PMO-RALG

# HANANG DC CWIQ
# Survey on Poverty, Welfare and Services in Hanang DC

December 2006

Implemented by:
EDI (Economic Development Initiatives)
PO Box 393, Bukoba
Tanzania

Telephone and Fax: +255-(0)28-2220059
Email:
research@edi-africa.com
www.edi-africa.com

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was commissioned by the Prime Minister's Office – Regional Administration and Local Governance (PMO-RALG) and implemented by EDI (Economic Development Initiatives). It is part of an effort to conduct CWIQ surveys in 34 districts across Tanzania. The project Director is Joachim De Weerdt. Field work operations are being co-coordinated by Respichius Mitti and Francis Moyo. Field supervision was in the hands of Matovu Davies, Wilson Kabito, Henry Kilapilo, Henry Lugakingira, Josephine Lugomora, George Musikula, and Neema Mwampeta. The listing team was formed by Felix Kapinga and Benjamin Kamukulu. Interviewers were Dativa Balige, Geofrey Bakari, Rukia Charles, Abbanova Gabba, George Gabriel, Jamary Idrissa, Felix James, Sampson Mutalemwa Gloria Joseph, Placidia Josephat, Justina Katoke, Makarius Kiyonga, Faustine Misinde, Jesca Nkonjerwa, Kamugisha Robert, Resti Simon, Pius Sosthenes, Aissa Soud, Adella Theobald, and Honoratha Wycliffe. The data processing software was written by Jim Otto and Neil Chalmers. The data entry team consisted of Mary Stella Andrew and Alieth Mutungi, and was supervised by Thaddaeus Rweyemamu. Formatting the final document layout was in the hands of Amina Suedi. The data analysis and report writing were undertaken by Luis Barron, John Ibembe, Ezekiel Kiagho, Baruani Mshale and Teddy Neema under the supervision of Manuel Barron. Assistance from Charles Citinka and Howard Clegg from PMO-RALG is acknowledged.

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 was 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. |
| 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

## LIST OF TABLES

Generic Core Welfare Indicators (2006)

| | Total | Margin of error* | Accessible | Remote | Poor | Non-poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Household characteristics** | | | | | | |
| *Dependency ratio* | 1.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.0 |
| *Head is male* | 83.3 | 2.7 | 78.5 | 88.7 | 86.8 | 81.7 |
| *Head is female* | 16.7 | 3.0 | 21.5 | 11.3 | 13.2 | 18.3 |
| *Head is monagamous* | 60.7 | 2.5 | 58.7 | 63.0 | 66.3 | 58.2 |
| *Head is polygamous* | 14.6 | 1.7 | 13.3 | 16.0 | 18.6 | 12.8 |
| *Head is not married* | 24.8 | 3.2 | 28.0 | 21.0 | 15.1 | 29.1 |
| **Household welfare** | | | | | | |
| Household economic situation compared to one year ago | | | | | | |
| *Worse now* | 31.6 | 3.3 | 29.2 | 34.3 | 32.7 | 31.0 |
| *Better now* | 50.3 | 4.2 | 48.6 | 52.3 | 47.9 | 51.3 |
| Neighborhood crime/security situation compared to one year ago | | | | | | |
| *Worse now* | 15.5 | 3.5 | 11.7 | 19.8 | 21.2 | 12.9 |
| *Better now* | 41.4 | 4.2 | 48.6 | 33.1 | 34.6 | 44.4 |
| Difficulty satisfying household needs | | | | | | |
| *Food* | 36.7 | 5.6 | 37.8 | 35.5 | 36.2 | 36.9 |
| *School fees* | 2.5 | 0.7 | 3.9 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 2.9 |
| *House rent* | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| *Utility bills* | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| *Health care* | 17.1 | 3.3 | 17.9 | 16.2 | 22.6 | 14.7 |
| **Agriculture** | | | | | | |
| Land owned compared to one year ago | | | | | | |
| *Less now* | 3.8 | 0.9 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 5.7 | 3.0 |
| *More now* | 2.2 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 2.7 |
| Cattle owned compared to one year ago | | | | | | |
| *Less now* | 14.4 | 1.9 | 14.7 | 14.1 | 24.3 | 10.0 |
| *More now* | 26.6 | 3.3 | 28.7 | 24.1 | 28.1 | 25.9 |
| Use of agricultural inputs | | | | | | |
| *Yes* | 52.0 | 4.5 | 57.7 | 45.4 | 61.1 | 47.9 |
| *Fertilizers* | 82.6 | 4.1 | 79.5 | 87.0 | 91.1 | 77.7 |
| *Improved seedlings* | 38.7 | 3.8 | 44.0 | 31.0 | 28.5 | 44.5 |
| *Fingerlings* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Hooks and nets* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Insecticides* | 16.0 | 2.9 | 18.0 | 13.1 | 9.2 | 19.9 |
| *Other* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Household infrastructure** | | | | | | |
| *Secure housing tenure* | 1.8 | 1.5 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
| *Access to water* | 65.6 | 8.6 | 93.1 | 34.1 | 58.4 | 68.9 |
| *Safe water source* | 45.4 | 5.8 | 37.4 | 54.5 | 46.4 | 44.9 |
| *Safe sanitation* | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| *Improved waste disposal* | 8.8 | 2.3 | 7.1 | 10.9 | 7.5 | 9.4 |
| *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* | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| *Mobile phone* | 10.1 | 2.9 | 15.0 | 4.4 | 0.7 | 14.3 |
| *Radio set* | 43.4 | 3.1 | 45.9 | 40.6 | 19.6 | 54.0 |
| *Television set* | 2.3 | 1.7 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 |

| | Total | Margin of error* | Accessible | Remote | Poor | Non-poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Employment** | | | | | | |
| Employer in the main job | | | | | | |
| *Civil service* | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
| *Other public serve* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Parastatal* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *NGO* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Private sector formal* | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.9 |
| *Private sector informal* | 47.6 | 1.8 | 48.2 | 46.9 | 45.0 | 49.2 |
| *Household* | 46.6 | 1.5 | 44.9 | 48.5 | 50.4 | 44.3 |
| Activity in the main job | | | | | | |
| *Agriculture* | 61.1 | 3.3 | 58.3 | 64.4 | 62.8 | 60.1 |
| *Mining/quarrying* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Manufacturing* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Services* | 1.1 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.5 |
| Employment Status in last 7 days | | | | | | |
| *Unemployed (age 15-24)* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Male* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Female* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Unemployed (age 15 and above))* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Male* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Female* | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| *Underemployed (age 15 and above)* | 16.1 | 2.1 | 14.6 | 17.8 | 14.1 | 17.3 |
| *Male* | 21.2 | 3.0 | 19.4 | 23.1 | 17.3 | 23.5 |
| *Female* | 10.8 | 1.4 | 10.0 | 11.8 | 10.8 | 10.8 |
| **Education** | | | | | | |
| Adult literacy rate | | | | | | |
| *Total* | 65.4 | 2.4 | 68.0 | 62.4 | 61.0 | 68.0 |
| *Male* | 72.5 | 2.7 | 73.8 | 71.2 | 66.9 | 75.8 |
| *Female* | 57.9 | 3.1 | 62.4 | 52.2 | 54.6 | 59.8 |
| Youth literacy rate (age 15-24) | | | | | | |
| *Total* | 87.0 | 2.6 | 92.1 | 81.3 | 86.9 | 87.1 |
| *Male* | 90.1 | 2.6 | 93.9 | 86.3 | 88.3 | 91.4 |
| *Female* | 83.1 | 3.7 | 90.0 | 74.1 | 85.1 | 81.8 |
| Primary school | | | | | | |
| *Access to School* | 68.7 | 6.6 | 81.7 | 52.4 | 65.1 | 72.6 |
| *Primary Gross Enrollment* | 105.8 | 4.1 | 108.9 | 102.0 | 101.3 | 110.9 |
| *Male* | 110.3 | 5.7 | 111.8 | 108.5 | 103.0 | 118.8 |
| *Female* | 101.7 | 5.0 | 106.3 | 95.7 | 99.7 | 103.8 |
| *Primary Net Enrollment* | 76.7 | 3.2 | 81.2 | 71.0 | 73.1 | 80.7 |
| *Male* | 76.2 | 3.4 | 76.8 | 75.5 | 72.0 | 81.1 |
| *Female* | 77.2 | 4.0 | 85.3 | 66.7 | 74.2 | 80.3 |
| *Satisfaction* | 65.9 | 3.4 | 64.4 | 67.9 | 71.3 | 60.5 |
| *Primary completion rate* | 19.4 | 2.5 | 23.0 | 14.8 | 14.8 | 24.4 |

