
| **Share Satisfied by Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 87.4 | 84.9 | 77.4 | 45.4 | 61.1 |
| Non-poor | 82.3 | 80.8 | 68.8 | 47.9 | 59.6 |
| **Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 82.0 | 82.5 | 76.6 | 56.4 | 58.4 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 84.5 | 82.5 | 71.6 | 48.1 | 63.6 |
| Self-employed - other | 85.0 | 80.9 | 70.1 | 48.5 | 49.5 |
| Other | 73.2 | 75.7 | 60.6 | 29.3 | 47.2 |
| **Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)** | | | | | |
| Political differences | 6.3 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
| Embezzlement/corruption | 14.7 | 21.6 | 11.9 | 3.0 | 1.9 |
| They do not listen to people | 24.0 | 21.8 | 8.5 | 2.3 | 13.9 |
| Favouritism | 26.6 | 25.2 | 16.1 | 2.5 | 7.3 |
| Lazy/inexperienced | 6.3 | 6.3 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 4.7 |
| Personal Reasons | 5.1 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| I see no results | 34.4 | 30.4 | 20.9 | 12.8 | 27.2 |
| They never visit us | 17.5 | 31.2 | 56.6 | 80.5 | 35.4 |
| **No. of Obs.** | 435 | 435 | 435 | 432 | 433 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

1. While the question for kitongoji, village, ward and district leaders was framed as: "do you think the leaders at this level are polite and helpful', the question for the district councillor was framed as 'are you satisfied with the work of your district councillor?'

mean that respondents specifically reported dissatisfaction with leaders at higher levels of government. In fact, the percentage of people claiming they are dissatisfied with leaders does not differ much between kitongoji, village, ward and district leaders. Rather, the number of people responding with 'I don't know' increases for higher levels of government. Just over a quarter of respondents were not satisfied with the work of their district councillor, while 60 percent was satisfied and 13 percent answered with 'I don't know'.

Breaking the results down by accessibility of the cluster and the poverty status of the household shows that respondents living in poorer households and more remote villages have higher satisfaction ratings for all levels of government.

Disaggregating the ratings by socio-economic group shows that especially the others category has lower satisfaction ratings than the other socioeconomic groups.

Finally, all respondents who did not report that they were satisfied with the leaders at a certain level of government where asked why this was so. The bottom part of Table 8.2 summarises the responses. Note that the base for the percentages here is the number of people who answered 'don't know' or 'no' to the question of whether they were satisfied with their leaders at the specified level.

The reasons for dissatisfaction are very different across the different levels of government. While at kitongoji level only 17 percent of dissatisfied respondents complain that leaders never visit them,

this figure goes up to 80 percent for district leaders. Failure to see any result of the leaders' work, by contrast, is the most commonly cited response at kitongoji level at 34 percent, while it is less important at district level at 13 percent. Favouritism and failure to listen to people is a commonly cited reason for dissatisfaction with kitongoji and village leaders, but is less important for ward and district leaders. The most common reason for dissatisfaction with district councillors is their failure to pay visits, followed by the complaint that no results of their work can be seen. A very low percentage complains about embezzlement and corruption by the district leaders and the district councillor, while this complaint is more common for ward, village and kitongoji leaders.

## 8.3. Public Spending

This section discusses the results of questions on the extent to which financial information reached the sample of respondent, as well as their satisfaction with public spending. Table 8.3 shows the distribution of the percentage of respondents that reported having received financial information from four different levels of government. Information on village finances seems to reach the largest share of households at 20 percent. Information on kitongoji, ward and district finances reaches 12, 8 and 5 percent of the household's respectively. Overall slightly more households in remote villages report receiving financial information than households in accessible villages, especially on village finances; while the breakdown of households by poverty status does not yield important differences.

There are no major differences across socio-economic groups, although the self-employed other category seems to receive more information on ward finances than other socio-economic groups. For those that received financial information, the source of this information was probed for.

The results in Table 8.3 show that at all levels of government the most important method of acquiring information was attendance of meetings. Information received through rumours or hear-say scores second place at all levels, ranging from 9 percent at ward level to 25 percent at district level.

Respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with spending at different levels of government and were requested to respond with either 'yes', 'no' or 'don't know'. Table 8.4 shows the results. Satisfaction with spending is higher for lower levels of government. While around 40 percent of respondents were satisfied with village and kitongoji spending, only 29 and 23 percent, respectively, reported the same for ward and district spending. This does not, however, mean that respondents specifically report dissatisfaction with spending for higher levels of government, rather the share of respondents reporting 'I don't know' increases.

In line with the results on satisfaction with leaders, respondents living in poor households and in remote villages consistently show higher satisfaction rates than respondents living in non-poor households and in accessible villages. The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed agriculture group displays the highest satisfaction rates, except for district spending, where the employed group shows slightly higher rates.

**Table 8.3: Percentage distribution of households who received financial information in the past 12 months**

| | Kitongoji Finances | Village Finances | Ward Finances | District Finances |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 12.4 | 20.4 | 7.9 | 4.5 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 11.4 | 17.4 | 6.5 | 3.4 |
| Remote | 13.4 | 23.7 | 9.3 | 5.7 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 14.5 | 20.4 | 10.5 | 2.1 |
| Non-poor | 11.7 | 20.5 | 7.0 | 5.3 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | |
| Employee | 9.3 | 16.3 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 12.4 | 19.1 | 7.8 | 5.5 |
| Self-employed - other | 12.1 | 27.8 | 9.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 15.8 | 23.2 | 9.4 | 4.3 |
| **Source** | | | | |
| Letter | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 13.8 |
| Notice board | 2.5 | 1.2 | 4.3 | 3.7 |
| Meeting | 84.5 | 87.9 | 89.2 | 54.0 |
| Rumours/hear-say | 15.5 | 10.3 | 8.7 | 24.8 |
| Radio/newspapers | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **No. of Obs.** | 435 | 435 | 435 | 434 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

When respondents were further queried why they were not satisfied, or why they did not know whether they were satisfied, the most common response was that they did not receive any information. The second most important response was that they saw no results arising from the public spending.

**Table 8.4: Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction**

|  | Kitongoji Spending | Village Spending | Ward Spending | District Spending |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | | | | |
| Satisfied | 41.9 | 38.7 | 29.1 | 23.5 |
| Not Satisfied | 20.8 | 24.8 | 20.7 | 13.2 |
| Don' Know | 37.3 | 36.5 | 50.2 | 63.3 |
| **Share Satisfied by Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 33.0 | 29.7 | 21.6 | 17.1 |
| Remote | 51.4 | 48.2 | 37.1 | 30.2 |
| **Share Satisfied by Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 49.8 | 48.0 | 44.1 | 28.8 |
| Non-poor | 39.4 | 35.8 | 24.4 | 21.8 |
| **Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group** | | | | |
| Employee | 39.9 | 25.1 | 27.9 | 26.2 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 43.6 | 41.6 | 30.9 | 24.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 39.1 | 32.7 | 27.3 | 21.8 |
| Other | 33.2 | 35.5 | 16.9 | 19.9 |
| **Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)** | | | | |
| I see no results | 24.6 | 22.6 | 20.2 | 14.5 |
| Embezzlement/corruption | 8.3 | 10.6 | 5.8 | 3.4 |
| Favouritism | 5.5 | 5.5 | 3.3 | 0.8 |
| This is what I hear | 3.3 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 1.6 |
| They give no information | 72.5 | 72.8 | 77.8 | 84.8 |
| **No. of Obs.** | 435 | 435 | 435 | 434 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Bukoba DC

# 9. Changes between 2003 and 2006

This chapter will use the results of the 2003 Bukoba Rural CWIQ to analyse changes in a selected set of indicators between the two surveys. Both the sampling methodology and the structure of the questionnaires allow comparisons between the surveys. "t" tests were performed to ensure statistical significance of the changes that take into account the clustered nature of the dataset. The null hypothesis in all cases was equality of means, so rejection of the null implies that the means are statistically different. These tests rely on two assumptions: normality of the distribution of each variable in the population and equality of variance. Violation of the first assumption does not pose serious problems in practice. Regarding the second assumption, one may be willing to assume equal variance between the two samples if it is considered that both are representative of the same population in two relatively close points in time.

Being estimates, the changes should not be read as points, but from the corresponding confidence intervals. For instance, Table 9.1 shows that share of households with one or two members increased by 9 percent, and that the confidence interval of the change runs from 2.9 to 13.9 percent. This should be read: "the share of households with one or two members increased between 2.9 and 13.9 percent". If the confidence interval includes zero, it is said that the change is not significant. For the sake of space, the tables only show the 95 percent confidence intervals. However, some researchers or policy makers prefer 90 and 99 percent confidence intervals. Although they are not presented in the tables, stars indicate the significance level of each change. *, **, and *** represent significance at the 90, 95 and 99 percent of confidence. The text only discusses changes at the 95 percent of confidence.