| | Total | Margin of error* | Accessible | Remote | Poor | Non-poor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Secondary school | | | | | | |
| *Access to School* | 29.4 | 9.3 | 41.8 | 14.2 | 25.5 | 33.1 |
| *Secondary Gross Enrollment* | 12.7 | 3.5 | 16.1 | 8.4 | 5.5 | 19.4 |
| *Male* | 12.6 | 3.6 | 14.3 | 10.7 | 6.1 | 18.3 |
| *Female* | 12.7 | 4.1 | 18.3 | 5.8 | 4.8 | 20.7 |
| *Secondary Net Enrollment* | 6.9 | 1.8 | 10.4 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 10.2 |
| *Male* | 6.5 | 2.0 | 9.2 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 9.7 |
| *Female* | 7.3 | 2.2 | 11.8 | 1.7 | 3.8 | 10.8 |
| *Satisfaction* | 65.3 | 10.7 | 63.2 | 70.0 | 66.4 | 65.0 |
| *Secondary completion rate* | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| **Medical services** | | | | | | |
| *Health access* | 23.0 | 7.4 | 35.1 | 8.7 | 16.7 | 27.7 |
| *Need* | 15.0 | 0.8 | 16.0 | 13.9 | 13.5 | 16.1 |
| *Use* | 17.3 | 1.1 | 19.9 | 14.3 | 15.4 | 18.7 |
| *Satisfaction* | 89.0 | 2.2 | 87.9 | 90.8 | 91.0 | 87.8 |
| *Consulted traditional healer* | 5.4 | 1.8 | 3.3 | 9.0 | 3.3 | 6.8 |
| *Pre-natal care* | 97.5 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 95.1 | 96.4 | 98.5 |
| *Anti-malaria measures used* | 33.9 | 5.1 | 37.2 | 30.1 | 23.1 | 38.7 |
| *Person has physical/mental challenge* | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.6 |
| **Child welfare and health** | | | | | | |
| Orphanhood (children under 18) | | | | | | |
| *Both parents dead* | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.8 |
| *Father only* | 6.1 | 1.4 | 7.7 | 4.3 | 7.8 | 4.5 |
| *Mother only* | 2.4 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 2.1 |
| Fostering (children under 18) | | | | | | |
| *Both parents absent* | 7.3 | 1.6 | 6.7 | 8.0 | 3.0 | 11.4 |
| *Father only absent* | 11.2 | 2.2 | 16.1 | 5.4 | 13.4 | 9.1 |
| *Mother only absent* | 3.0 | 0.8 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.7 |
| Children under 5 | | | | | | |
| *Delivery by health professionals* | 43.5 | 4.1 | 49.4 | 36.9 | 33.4 | 51.2 |
| *Measles immunization* | 77.5 | 2.1 | 81.6 | 73.0 | 73.3 | 80.7 |
| *Fully vaccinated* | 36.6 | 4.4 | 47.4 | 24.6 | 31.2 | 40.7 |
| *Not vaccinated* | 10.0 | 2.0 | 9.2 | 10.9 | 15.1 | 6.2 |
| *Stunted* | 28.4 | 2.9 | 28.9 | 27.9 | 30.4 | 27.0 |
| *Wasted* | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 2.4 |
| *Underweight* | 14.2 | 2.2 | 14.5 | 14.0 | 15.4 | 13.4 |

** 1.96 standard deviations*

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 The Hanang District CWIQ

This report presents district level analysis of data collected in the Hanang 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.

Although beyond the purpose of this report, the results of Hanang 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: Bahi DC, Bariadi DC, Bukoba DC, Bunda DC, Dodoma MC, Kahama DC, Karagwe DC, Kasulu DC, Kibondo DC, Kigoma DC, Kilosa DC, Kishapu DC, Korogwe 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 Hanang 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.

Finally, it is important to highlight that the data entry was done by scanning the questionnaires, to minimise data entry errors and thus ensure high quality in the final dataset.

## 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 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 Hanang 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

**Table 1.1 Variables Used to Predict Consumption Expenditure in Arusha Region**

| | |
|---|---|
| ***Basic Variables*** | ***Household Assets*** |
| Size of the household | Ownership of a radio |
| Level of education of the household head | Ownership of an iron |
| Main source of income | Ownership of a watch |
| Main activity of the household head | Ownership of a motor vehicle |
| | Ownership of a bed |
| ***Household Amenities*** | Ownership of a sewing machine |
| Problems satisfying food needs | Main material in the walls |
| Type of toilet in the household | Land ownership |
| Fuel used for cooking | |
| | ***Village Level Variables*** |
| | Share of households with piped water |
| | Share of households with a bank account |

Source: HBS 2000/2001 for Arusha Region

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 needs1.

The Hanang 2006 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. The model wrongly predicts a non-poor household to be poor in 10.6 percent of the cases, and vice versa in 9.4 percent of the households. This gives an overall percentage of correct predictions of 80.0 percent.

When the model is applied to the CWIQ 2006 data for Hanang DC, the share of households living in poverty is 31 percent. This rate is consistent with the 29 percent estimated for Arusha with the HBS. However, it must be kept in mind that the aim of the model is not estimating poverty rates, but determining 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.

**Table 1.2 : Predicted and Observed Poverty Rates, Arusha Region, 2000/01**

| Predicted | Observed | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Non-Poor | Poor | Total |
| **Non-Poor** | 60.6 | 9.4 | 70.0 |
| **Poor** | 10.6 | 19.4 | 30.1 |
| **Total** | 71.2 | 28.8 | 100.0 |

Source: HBS 2000/01 for Arusha Region

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 Hanang 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

**Table 1.3: Cluster Location**

| | Median Time (in minutes) to: | | | Poverty Rate | Estimated Number of Households |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | District Capital | All-Weather Road | Public Transport | | |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Remote | 180.0 | 180.0 | 420.0 | 31.2 | 9,450 |
| Accessible | 45.0 | 25.0 | 180.0 | 30.6 | 27,240 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

[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 1.4: Socio-economic Group, Poverty Rate, and Location**

| | Poverty Rate | Percentage Living in | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Remote Clusters | Accessible Clusters |
| **Socio-Economic Group** | | | |
| Employees | 27.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Self-Employed Agriculture | 32.7 | 72.0 | 28.0 |
| Self-Employed Other | 8.3 | 89.0 | 11.0 |
| Other | 34.6 | 77.7 | 22.3 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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 median of each of the variables used to construct the cluster location.

Table 1.3 shows that the poverty rate does not differ substantially by cluster location, with both types of villages reporting rates of 31 percent.

### 1.3.3 Socio-economic Group

The socio-economic group that a household belongs to depends on the employment of the household head. Throughout the report heads 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 the poverty rate is highest for households whose main income earner is self-employed in agriculture or in other activities, at rates of 33 and 35 percent, respectively. In turn, poverty is lowest for households where the
main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 8 percent. The poverty rate for employees is 27 percent. In addition, households from the latter group are the most likely to be located in remote villages, at 100 percent, whereas the self-employed in agriculture are the most likely to be located in accessible villages, at 28 percent.

The socio-economic group of the household by gender of the household head is shown in Table 1.5. 83 percent of the households is headed by a male. The share of female-headed households is highest for the 'other' category at 33 percent, and lowest for the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 7 percent.

Table 1.6 shows the breakdown of socio-economic groups by main activity of the household heads. As expected, the main economic activity in the district is agriculture, to which 73 percent of the household heads is dedicated. Employees are mostly dedicated to mining, manufacturing, energy or construction, with a share of 100 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities are mostly dedicated to services (90 percent). The 'other' category is divided between household duties and other at 34 and 37 percent, respectively.

**Table 1.5: Socio-economic Group of the Household and Gender of the Household Head**

| | Male | Female | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | |
| Employees | 90.3 | 9.7 | 100.0 |
| Self-Employed Agriculture | 82.9 | 17.1 | 100.0 |
| Self-Employed Other | 95.6 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| Other | 67.4 | 32.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 83.3 | 16.7 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

**Table 1.6: Socio-economic Group of the Household and Main Economic Activity of the Household Head**

| | Agriculture | Mining ManufacturingEnergy Construction | Private and Public Services | Household Duties | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | |
| Employees | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-Employed Agriculture | 84.2 | 0.4 | 9.0 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| Self-Employed Other | 2.5 | 2.5 | 89.6 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 100.0 |
| Other | 13.3 | 0.0 | 16.5 | 33.7 | 36.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 72.8 | 2.8 | 15.0 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 100.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

# 1 Inroduction

# 2 VILLAGE, POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

## 2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the Hanang DC 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, 6 percent of the population is 60 years old or over, whereas 50 percent is under 15 years old. The remaining 44 percent is between 15 and 59 years old. There are no strong differences by cluster location, but poor households have a higher share in the 0-14 group and lower shares in the remaining groups than non-poor households.

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. The breakdown by cluster location does not show strong differences. However, the breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households have a higher dependency rate than non-poor households, at 1.5 and 1.0 respectively.

The dependency ratio increases with the number of household members, from 0.7 for households with 1 or 2 members, to 1.4 for households with 7 or more members. The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the 'other' group has the highest dependency ratio (2.0), whereas the self-employed in agriculture and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the lowest ratio (1.2 for each group). The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that the dependency ratio in male-headed households is slightly higher than in female-headed households, at 1.2 and 1.1, respectively.

Table 2.3 shows the percent distribution of households by number of household members. The mean household size is 5.5 individuals. Households with at most two individuals only represent 12 percent of all households in the district. The figure for households with 7 or more members is 34 percent.