Some caveats must be pointed out. In first place, the sample is not a panel, i.e. the households interviewed in 2003 are not the same as the households interviewed in 2002. Therefore, only the overall changes can be analysed, not the evolution for individual households. For instance, as shown in Table 9.4, the share of population owning only small livestock did not change significantly between the two surveys. It must be kept in mind that this result does not mean that the households that owned small livestock in 2003 are the same ones that own small livestock in 2006.

In second place, the district boundaries changed between 2003 and 2006. The northern part of the district was transformed into a new district, Mishenyi DC. Hence, if all the clusters of 2003 were used to make the comparison, part of the changes would be due to the boundary changes, so the results of the analysis would be inconclusive. To ensure comparability of the results, the figures for 2003 were re-estimated using only the clusters that remained part of Bukoba in 2006. By using fewer clusters the precision of the estimates diminishes (the standard errors increase), but the estimates

**Table 9.1: Household Characteristics**

|  | 2003 | 2006 | Change | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | Estimate | SE | Signif. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
| **Household Size** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-2 | 9.2 | 18.2 | 9.0 | 2.7 | *** | 2.9 | 13.9 |
| 3-4 | 29.2 | 30.7 | 1.5 | 4.4 |  | -6.9 | 10.9 |
| 5-6 | 33.7 | 29.7 | -4.0 | 4.6 |  | -14.0 | 4.8 |
| 7+ | 27.8 | 21.4 | -6.4 | 3.8 |  | -13.3 | 1.8 |
| **Mean Household Size** | 5.3 | 4.8 | -0.5 | 0.2 | ** | -1.0 | 0.0 |
| **Female-headed Households** | 20.6 | 27.3 | 6.7 | 3.6 | * | -0.6 | 13.9 |

Source: Bukoba Rural CWIQ for 2003 and 2006

**Table 9.2: Education**

| | 2003 | 2006 | Change | | | | |
| | | | Estimate | SE | Signif. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Literacy** | 78.6 | 80.4 | 1.8 | 3.1 | | -3.7 | 8.9 |
| **Primary School** | | | | | | | |
| Net Enrolment Rate | 80.3 | 86.7 | 6.4 | 4.4 | | -2.7 | 14.9 |
| Satisfaction | 66.3 | 52.2 | -14.1 | 7.1 | * | -28.6 | 0.2 |
| **Secondary School** | | | | | | | |
| Net Enrolment Rate | 10.5 | 12.2 | 1.7 | 3.2 | | -4.5 | 8.5 |
| Satisfaction | 72.9 | 33.4 | -39.5 | 10.4 | *** | -62.6 | -20.1 |
| **Dissatisfaction Rate** | 32.9 | 46.7 | 13.8 | 6.8 | ** | 0.4 | 27.7 |
| Reasons for Dissatisfaction | | | | | | | |
| Books/Supplies | 79.3 | 37.7 | -41.6 | 7.7 | *** | -57.1 | -26.1 |
| Poor Teaching | 8.6 | 13.3 | 4.7 | 4.3 | | -3.3 | 14.0 |
| Lack of Teachers | 67.3 | 51.7 | -15.6 | 9.1 | | -33.5 | 3.3 |
| Bad Condition of Facilities | 30.1 | 36.6 | 6.5 | 7.8 | | -9.9 | 21.6 |
| Overcrowding | 11.4 | 36.7 | 25.3 | 8.0 | *** | 9.4 | 41.7 |

Source: Bukoba Rural CWIQ for 2003 and 2006

are still unbiased.

In third place, changes in perception may depend on the population interviewed. The same circumstance can be catalogued as "fair" by some people and "unfair" by others. The impact of this caveat is minimised by securing randomness in the selection of sampled households.

Finally, the figures are just two dots in time, and do not necessarily imply the existence of a trend between them.

Section one presents changes in household characteristics. In section two, the evolution of education indicators is analysed. Changes in health are reported in section three. The last section presents an analysis of changes in household assets and perceptions of welfare.

## 9.1 Household characteristics

Household size has remained fairly stable, as would be expected from two surveys with a relatively short time gap. The only significant change is an increase in the share of households with 1 or 2 members. This change led to a reduction of mean household size from 5.3 to 4.8 members per household. In addition, the share of households headed by females has not changed at the 95 percent of confidence.