**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** | 24.3 | 22.4 | 3.1 | 49.8 | 26.1 | 21.3 | 2.8 | 50.2 | 50.3 | 43.8 | 5.9 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 24.2 | 21.3 | 3.0 | 48.5 | 26.4 | 21.9 | 3.1 | 51.5 | 50.6 | 43.3 | 6.1 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 24.3 | 23.7 | 3.3 | 51.3 | 25.7 | 20.6 | 2.4 | 48.7 | 50.0 | 44.4 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 27.1 | 19.8 | 2.3 | 49.1 | 30.2 | 19.3 | 1.4 | 50.9 | 57.3 | 39.1 | 3.6 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 22.1 | 24.5 | 3.8 | 50.3 | 22.9 | 22.9 | 3.9 | 49.7 | 45.0 | 47.3 | 7.6 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

**Table 2.2: Dependency ratio**

| | 0-4 years | 5-14 years | 0-14 years | 15-64 years | 65+ years | Total | Dependency ratio |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 1.0 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 5.5 | 1.2 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 1.0 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 5.6 | 1.2 |
| Remote | 1.0 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 5.4 | 1.2 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 1.4 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 7.7 | 1.5 |
| Non-poor | 0.8 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 4.5 | 1.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 3-4 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 3.6 | 0.8 |
| 5-6 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 5.5 | 1.2 |
| 7+ | 1.5 | 3.4 | 4.9 | 3.5 | 0.1 | 8.5 | 1.4 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 1.2 | 3.1 | 4.3 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 7.8 | 1.3 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 1.0 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 5.5 | 1.2 |
| Self-employed - other | 1.2 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 5.7 | 1.2 |
| Other | 0.7 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 2.0 |
| **Gender of Household Head** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 1.1 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 5.8 | 1.2 |
| Female | 0.5 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 4.0 | 1.1 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

**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** | 11.9 | 27.5 | 26.9 | 33.7 | 100.0 | 5.5 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 12.4 | 25.3 | 29.0 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 5.6 |
| Remote | 11.3 | 30.0 | 24.5 | 34.1 | 100.0 | 5.4 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 1.0 | 2.3 | 28.4 | 68.2 | 100.0 | 7.7 |
| Non-poor | 16.7 | 38.7 | 26.2 | 18.4 | 100.0 | 4.5 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 8.6 | 13.6 | 77.8 | 100.0 | 7.8 |
| Self-employed - agric | 12.1 | 27.1 | 27.5 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 5.5 |
| Self-employed - other | 6.2 | 28.5 | 30.2 | 35.0 | 100.0 | 5.7 |
| Other | 21.3 | 40.5 | 17.4 | 20.8 | 100.0 | 4.5 |
| **Gender of Household Head** | | | | | | |
| Male | 9.7 | 23.5 | 29.4 | 37.4 | 100.0 | 5.8 |
| Female | 23.1 | 47.5 | 14.2 | 15.2 | 100.0 | 4.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages tend to be larger than households in remote villages, with means of 5.6 and 5.4 members, respectively. The difference by poverty status is more pronounced, with poor households reporting a mean household size of 7.7 members, and non-poor households reporting 4.5 members on average.

Regarding socio-economic groups, the employees have the highest mean household size, at 7.8, while the 'other' socio-economic group has the lowest at 4.5 members.

Finally, households headed by males are larger than female headed households: the former have 5.8 members in average, whereas the latter have only 4.0 members. This difference partly owes to the fact

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

| | Head | Spouse | Child | Parents | Other relative | Not related | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 18.2 | 13.7 | 58.6 | 0.9 | 8.3 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 18.0 | 12.9 | 59.2 | 1.1 | 8.5 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 18.4 | 14.7 | 58.0 | 0.6 | 8.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 13.0 | 11.1 | 67.4 | 0.5 | 7.6 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 22.1 | 15.7 | 52.0 | 1.1 | 8.8 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | |
| 0- 9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 91.2 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| 10-19 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 15.2 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| 20-29 | 24.5 | 32.0 | 35.4 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 46.7 | 47.4 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 56.4 | 42.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 78.7 | 17.9 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 65.9 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 12.4 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 30.4 | 0.1 | 60.8 | 0.2 | 8.0 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Female | 6.1 | 27.2 | 56.5 | 1.5 | 8.6 | 0.2 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

that, as shown in Section 2.4, female household heads rarely have a spouse.

## 2.3 Main Household Characteristics

Table 2.4 shows the percent distribution of total population by relationship to the head of household.

No particular trends emerge by analysing by cluster location. However, the analysis by poverty status shows that the share of 'child' is higher in poor households, whereas non-poor households report higher shares of 'head' and 'spouse'.

When analysing by age-groups, it is clear that the category 'other relatives' is mostly comprised by children under 19 years old. This highlights the importance of the analysis of fostering and orphan status. After the age of 30, most of the population is either head of their own household or spouse to the head of the household.

The gender breakdown shows that males are more likely to be household heads than females, with shares of 30 and 6 percent, respectively. In turn, females are more likely to be spouses to the household head than males, at rates of 27 and less than 1 percent, respectively.

Table 2.5 shows the percent distribution of the population age 12 and above by marital status. Overall, 42 percent of the population has never been married. In addition, 38 percent is married and monogamous, and 9 percent is married and polygamous. Despite virtually nobody in the district being 'officially' divorced, 4 percent of the population is 'unofficially' separated. Informal unions constitute 1 percent of the population and 5 percent is widowed.

There are no strong differences in marital status by cluster location. However, the breakdown by poverty status shows that members of poor households are more likely to have never been married, whereas members of non-poor households are more likely to be in a monogamous marriage.

The age breakdown shows that the 'polygamous-married' category peaks at the 40-49 group, at 28 percent. For the population after 25 years old, married-monogamous is the most common category. 'Separated' and 'widowed' show higher shares for the older cohorts. 'Never married' also shows correlation with age, decreasing rapidly as the population gets older.

Around 48 percent of the men have never been married, but for women the figure is only 37 percent. While 8 percent of women are widowed and 5 percent

**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** | 42.2 | 38.4 | 9.0 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 43.9 | 36.6 | 8.1 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 4.4 | 5.4 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 40.2 | 40.7 | 10.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 49.9 | 33.0 | 9.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 37.1 | 42.1 | 9.1 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | | |
| 12-14 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 15-19 | 96.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 20-24 | 57.4 | 34.6 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 25-29 | 17.1 | 67.6 | 7.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 2.4 | 75.8 | 11.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 1.8 | 59.5 | 27.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 0.7 | 54.7 | 20.6 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 8.4 | 14.7 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 0.7 | 39.9 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.3 | 25.8 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 47.5 | 37.5 | 8.9 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 3.7 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Female | 36.7 | 39.4 | 9.2 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 8.3 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

separated, the shares for males are 1 and 4 percent, respectively.

Table 2.6 shows the percent distribution of the population age 5 and above by socio-economic group. Overall, 29 percent of the population is self-employed in agriculture, with 67 percent in other activities. No strong differences are observed between accessible and remote clusters. The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households have a higher share in 'self-employed agriculture' and 'self-employed other' than poor households, while the latter report a higher share of 'other' (unemployed, inactive unpaid, or household workers) than the former.

The analysis of the age-groups is particularly interesting. The share of employees peaks at 7 percent for the 50-59 cohort. The share for self-employed other is higher for the population in the 20-49 age-groups, at around 7 percent. The share of self-employed in agriculture tends to increase with age, peaking at 75 percent for the 50-59 cohort. On the contrary, the category 'other' tends to decrease with age, showing a sharp decrease between 15-19 and 20-29, from 91 to 48 percent, then decreases steadily until 15 percent for the 50-59 cohort.

The gender breakdown shows that males are more likely to be self-employed (whether in agriculture or non-agricultural activities) than women. In turn, females are more likely to be in the 'other' category, with a share of 77 percent against 57 percent for the males.

Table 2.7 shows the percent distribution of the population aged 5 and above by highest level of education. Roughly 35 percent of the population has no education, 31 percent has some primary, and 28 percent has completed primary. The remaining levels have shares of at most 2 percent each.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote villages report a higher share of population with no education, while accessible villages report a higher share with completed primary. The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report a higher share of population with no education or with just some primary than non-poor households. In turn the latter report higher shares with completed primary and some secondary.

The age breakdown shows that 72 percent of the children between 5 and 9 have no formal education, but 89 percent of the children 10-14 have some or complete primary. Rates of no education are lowest for the population in the 15-19 cohort (6 percent) and higher for the older groups. In the groups between 20 and 39 years old, the most common is completed primary.

The gender breakdown shows that females have a higher share of uneducated population than males: 38 against 32 percent, but at the same time similar shares with complete primary. The share of males reporting some primary is higher than that of females (34 and 29 percent, respectively).

## 2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household

Table 2.8 shows the percent distribution of household heads by marital status. Overall, 61 percent of the household heads is married and monogamous, 21 divorced, separated or widowed, 15 percent married and polygamous, 3 percent has never been married and a further 1 percent lives in an informal union.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote villages report higher shares of married household heads, monogamous as well as polygamous, than accessible clusters. In turn, the latter report a higher share in widowed/divorced/separated.

Regarding poverty status, heads of non-poor households are more likely to be single (never married, divorced, separated or widowed), while heads of poor households are more likely to be married, either monogamous or polygamous.

The breakdown by age-group shows that the 'married-monogamous' category decreases with age, as 'married-polygamous' and 'divorced, separated or widowed' increase.

Most female household heads are divorced, separated or widowed (91 percent), whereas for males, this category roughly represents 7 percent. Most male household heads are married, monogamous or polygamous (72 and 17 percent, respectively).

Table 2.9 shows the percent distribution of household heads by socio-economic group. It is worth remembering that the socio-economic group of the household is determined by the type of employment of the main income earner of the household, who not always the household head. As expected, the great majority of the district's household heads belongs to the self-employed in agriculture, with a share of 85 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities represent 8 percent

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

| | Employee | Self-employed Agriculture | Self-employed Other | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 0.8 | 29.4 | 2.9 | 67.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 1.2 | 29.9 | 3.4 | 65.6 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 0.3 | 28.8 | 2.3 | 68.7 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.3 | 25.4 | 1.3 | 72.9 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 1.1 | 32.4 | 4.0 | 62.5 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | |
| 5- 9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 10-14 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 99.6 | 100.0 |
| 15-19 | 0.3 | 8.1 | 1.1 | 90.5 | 100.0 |
| 20-29 | 0.4 | 45.7 | 5.9 | 48.0 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 1.2 | 63.0 | 6.5 | 29.4 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 3.1 | 69.0 | 7.7 | 20.2 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 6.8 | 74.6 | 3.8 | 14.8 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 0.0 | 62.2 | 3.1 | 34.7 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | |
| Male | 1.1 | 37.2 | 4.3 | 57.4 | 100.0 |
| Female | 0.4 | 21.5 | 1.4 | 76.7 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

of the household heads, the 'other' category (unemployed, inactive and household workers) represents 5 percent, and the employees are a further 2 percent.

The analysis by cluster location shows that the share of household heads self-employed in agriculture in remote villages is higher than in accessible villages, with shares of 90 and 80 percent, respectively. In accessible villages, household heads are more likely to be in the 'self-employed other' group than heads of households in remote villages, with shares of 11 and 5 percent, respectively.

Heads of poor households belong to the 'self-employed agriculture' group more frequently than non-poor households. On the other hand, the heads of non-poor households belong to the 'self-employed other' group more often than the heads of poor households.

The breakdown by age of the household head shows interesting insights. For all age-groups, 'self-employed agriculture' is the most important category, representing at least 4 out of 5 household heads in each age-group. The 'employee' category peaks at 4 percent for the 40-49 and 50-59 age-groups. The 'self-employed – other' is lower for the 50-59 and 60+ cohorts. The 'other' category gains importance in the 60+ age-group, with a share 12 percent, as

**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** | 35.2 | 2.4 | 31.4 | 27.7 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 32.0 | 3.4 | 30.4 | 29.7 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 39.1 | 1.2 | 32.6 | 25.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 39.5 | 2.8 | 34.8 | 22.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 32.0 | 2.1 | 28.8 | 31.9 | 3.6 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | | |
| 5- 9 | 72.1 | 10.4 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 10-14 | 10.4 | 1.2 | 85.6 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 15-19 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 45.8 | 43.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| 20-29 | 13.8 | 0.0 | 13.0 | 64.4 | 7.9 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 26.2 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 62.7 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 43.4 | 0.0 | 12.1 | 40.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 58.7 | 0.0 | 28.7 | 3.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 85.1 | 0.0 | 12.9 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 32.3 | 2.2 | 33.8 | 28.1 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| Female | 38.2 | 2.6 | 29.0 | 27.2 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang 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** | 2.5 | 60.7 | 14.6 | 1.0 | 21.3 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 2.7 | 58.7 | 13.3 | 1.5 | 23.9 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 2.2 | 63.0 | 16.0 | 0.4 | 18.4 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 66.3 | 18.6 | 0.5 | 14.6 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 3.6 | 58.2 | 12.8 | 1.2 | 24.3 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 20-29 | 5.6 | 77.2 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 7.9 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 2.1 | 74.4 | 8.1 | 0.5 | 14.9 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 3.1 | 54.8 | 24.7 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 0.9 | 58.8 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 26.2 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 1.1 | 36.9 | 21.6 | 0.0 | 40.5 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | |
| Male | 2.3 | 72.1 | 17.2 | 1.0 | 7.4 | 100.0 |
| Female | 3.5 | 3.8 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 90.5 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

it includes the economically inactive population.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that in male-headed households, the main income earner is more likely to be self-employed in agriculture than in female-headed households. In the latter, the main income earner is more likely to be in the 'other' category than in the former.

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

| | Employed | Self-employed Agriculture | Self-employed Other | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 2.2 | 84.5 | 8.0 | 5.4 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 2.9 | 80.0 | 10.6 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 1.3 | 89.6 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 1.9 | 89.9 | 2.2 | 6.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 2.3 | 82.1 | 10.6 | 5.1 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 20-29 | 1.8 | 86.2 | 11.3 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 1.8 | 86.4 | 8.6 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 3.8 | 80.0 | 10.3 | 6.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 4.2 | 85.7 | 5.9 | 4.1 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 0.0 | 84.0 | 3.9 | 12.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | |
| Male | 2.3 | 84.1 | 9.2 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| Female | 1.3 | 86.2 | 2.1 | 10.5 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

Table 2.10 shows the percent distribution of the heads of household by highest level of education. Overall, around only 4 percent of the household heads has any education after primary. 40 percent of the household heads has no education, 16 percent some primary and 40 percent have completed primary.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that household heads from remote villages are more likely to have just some primary than household heads from accessible villages. Poverty status is strongly 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 poverty status. However, the difference is still important: household heads from poor households are more likely to have no education than heads from non-poor households, whereas the latter are more likely to have complete primary or post secondary studies than the former.

The age breakdown shows that 80 percent

**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** | 40.2 | 15.8 | 40.2 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 41.3 | 12.1 | 41.3 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 38.8 | 20.0 | 38.9 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 46.8 | 15.4 | 36.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 37.2 | 16.0 | 41.8 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | |
| 15-19 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 20-29 | 13.2 | 16.4 | 68.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
| 30-39 | 20.7 | 7.1 | 69.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| 40-49 | 38.4 | 14.8 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| 50-59 | 51.5 | 32.4 | 4.9 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 9.9 | 100.0 |
| 60 and above | 80.2 | 16.8 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 34.9 | 16.9 | 44.1 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Female | 66.3 | 10.4 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

**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** | 2.4 | 6.1 | 0.5 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | |
| Accessible | 1.6 | 7.7 | 0.6 |
| Remote | 3.2 | 4.3 | 0.3 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | |
| Poor | 2.6 | 7.8 | 0.1 |
| Non-poor | 2.1 | 4.5 | 0.8 |
| **Age** | | | |
| 0-4 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 0.0 |
| 5-9 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 0.4 |
| 10-14 | 3.4 | 8.6 | 0.8 |
| 15-17 | 2.4 | 12.0 | 1.1 |
| **Gender** | | | |
| Male | 2.5 | 4.7 | 0.7 |
| Female | 2.2 | 7.5 | 0.2 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

of household heads aged 60 or over has no education, and a further 17 percent just some primary. Completed primary represents almost 70 percent for the groups between 20 and 39; but only 43 percent in the 40-49, and 5 percent of the 50-59 cohorts. In the latter groups, 'some primary' gains importance.

The analysis by gender shows that female household heads are more likely to have no education than males, with rates of 66 and 17 percent, respectively. Males report a higher share with some primary than females. Furthermore, 44 percent of the male household heads has completed primary, against 21 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 1 percent of children under 18 lost both parents, 2 percent lost only their mother and 6 percent lost only their father. This amounts to 9 percent of all children under 18 who lost at least one parent at the time of the survey.

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 15 percent of the children between 15 and 17 years lost at least one parent, and 13 of the children in that age-group 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 21 percent of children under 18 were living in non-nuclear households at the time of the survey.

Children from accessible clusters are more likely to live in non-nuclear households than children from remote clusters, at 26 and 17 percent, respectively. In turn, 23 percent of children from non-poor households lives in non-nuclear households, while the share for poor households is 20 percent.

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

There appears to be no strong correlation between gender and foster status.

**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** | 11.2 | 3.0 | 7.3 | 21.4 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 16.1 | 2.8 | 6.7 | 25.6 |
| Remote | 5.4 | 3.1 | 8.0 | 16.5 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 13.4 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 19.6 |
| Non-poor | 9.1 | 2.7 | 11.4 | 23.2 |
| **Age** | | | | |
| 0-4 | 7.2 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 11.8 |
| 5-9 | 9.4 | 2.1 | 6.4 | 17.9 |
| 10-14 | 15.3 | 5.1 | 10.4 | 30.8 |
| 15-17 | 17.2 | 3.8 | 14.2 | 35.2 |
| **Gender** | | | | |
| Male | 10.7 | 3.7 | 6.8 | 21.2 |
| Female | 11.8 | 2.2 | 7.7 | 21.7 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

2 Village, population and household characteristics

# 3 EDUCATION

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

The first section presents an overview on selected education indicators. The second section provides information on dissatisfaction and non-attendance along with the reasons behind them. School enrolment and drop-out rates are presented in the fourth section. These give a picture on the enrolment patterns according to the age of pupils. The final section of the chapter gives information on adult and youth literacy status within the district.

## 3.1 Overview of the Education indicators

### 3.1.1Literacy

Table 3.1 shows the main education indicators for the district. 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. The adult literacy rate[1] is 65 percent. Literacy rates differ between accessible and remote villages at 68 and 62 percent respectively. Likewise, the literacy rate among non-poor households is higher than that of poor households at 68 and 61 percent respectively.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that literacy rates are higher among the employees (88 percent). The gender breakdown shows an important literacy rate gap between men and women. The literacy rate among men is 15 percentage points higher than that of women at 73 percent and 58 percent respectively.