## 9.2 Education

Neither literacy nor net enrolment rates changed between the surveys. However, it must be pointed out that the net enrolment rate for secondary school still lags far behind that for primary school.

Dissatisfaction with school has increased but especially for secondary school, which went up almost 40 points between the two surveys. Regarding the reasons, the most important reduction is observed in lack of books, which constitutes the most important change. Overcrowding shows the most important increase as a reason for dissatisfaction with school.

## 9.3 Health

The rates of need and use increased between 2003 and 2006, but the rate of satisfaction remained constant. The reason for dissatisfaction that reports the highest increase is the long waits. Conversely, the sharpest declines are observed in "lack of professionals", and "lack of medicine". Cost remained fairly stable, as the second most cited cause for dissatisfaction in both surveys.

The share of people who did not consult reduced significantly, but the reasons for not consulting did not change at the 95 percent of confidence.

Government hospitals are the facility with the highest rate of use in both surveys. Pharmacies ranked seventh in 2003, but they show an important increase in 2006, where they rank second.

There is an increase in the percentage of women between 20 and 24 years that had a live birth in the year preceding the survey. According to both surveys, virtually all pregnant women received pre-natal care. The share of women giving birth in hospitals has remained statistically unchanged at the 95 percent of confidence. The last panel of the table shows child nutrition indicators, previously defined in section 4. The rates of stunting and severe stunting, long-term indicators of child malnutrition, appear to be constant. The rates of wasting, short-term indicators have decreased considerably.

**Table 9.3: Health**

| | 2003 | 2006 | Change | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Estimate | SE | Signif. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
| **Medical Services** | | | | | | | |
| Need | 16.3 | 36.6 | 20.3 | 3.2 | *** | 13.7 | 26.7 |
| Use | 18.4 | 31.9 | 13.5 | 22.2 | *** | 210.7 | 300.1 |
| Satisfaction | 81.8 | 79.3 | -2.5 | 4.9 | | -11.6 | 7.9 |
| **Reasons for Dissatisfaction** | | | | | | | |
| Long wait | 37.4 | 63.9 | 26.5 | 12.8 | ** | 3.9 | 55.7 |
| Shortage of trained professionals | 36.9 | 9.3 | -27.6 | 10.8 | ** | -48.9 | -5.2 |
| Cost | 37.3 | 24.3 | -13.0 | 10.6 | | -33.0 | 9.8 |
| No drugs available | 24.4 | 8.6 | -15.8 | 7.8 | ** | -31.7 | -0.2 |
| Unsuccessful treatment | 15.7 | 5.1 | -10.6 | 7.8 | | -26.6 | 5.1 |
| **Not Consulting** | 81.6 | 68.1 | -13.5 | 2.4 | *** | -18.6 | -8.9 |
| **Reasons for Not Consulting** | | | | | | | |
| No need | 94.5 | 90.0 | -4.5 | 2.4 | * | -9.6 | 0.2 |
| Cost | 3.2 | 7.9 | 4.7 | 2.9 | | -8.4 | 3.2 |
| Distance | 10.7 | 1.2 | -9.5 | 1.4 | | -4.3 | 1.3 |
| **Facility Used** | | | | | | | |
| Private hospital | 5.6 | 3.3 | -2.3 | 2.3 | | -7.0 | 2.1 |
| Government hospital | 47.3 | 56.1 | 8.8 | 6.0 | * | -1.8 | 22.3 |
| Traditional healer | 8.8 | 8.9 | 0.1 | 2.9 | | -5.5 | 6.0 |
| Pharmacy | 3.9 | 16.7 | 12.8 | 4.0 | *** | 4.2 | 20.2 |
| **Women who Had Live-Births** | | | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 9.7 | 9.4 | -0.3 | 5.6 | | -11.5 | 10.9 |
| 20-24 | 23.3 | 36.1 | 12.8 | 8.2 | ** | 0.6 | 33.9 |
| 25-29 | 24.3 | 31.4 | 7.1 | 8.2 | | -8.5 | 24.7 |
| 30-39 | 15.7 | 17.7 | 2.0 | 5.6 | | -8.6 | 13.9 |
| 40+ | 2.9 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 2.5 | | -4.4 | 5.6 |
| **Prenatal care** | 100.0 | 99.0 | -1.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Facilities Used in Child Deliveries** | | | | | | | |
| Hospital or maternity ward | 56.8 | 50.3 | -6.5 | 7.5 | * | -1.4 | 28.7 |
| **Delivery Assistance** | | | | | | | |
| Doctor/Nurse/Midwife | 56.9 | 69.0 | 12.1 | 7.1 | * | -2.2 | 26.3 |
| TBA | 33.0 | 28.1 | -4.9 | 5.5 | | -16.1 | 6.2 |
| Other/Self | 10.1 | 2.7 | -7.4 | 3.0 | ** | -13.3 | -1.4 |
| **Child Nutrition** | | | | | | | |
| Stunted | 39.8 | 38.0 | -1.8 | 6.0 | | -13.1 | 10.9 |
| Severely Stunted | 16.1 | 12.0 | -4.1 | 4.1 | | -12.4 | 4.1 |
| Wasted | 13.3 | 4.0 | -9.3 | 2.8 | *** | -15.0 | -3.9 |
| Severely Wasted | 6.5 | 0.3 | -6.3 | 1.7 | *** | -9.6 | -2.9 |