Orphaned children have a literacy rate of 91 percent, whereas the rate for non-orphaned children is 3 points lower, at 88 percent. Finally, foster status does not show correlation with literacy rate.

[1] The Adult literacy rate is defined for the population aged 15 and over.

### 3.1.2 Primary School

### 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 the nearest primary school. Overall, 69 percent of primary school-age children live within 30 minutes of a primary school. Primary school access is remarkably higher in accessible clusters than in remote clusters, at 82 and 52 percent respectively.

Almost three quarters (73 percent) of the children aged 7 to 13 living in non-poor households live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school compared to 65 percent of those living in poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that virtually all children living in households belonging to the ‘employee’ category live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school compared to 51 percent of the children living in households where the main income earner belongs to the ‘other’ category.

Orphaned children have a higher access rate to primary schools than non-orphaned children, at 74 and 68 percent respectively. On the other hand, 70 percent of non-fostered children has access to primary schools, whereas the rate for fostered children is 48 percent. Finally, gender does not show strong correlation with primary school access.

### Enrolment

The two main measures of enrolment, the Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) and the Net Enrolment Rate (NER) are analysed in this section. GER is defined as the ratio of all individuals attending school, irrespective of their age, to the population of school-age children. If there is a large proportion of non-school-age individuals attending school, the GER may exceed 100 percent. Primary school GER 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.

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

The NER provides more information for analysis than the GER. While trends in the actual participation of school-age children in formal education are in part captured by the NER, the GER, at best provides a broad indication of general participation in education and of the capacity of the schools. The GER 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 GER was 106 percent at the time of the survey. This figure indicates that all individuals who were at primary school constitute 106 percent of all children of primary school-age in the district. The NER further shows that 77 percent of all primary school-age children were attending school.

While the GER for households located in accessible clusters is 109 percent, the rate for households located in remote clusters is 102 percent. Likewise, NER for households in accessible clusters is higher than that of households in remote clusters at 81 and 71 percent respectively.

**Table 3.1: Education indicators**

| | | Primary | | | | Secondary | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Adult Literacy rate | access | gross enrollment | net enrollment | satisfaction | access | gross enrollment | net enrollment | satisfaction |
| **Total** | 65.4 | 68.7 | 105.8 | 76.7 | 65.9 | 11.4 | 12.7 | 6.9 | 65.3 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 68.0 | 81.7 | 108.9 | 81.2 | 64.4 | 14.5 | 16.1 | 10.4 | 63.2 |
| Remote | 62.4 | 52.4 | 102.0 | 71.0 | 67.9 | 7.5 | 8.4 | 2.6 | 70.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 61.0 | 65.1 | 101.3 | 73.1 | 71.3 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 3.3 | 66.4 |
| Non-poor | 68.0 | 72.6 | 110.9 | 80.7 | 60.5 | 16.9 | 19.4 | 10.2 | 65.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 88.3 | 100.0 | 111.9 | 88.9 | 57.3 | 53.2 | 46.0 | 30.0 | 17.4 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 65.1 | 67.2 | 106.4 | 75.7 | 68.7 | 9.0 | 11.9 | 6.2 | 69.9 |
| Self-employed - other | 81.2 | 78.7 | 106.9 | 86.4 | 56.3 | 26.2 | 12.2 | 7.4 | 100.0 |
| Other | 25.4 | 51.0 | 88.2 | 67.5 | 33.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 72.5 | 68.4 | 110.3 | 76.2 | 66.7 | 14.0 | 12.6 | 6.5 | 62.8 |
| Female | 57.9 | 69.0 | 101.7 | 77.2 | 65.1 | 8.3 | 12.7 | 7.3 | 68.1 |
| **Orphan status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Orphaned | 90.6 | 74.0 | 116.2 | 75.1 | 61.7 | 4.0 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 100.0 |
| Not-orphaned | 88.1 | 67.7 | 104.3 | 76.9 | 66.6 | 13.3 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 48.7 |
| **Foster status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Fostered | 88.8 | 48.2 | 97.1 | 73.5 | 67.6 | 21.1 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 100.0 |
| Not-fostered | 88.6 | 69.7 | 105.3 | 76.9 | 66.5 | 11.9 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 54.9 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Hanang 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.

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

| | | Reasons for dissatisfaction | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent dissatisfied | Books/ supplies | Poor Teaching | Lack of teachers | Teachers absent | Lack of space | Facilties in bad condition | High fees | Other |
| **Total** | 33.2 | 25.4 | 8.9 | 51.0 | 2.2 | 36.0 | 31.6 | 5.5 | 5.6 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 33.9 | 27.4 | 7.9 | 34.0 | 0.8 | 48.2 | 31.9 | 6.3 | 2.9 |
| Remote | 32.2 | 22.2 | 10.6 | 77.5 | 4.5 | 17.1 | 31.1 | 4.3 | 9.8 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 28.3 | 19.1 | 10.0 | 58.3 | 5.5 | 38.6 | 30.0 | 4.5 | 6.6 |
| Non-poor | 37.6 | 29.6 | 8.2 | 46.1 | 0.0 | 34.3 | 32.7 | 6.2 | 4.9 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 44.8 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 81.8 | 0.0 | 69.7 | 25.2 | 0.0 | 13.1 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 30.7 | 23.8 | 9.5 | 52.4 | 2.9 | 32.1 | 32.2 | 6.3 | 5.7 |
| Self-employed - other | 38.1 | 24.4 | 11.3 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 63.0 | 33.7 | 6.7 | 3.5 |
| Other | 64.0 | 64.6 | 7.6 | 23.4 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 27.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 33.3 | 22.5 | 10.0 | 52.7 | 2.3 | 38.8 | 30.5 | 4.7 | 4.0 |
| Female | 33.1 | 28.3 | 7.8 | 49.3 | 2.1 | 33.1 | 32.7 | 6.4 | 7.2 |
| **Type of school** | | | | | | | | | |
| Primary | 34.1 | 25.4 | 9.3 | 50.3 | 2.5 | 40.6 | 30.4 | 1.1 | 5.9 |
| Government | 34.1 | 25.4 | 9.3 | 50.3 | 2.5 | 40.6 | 30.4 | 1.1 | 5.9 |
| Private | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Secondary | 34.7 | 25.1 | 11.2 | 59.8 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 43.3 | 32.3 | 6.0 |
| Government | 36.1 | 26.6 | 11.9 | 57.2 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 39.7 | 34.3 | 6.4 |
| Private | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 52.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 22.2 | 25.7 | 0.0 | 51.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.9 | 45.7 | 0.0 |
| Government | 19.3 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 69.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.9 | 30.8 | 0.0 |
| Private | 27.4 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 33.3 | 29.9 | 0.0 | 29.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.1 | 58.7 | 0.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

Furthermore, while GER for non-poor households is 111 percent, the rate for poor households is 101 percent. Similarly, NER for non-poor households is higher than that of poor households at 81 and 73 percent respectively.

GER and NER are highest among people living in households belonging to the 'employee' category at 112 and 89 percent respectively. On the other hand, GER and NER are lowest among households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category at 88 and 68 percent respectively.

Furthermore, while GER for males is 110 percent, the share for females is 102 percent. In contrast gender does not show strong correlation with NER.

Surprisingly, the breakdown by orphan status shows higher GER for orphaned children. In contrast, non-fostered children have higher GER than fostered children at 105 and 97 percent respectively. Likewise, non-fostered children have a higher NER than fostered children at 77 and 74 percent respectively. On the other hand, orphan status does not show strong correlation with NER. It is worth remembering the small sample size in the orphaned and fostered category (see chapter 2), as well as that foster and orphan status are strongly correlated with age: orphaned and fostered children have higher mean ages than non-orphaned and non-fostered children.

## 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 school.

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

| | | Reasons not currently attending | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent not attending | Completed school | Distance | Cost | Work | Illness | Pregnancy | Got married | Useless/ uninteresting | Failed exam | Awaits admission | Dismissed |
| **Total** | 20.4 | 35.7 | 1.1 | 7.4 | 1.6 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 17.3 | 17.3 | 34.7 | 1.3 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 19.7 | 33.1 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 17.6 | 14.9 | 43.1 | 0.8 |
| Remote | 21.5 | 39.1 | 2.6 | 6.3 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 17.0 | 20.3 | 23.6 | 1.9 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 18.9 | 38.9 | 1.6 | 10.7 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 15.7 | 24.9 | 27.7 | 2.8 |
| Non-poor | 21.9 | 33.1 | 0.7 | 4.7 | 1.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 18.7 | 10.9 | 40.4 | 0.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 18.7 | 28.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 71.2 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 20.5 | 36.1 | 1.3 | 8.2 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 17.1 | 18.9 | 32.4 | 1.5 |
| Self-employed - other | 22.3 | 47.2 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 5.3 | 51.4 | 0.0 |
| Other | 17.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 74.2 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 20.5 | 37.4 | 2.2 | 8.1 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 23.9 | 11.6 | 31.0 | 2.5 |
| Female | 20.4 | 33.9 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 10.7 | 23.0 | 38.4 | 0.0 |
| **Age** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7-13 | 2.4 | 7.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.2 | 0.0 | 41.4 | 12.2 |
| 14-19 | 45.2 | 37.7 | 1.2 | 8.0 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 16.4 | 18.5 | 34.2 | 0.5 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

66 percent of all primary school pupils were satisfied with school. 68 percent of pupils living in remote clusters reported to be satisfied with their primary schools compared to 64 percent of pupils living in accessible clusters. Likewise, while 71 percent of pupils living in poor households reported to be satisfied with school, the share for pupils living in non-poor households is 61 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' have the highest rate of satisfaction with their primary schools at 69 percent, while pupils living in households belonging to the 'other' category have the lowest satisfaction rate at 34 percent.Furthermore, 67 percent of non-orphaned children reported to be satisfied with primary school compared to 62 percent of orphaned children. On the other hand, gender and foster status do not show strong correlation with primary school satisfaction rates.

## 3.1.3 Secondary School 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 the nearest secondary school.

Only 11 percent of all pupils in secondary school live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school. While 15 percent of pupils from accessible villages lives within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, the share for pupils living in remote villages is 8 percent. Similarly, 17 percent of pupils living in non-poor households lives within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, whereas the share for pupils living in poor households is 6 percent.

The socio-economic status of the household seems to be strongly correlated with the rate of access to secondary school. While pupils living in households belonging to the 'employee' category have the highest rate of access to secondary school at 53 percent, followed by those who belong to the 'self-employed other'

category (26 percent), the share for the 'other' category is virtually null.

While 14 percent of males live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, the share for females is 8 percent. On the other hand, the access rate for orphaned children is 4 percent, lower than that for non-orphaned children, at 13 percent. Likewise, while 21 percent of fostered children live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, the share for non-fostered children is 12 percent.

## Enrolment

As explained before, Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) 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 (NER) is defined as the ratio of school-age children enrolled at school to the population of school-age children. The secondary school-age is between 14 and 19 years old.

The GER and NER at secondary school are very low compared to primary school level. Overall, GER was 13 percent and NER was 7 percent. The secondary school GER for households located in accessible clusters is 8 percentage points higher than that of households located in remote clusters. Likewise, Secondary school NER is higher in accessible clusters than remote clusters at 10 and 3 percent respectively. Furthermore, both secondary GER and NER are higher in non-poor households than in poor households, with a difference of 13 and 7 percentage points respectively.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that employees are the category with highest GER and NER at 46 and 30 percent respectively, whereas the shares for the 'other' category is virtually null. Gender does not show strong correlation with GER and NER.

Finally, the GER and NER rates do not show important differences among orphaned and non-orphaned children. On the other hand, while the GER and NER for non-fostered children is 8 percent, the share for fostered children is 3 percent.

## Satisfaction

The majority (65 percent) of the population enrolled in secondary school is satisfied with school. 35 percent of this population reports to be dissatisfied with the secondary schools they attend. This satisfaction rate is lower than in primary schools (66 percent). The satisfaction rate is higher among people living in remote clusters than that of people living in accessible clusters, at 70 and 63 percent respectively. On the other hand, poverty status does not show strong correlation with secondary school satisfaction rates.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that virtually all pupils living in households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category are satisfied with secondary school, while the share for those living in households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category is virtually null.

68 percent of female pupils were satisfied with their school compared to only 63 percent of males. Among the individuals enrolled in secondary schools, a higher share of orphaned children reported to be satisfied with their schools than non-orphaned children. Virtually all orphaned children are satisfied with their schools compare to 49 percent of non-orphaned children. Similarly, virtually all fostered children reported to be satisfied with their secondary schools compared to 55 percent of non-fostered children.

## 3.2 Dissatisfaction

One of the aims of the survey is to inform on perceptions of quality of services received among individuals for whom these are provided. To obtain this information, primary and secondary school students who were not satisfied with school 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 'poor teaching' category. The 'facilities' category incorporates complaints regarding overcrowding and bad condition of facilities. The results are shown in Table 3.2.

Overall, 33 percent of the students who were enrolled in either primary or secondary school reported dissatisfaction with school. 51 percent of students reported lack of teachers as the cause of

their dissatisfaction. In addition, 36 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools due to lack of space whereas, 32 percent reported bad condition of facilities. While 25 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools due to lack of books and supplies, 9 percent reported poor teaching and 6 percent reported high fees.

The dissatisfaction rate for people living in accessible villages is 2 percentage points higher than that of those living in remote villages, at 34 and 32 percent respectively. Likewise, dissatisfaction rate for people living in non-poor households is slightly higher than that of people living in poor households at 38 and 28 percent respectively. Further breakdown of the data shows that the dissatisfaction rate due to lack of teachers among poor households is higher than that among non-poor households at 58 and 46 percent respectively. Likewise, while 78 percent of people living in remote clusters reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers, the share for those living in accessible clusters is 34 percent. In contrast, 48 percent of people living in accessible clusters reported dissatisfaction due to lack of space compared to 17 percent of people living in remote clusters.

The breakdown by socio-economic groups shows that the dissatisfaction rate among households belonging to the 'other' category is the highest (64 percent). At the same time the 'self-employed agriculture' category reported the lowest dissatisfaction rate (31 percent). It is also observed that 82 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers compared to 23 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category.

The gender breakdown shows that the dissatisfaction rate due to lack of space among males is higher than that among females at 39 and 33 percent respectively.

Those attending primary school reported to be most dissatisfied due to lack of teachers (50 percent) followed by lack of space (41 percent) while those attending secondary schools reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers (60 percent) followed by bad condition of facilities (43 percent).

## 3.3 Non-attendance

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

The district has about 20 percent of 7 to 19 year olds who were not attending school. Around 36 percent of the non-attending population did not attend because they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level. 35 percent reported that they were awaiting admission and 17 percent said either school was useless or uninteresting or they had failed standard four, seven or form four exams. 7 percent of respondents reported that they were not attending school due to cost and 3 percent had gotten married.

Cluster location, poverty status and gender do not show strong correlation with non-attendance rates. However, further breakdown of the data shows that 40 percent of children living in non-poor households were not attending school because they were awaiting admission compared to 28 percent of those living in poor households. Likewise, while 39 percent of children living in remote clusters were not attending school because they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level, the share for children living in accessible clusters was 33 percent It is also noticeable that while 6 percent of children living in poor households were not attending school due to marriage, the share for those living in non-poor households was 1 percent.

Furthermore, 22 percent of children from households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed other' category does not attend school compared to 17 percent of those from households belonging to the 'other' category. Further breakdown of the data shows that while 71 percent of children from households where the main income earner is an employee was not attending because they were awaiting admission, the share for those from households belonging to the 'other' category is virtually null.

Breakdown of the data shows that while 38 percent of girls were not attending

**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** | 76.2 | 77.2 | 76.7 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 1.2 |
| 7 | 32.1 | 30.2 | 31.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 8 | 56.6 | 75.1 | 65.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 9 | 90.7 | 80.2 | 85.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 10 | 87.1 | 93.8 | 90.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 11 | 92.1 | 95.8 | 94.1 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| 12 | 90.0 | 80.5 | 85.7 | 3.0 | 6.0 | 4.4 |
| 13 | 95.0 | 85.9 | 90.0 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 2.8 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Hanang 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** | 6.5 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 22.9 | 25.3 | 24.0 |
| 14 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 10.9 | 6.9 |
| 15 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 19.5 | 21.0 | 20.1 |
| 16 | 6.1 | 2.8 | 4.9 | 20.9 | 37.3 | 26.8 |
| 17 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 11.3 | 48.0 | 40.9 | 44.0 |
| 18 | 21.6 | 19.1 | 20.4 | 22.3 | 20.8 | 21.6 |
| 19 | 8.6 | 4.5 | 6.3 | 52.8 | 28.3 | 39.0 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

because they were awaiting admission, the share for boys is 31 percent. It is also observed that while 6 percent of females were not attending school due to marriage, the share for males was 1 percent.

Almost all primary school-aged children attend school, as their non-attendance rate is 2 percent. On the other hand, the share for secondary school-age children is 45 percent. 38 percent of secondary school-aged individuals not attending secondary school reported having completed school, while 41 percent of primary school-aged children not attending school reported that they were awaiting admission.

## 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 categorized 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 / (enrolled children + children who dropped out)).

### Primary School

Table 3.4 shows primary school net enrolment and drop-out rates. The drop-out rates at primary level are generally very low. Disaggregation of the data shows that at the time of the survey, the primary school drop-out rate was only 1 percent. Therefore, only enrolment rates will be analysed.

Overall, 77 percent of primary school-aged children were enrolled at the time of the survey. Out of those in primary school-age (7 to 13 years), 77 percent of girls and 76 percent of boys were enrolled. The required age at which children should start standard one is 7 years. However, data on primary school enrolment show that at the time of the survey only 31 percent of all seven year olds were enrolled. Children are most likely to be in school by the age of 11, where the NER is about 94 percent.

## Secondary School

Table 3.5 shows secondary net enrolment patterns by age. Secondary school enrolment rates are much lower than those at primary level. Only 7 percent of secondary school-aged children was enrolled compared to 77 percent in primary school. For a person following a normal school curriculum, i.e. started standard one at age 7, he/she is expected to start form one at age 14. The table shows that the biggest difference in enrolment rates is observed between age 18 and 19. Furthermore, 20 percent of 18 year olds reported to be enrolled at the time of the survey.