Source: Bukoba Rural CWIQ for 2003 and 2006

## 9.4 Household Assets and Perceptions of Welfare

Table 9.4 analyses changes in household assets and on welfare perceptions. The share of households owning less land than the year preceding the survey reduced. The change was compensated by the increase in the share of households for which land ownership did not change. Regarding livestock ownership, there were no changes for any type of livestock holding.

The share of households that had frequent difficulties satisfying food needs increased between 1 and 7 percentage points, but the share of households that reported having had such difficulties "sometimes" reduced between 27 and 4 percentage points. This is consistent with the important reductions in the shares of households reporting deterioration of the economic situation of the household and the community.

**Table 9.4: Household Assets and Perception of Welfare**

| | 2003 | 2006 | Change | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Estimate | SE | Signif. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
| **Landholding** | | | | | | | |
| No holding | 2.2 | 3.5 | 2 | 1.9 | | -2.6 | 5.1 |
| Less | 17.7 | 3.5 | -15 | 1.8 | *** | -17.9 | -10.5 |
| Same | 75.3 | 88 | 13 | 3.1 | *** | 10.1 | 22.5 |
| More | 4.9 | 4.9 | 0 | 1.8 | | -3.6 | 3.7 |
| **Difficulty satisfying food needs** | | | | | | | |
| Never | 19.1 | 29 | 10 | 5.2 | * | -0.7 | 20.3 |
| Seldom | 46.0 | 47 | 1 | 4.5 | | -7.6 | 10.4 |
| Sometimes | 34.2 | 19 | -15 | 0.1 | ** | -26.8 | -3.6 |
| Always | 0.7 | 5 | 4 | 1.3 | *** | 1.3 | 6.7 |
| **Livestock** | | | | | | | |
| No livestock | 58.0 | 61 | 3 | 4.6 | | -14.4 | 3.9 |
| Small only | 30.2 | 32 | 1 | 4.6 | | -8.3 | 10.3 |
| Large only | 4.9 | 7 | 3 | 2.2 | | -2.1 | 6.7 |
| Small and large | 7.0 | 8 | 1 | 1.8 | | -1.7 | 5.5 |
| **Landholding (in acres)** | | | | | | | |
| **Mean** | 2.4 | 2.3 | -0.1 | 17.3 | | -43.2 | 26.3 |
| 0 | 2.2 | 4 | 1 | 1.9 | | -2.6 | 5.1 |
| 0-0.99 | 4.4 | 17 | 13 | 2.5 | *** | 7.2 | 17.4 |
| 1-1.99 | 37.3 | 27 | -10 | 3.9 | ** | -17.2 | -1.6 |
| 2-3.99 | 37.9 | 34 | -4 | 4.1 | | -12.3 | 4.2 |
| 4-5.99 | 14.3 | 12 | -3 | 2.9 | | -8.5 | 3.4 |
| 6+ | 3.8 | 6 | 2 | 1.7 | | -1.0 | 5.8 |
| **Economic Situation Has Deteriorated** | | | | | | | |
| Community | 78.2 | 49 | -29 | 5.0 | *** | -39.7 | -19.6 |
| Household | 75.7 | 56 | -20 | 4.2 | *** | -28.5 | -11.7 |

Source: Bukoba Rural CWIQ for 2003 and 2006