Drop-out rates among secondary school-age children (14 to 19 years) are higher compared to those of primary school. 24 percent of children of secondary school-age had dropped out in the year prior to the survey. In general, the highest drop-out rate is observed among 17 year olds (at 44 percent). The highest drop-out rate among males is at the age 19 while female drop out rate is highest at age of 17.

## 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 data 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. Furthermore, questions that helped determine adult literacy were only asked for individuals aged 15 or older.

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

| | Male | Female | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 72.5 | 57.9 | 65.4 |
| 15-19 years | 91.2 | 84.6 | 88.2 |
| 20-29 years | 84.3 | 76.0 | 80.5 |
| 30-39 years | 80.3 | 59.5 | 68.6 |
| 40-49 years | 66.2 | 42.7 | 53.6 |
| 50-59 years | 47.3 | 28.9 | 40.5 |
| 60+ years | 22.1 | 2.7 | 12.9 |
| **Accessible** | 73.8 | 62.4 | 68.0 |
| 15-19 years | 94.3 | 88.8 | 91.7 |
| 20-29 years | 90.8 | 80.7 | 85.8 |
| 30-39 years | 82.3 | 65.2 | 72.9 |
| 40-49 years | 56.2 | 49.4 | 52.5 |
| 50-59 years | 50.9 | 40.7 | 46.4 |
| 60+ years | 15.7 | 2.1 | 8.7 |
| **Remote** | 71.2 | 52.2 | 62.4 |
| 15-19 years | 87.8 | 78.9 | 84.0 |
| 20-29 years | 78.0 | 69.9 | 74.6 |
| 30-39 years | 77.7 | 53.0 | 63.4 |
| 40-49 years | 75.6 | 35.8 | 54.6 |
| 50-59 years | 43.8 | 5.0 | 33.0 |
| 60+ years | 29.1 | 3.6 | 18.3 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base is population age 15+

## Adult Literacy

Overall, 65 percent of the population aged 15 and above in the district are literate. The difference in literacy rates among males and females is about 15 percentage points at 73 and 58 percent respectively. Individuals aged between 15 and 19 have the highest literacy rate (88 percent) while only 13 percent of those who are above 60 years know how to read and write. There are remarkable gender differences in literacy. Furthermore, the gap is larger for the older cohorts.

The literacy rate in accessible villages is 6 percentage points higher than in remote villages. The literacy rate for the 15-19 age-group in accessible villages is 92 percent, whereas for remote villages the rate is 84 percent. Furthermore, in accessible villages the literacy rate of men is 12 percentage points higher than that of women. In remote villages, the difference increases to 19 percentage points. On the contrary, while the literacy rate of women in accessible villages is about 10 percentage points higher than that of women in remote villages, the difference in literacy rates between men in accessible and remote villages is only 3 percentage points. Finally, there is a significant difference in literacy rates among men and women above 60 years in both cluster locations. In both cases, the literacy rates of men over 60 years are above 14 percentage points higher than that of women.

## Youth Literacy

Table 3.7 shows literacy rates among the youth by age, gender and residential location. Youth literacy rate is calculated for all persons between 15 and 24 years old. The literacy rate for this group is 87 percent, but the gender difference is important. While the literacy rate for men is 90 percent, the rate for women is 7 percentage points lower, at 83 percent.

Analysis by age-groups shows that 21 to 22 year olds have the highest literacy rate at 92 percent. Youth of 18 to 20 years have the highest literacy rate in accessible villages at 96 percent, while in remote villages the literacy rate is highest among the youth of 21 to 22 years at 89 percent. However, youth literacy rate in accessible villages is higher than that of youth in remote villages at 92 and 81 percent respectively.

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

| | Male | Female | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 90.1 | 83.1 | 87.0 |
| 15-17 years | 90.1 | 81.2 | 86.4 |
| 18-20 years | 91.8 | 81.7 | 86.7 |
| 21-22 years | 87.8 | 96.7 | 91.9 |
| 23-24 years | 88.0 | 82.0 | 86.0 |
| **Accessible** | 93.9 | 90.0 | 92.1 |
| 15-17 years | 91.9 | 84.2 | 88.5 |
| 18-20 years | 98.0 | 94.4 | 96.1 |
| 21-22 years | 92.6 | 94.7 | 93.6 |
| 23-24 years | 92.4 | 92.4 | 92.4 |
| **Remote** | 86.3 | 74.1 | 81.3 |
| 15-17 years | 88.2 | 77.1 | 83.9 |
| 18-20 years | 85.6 | 66.0 | 76.2 |
| 21-22 years | 79.8 | 100.0 | 89.1 |
| 23-24 years | 85.4 | 70.4 | 81.4 |

Source: CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base is population aged 15-24

# 4 HEALTH

This chapter examines health indicators for the population in Hanang District. 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, 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, 23 percent of the households have access to medical services. Conversely, 77 percent of the households in the district do not have access to medical services.

As would be expected, households in accessible villages have a higher access rate to medical services than households in remote villages. Similarly accessible villages report higher rates of need and use than remote villages. Households in remote villages report a higher satisfaction rate (91 percent) than households in accessible villages (at 88 percent).

Non-poor households have a higher access rate than poor households, with shares of 28 percent and 17 percent, respectively. The breakdown by poverty status shows slight differences in the rates of need, use and satisfaction with non-poor households reporting higher need and use rates and a lower rate of satisfaction than poor households.

**Table 4.1 - Health Indicators**

| | Medical Services | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Access | Need | Use | Satisfaction |
| **Total** | 23.0 | 15.0 | 17.3 | 89.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 35.1 | 16.0 | 19.9 | 87.9 |
| Remote | 8.7 | 13.9 | 14.3 | 90.8 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 16.7 | 13.5 | 15.4 | 91.0 |
| Non-poor | 27.7 | 16.1 | 18.7 | 87.8 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | |
| Employee | 20.2 | 2.3 | 11.3 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 20.0 | 15.2 | 17.9 | 89.3 |
| Self-employed - other | 56.2 | 14.6 | 12.5 | 87.5 |
| Other | 18.4 | 21.9 | 18.6 | 82.0 |
| **Gender** | | | | |
| Male | 22.7 | 12.9 | 15.6 | 89.8 |
| Female | 23.3 | 17.1 | 19.0 | 88.4 |
| **Age** | | | | |
| 0-4 | 25.2 | 19.1 | 38.0 | 92.8 |
| 5-9 | 21.4 | 9.1 | 8.1 | 100.0 |
| 10-14 | 23.7 | 8.8 | 7.4 | 91.7 |
| 15-19 | 23.3 | 10.3 | 9.9 | 72.8 |
| 20-29 | 24.3 | 14.4 | 13.5 | 92.7 |
| 30-39 | 23.4 | 16.5 | 15.2 | 84.2 |
| 40-49 | 26.0 | 15.5 | 14.4 | 67.8 |
| 50-59 | 0.0 | 42.8 | 42.8 | 100.0 |
| 60+ | 15.6 | 30.6 | 25.7 | 86.1 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang 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 is total population. For satisfaction, base is population that used medical services.

**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.**

| | | Reasons for dissatisfaction | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent dissatisfied | Facilities not clean | Long wait | No trained professionals | Cost | No drugs available | Treatment unsuccessful | Other |
| **Total** | 11.0 | 1.5 | 20.9 | 15.8 | 14.8 | 26.3 | 60.9 | 3.3 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 12.1 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 20.3 | 14.9 | 29.6 | 65.7 | 3.2 |
| Remote | 9.2 | 4.8 | 18.2 | 6.0 | 14.5 | 19.2 | 50.7 | 3.5 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.9 | 34.2 | 32.1 | 52.1 | 0.0 |
| Non-poor | 12.2 | 2.2 | 30.5 | 17.6 | 5.9 | 23.6 | 65.0 | 4.8 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 10.7 | 1.8 | 19.9 | 18.5 | 10.7 | 22.0 | 67.4 | 1.3 |
| Self-employed - other | 12.5 | 0.0 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 77.3 | 22.7 | 0.0 |
| Other | 18.0 | 0.0 | 27.8 | 0.0 | 72.2 | 27.8 | 24.1 | 27.8 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 10.2 | 0.0 | 11.5 | 9.9 | 14.2 | 30.3 | 63.8 | 5.2 |
| Female | 11.6 | 2.6 | 27.6 | 20.0 | 15.2 | 23.5 | 58.9 | 1.9 |
| **Type of provider** | | | | | | | | |
| Public hospital | 11.0 | 2.6 | 36.3 | 17.6 | 6.5 | 38.2 | 57.3 | 3.8 |
| Private hospital | 9.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.1 | 0.0 | 52.9 | 0.0 |
| Religous hospital | 6.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 34.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 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 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.2 | 22.8 | 17.9 | 62.8 | 4.6 |
| Trad. Healer | 21.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 26.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

Regarding socio-economic status, the self-employed in non-agricultural activities show the highest access, at 56 percent. The remaining categories show rates of around 20 percent. Employees showed the lowest rate of need, at only 2 percent, but the highest satisfaction, at 100 percent. Households where the main income earner was in the 'other' category (unemployed, inactive, unpaid or household workers) showed the lowest satisfaction rate, at 82 percent but the highest rates of need and use, at 22 and 19 respectively.

There are no significant gender differences in access, with both genders at 23 percent. Females report a higher need rate than males (17 and 13 percent, respectively), a slightly higher rate of use, and similar satisfaction between genders.

Access does not vary for population groups between under 5 to 49 but is population group between 50 and 59 reports a null rate of access. The rate of use follows a slightly similar trend for all the age groups except again the population group between 50 and 59 which show the highest need. Satisfaction is highest for the heaviest users (the 50-59 cohort) and the lowest users (the 5-9 cohort) of the service at 100 percent while is lowest for the population group between 40 and 49.

## 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 10 users of healthcare facilities is dissatisfied, mostly because of treatment being unsuccessful (61 percent) and the unavailability of drugs (26 percent). Surprisingly, cost of the treatment was reported just by 15 percent of the users. It should be noticed that this does not imply that 85 percent of the households can afford health services, but that in 85 percent of the cases the cost was not the cause of dissatisfaction.

The analysis by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages are more commonly dissatisfied by the lack of trained professionals (20 percent) and non-availability of drugs (30 percent) against households in remote villages (6 and 19 percent respectively). A similar trend is observed on the unsuccessful treatment as a reason for dissatisfaction with 66 percent for the accessible households against 51 for the remote households. Interestingly, none of the accessible households reports facilities not clean as a reason for dissatisfaction.

The breakdown by poverty status shows insignificant differences in dissatisfaction rates. Both populations are highly dissatisfied with unsuccessful treatment, at 52 and 65 percent for the poor and non-poor households. Poor households are more frequently dissatisfied by the non-availability of drugs than non-poor households, at 32 and 24 respectively. Similarly, poor households report higher shares of population dissatisfied by the cost of the treatment than non-poor households (34 and 6 percent, respectively), whereas the latter are relatively more dissatisfied by the long wait (31 against 0 percent).

Employees are the socio-economic group with the lowest dissatisfaction rate, at 0 percent. The other socio-economic groups have different reasons for dissatisfaction. Whereas self-employed – agriculture group reports treatment unsuccessful as the main reason for dissatisfaction, at 67 percent, the self-employed in non-agricultural activities report lack of drugs more often, at 77 percent and the other socio-economic group reports cost as the main reason, at 72 percent.

Dissatisfaction does not vary by gender, but the reasons do so. Males point out the lack of medicine more often than females (30 and 23 percent respectively). In turn females are more likely to point long wait and lack of trained professionals more often than males (28 and 20 percent against 12 and 10 percent, respectively).

Regarding health provider, the main cause of dissatisfaction in public hospitals is the

**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** | 82.3 | 96.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 1.7 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 79.8 | 95.5 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 2.4 |
| Remote | 85.2 | 96.9 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 0.9 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 84.3 | 97.4 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Non-poor | 80.8 | 95.3 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 2.8 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | |
| Employee | 87.5 | 95.8 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 81.8 | 96.9 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 1.2 |
| Self-employed - other | 86.4 | 91.9 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 4.9 |
| Other | 81.0 | 91.5 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 4.2 |
| **Gender** | | | | | | |
| Male | 83.9 | 97.0 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.2 |
| Female | 80.7 | 95.4 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 2.2 |
| **Type of sickness/injury** | | | | | | |
| Fever/malaria | 8.1 | 20.6 | 36.8 | 26.2 | 20.3 | 10.1 |
| Diarrhea/abdominal pains | 5.6 | 40.7 | 27.1 | 13.7 | 0.0 | 32.2 |
| Pain in back, limbs or joints | 26.1 | 9.4 | 33.8 | 19.5 | 41.2 | 8.6 |
| Coughing/breathing difficulty | 10.4 | 5.2 | 49.9 | 27.4 | 28.6 | 18.1 |
| Skin problems | 14.9 | 0.0 | 49.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.7 |
| Ear, nose, throat | 21.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Eye | 14.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Dental | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Accident | 5.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 23.2 | 0.0 | 85.3 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

lack of success of the treatment, at 57 percent, followed by lack of drugs and long waits, at 38 and 36 percent respectively. Similarly the lack of success of the treatment was mentioned more frequently as the main cause dissatisfaction in private hospitals (53 percent) and traditional healers (100 percent). Moreover, lack of trained professionals and cost are the two main reasons for dissatisfaction by religious hospitals at 35 and 100 percent respectively. Furthermore, traditional healers 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, 82 percent of the population did not consult a health provider, typically because there was no need (96 percent of the cases).

A higher share of people from remote villages (85 percent) did not consult a health provider than people from accessible villages (80 percent). The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report a higher not consulting a health provider than non-poor households, at 84 percent and 81 percent respectively.

All socio-economic groups record high proportions for not consulting a health provider with the employee group having the highest percent not consulting (88 percent). In all the socio-economic groups the main reason was no-need. Interestingly 3 percent of employees mentions distance as the reason while around 3 of the non-consulting 'other' mentions cost.

The gender breakdown shows that 97 percent of the males who did not consult health facilities reported no need. Females report a similar share, at 95 percent.

The split-up by type of illness shows that for most infirmities, fever (including malaria) diarrhoea, pain, and coughing, the main cause for not consulting a health practitioner is cost. It is worth noticing that for infirmities related to ear, nose and throat, distance is the main reason at 100 percent. Similarly cost is main reason for not consulting in case of accident and/or eye problems at 100 percent.

**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** | 15.0 | 45.1 | 19.4 | 13.3 | 24.7 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 3.9 |
| **Male Total** | 12.9 | 41.6 | 20.8 | 12.4 | 24.4 | 3.7 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 5.1 | 4.0 |
| 0-4 | 16.7 | 55.1 | 27.7 | 1.3 | 25.4 | 6.1 | 6.8 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
| 5-9 | 7.9 | 41.8 | 22.3 | 6.9 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 6.9 |
| 10-14 | 9.5 | 32.3 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 24.2 | 9.3 | 4.7 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 15.7 | 0.0 |
| 15-29 | 11.4 | 46.8 | 21.3 | 11.7 | 13.6 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 9.5 |
| 30-49 | 12.1 | 39.3 | 21.1 | 22.0 | 33.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 7.1 | 7.9 |
| 50-64 | 21.3 | 29.0 | 33.3 | 14.7 | 23.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 0.0 |
| 65+ | 25.7 | 23.4 | 12.8 | 31.2 | 32.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Female Total** | 17.1 | 47.7 | 18.3 | 14.0 | 24.9 | 2.8 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 3.8 |
| 0-4 | 21.3 | 63.9 | 17.5 | 3.2 | 26.1 | 3.2 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| 5-9 | 10.3 | 24.0 | 30.2 | 0.0 | 30.5 | 15.7 | 11.6 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 10-14 | 8.2 | 31.0 | 35.4 | 7.1 | 35.4 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
| 15-29 | 14.7 | 53.1 | 9.2 | 4.0 | 19.1 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 11.7 |
| 30-49 | 19.6 | 56.1 | 21.8 | 17.1 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 3.2 |
| 50-64 | 44.2 | 36.5 | 8.4 | 21.0 | 27.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 2.9 |
| 65+ | 34.5 | 24.5 | 12.7 | 78.5 | 24.6 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

2. Base 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** | 57.8 | 2.5 | 7.4 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 25.5 | 5.4 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 61.4 | 1.4 | 6.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 25.4 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 51.8 | 4.3 | 8.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 25.7 | 9.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 60.4 | 2.8 | 8.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 23.5 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 56.2 | 2.3 | 6.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 26.7 | 6.8 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 75.3 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 56.5 | 2.4 | 7.4 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 27.0 | 5.4 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 59.4 | 3.2 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.9 | 3.4 | 5.2 | 100.0 |
| Other | 71.8 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base is population who consulted a health provider

## 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 45 percent of the total population. In turn, coughing and breathing difficulties and diarrhoea or abdominal come in second and third place, with 25 and 19 percent of the population. Pain in back, limbs or joints affected 13 percent of the ill population, whereas other illnesses had minor shares.

The gender breakdown shows no stark differences in types of illness. The age breakdown shows that the share of malaria/fever affects mostly the younger and older cohorts. The population group between 10 and 14 years have the highest shares of diarrhoea/abdominal pain and coughing/breathing difficulties at 35 percent for each illness. Generally, the share of population affected by malaria comes down with age but other problems emerge.

## 4.5 Health Provider

Table 4.5 shows the percent distribution of health consultations in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, 58 percent of the consultations were made in a public hospital, 26 percent to a pharmacist or chemist, 7 percent in a religious hospital, and 5 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) than households in remote villages, and the latter to private, religious and traditional healers more than the former.

Poor households make their consultations in public hospitals more often than non-poor households, with shares of 60 and 56 percent, respectively. In turn, members of non-poor households tend to consult chemists and traditional healers more often (27 and 7 vs. 24 and 3 percent, respectively).

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that employees and the 'other' go to public hospitals more often than the rest (with rates of 75 and 72 percent respectively) while the rest of socio-economic groups go to religious hospitals and chemists more often (around 8 and 20 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, 16 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 8 percent of the females between 15 and 19 gave birth. The rate peaks at 30 percent for the 25-29 group, and then goes down, ending in 11 percent for the group aged 40 or older. In addition, 98 percent of pregnant women received prenatal care.

**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 | 6.7 | 28.6 | 35.1 | 26.5 | 11.0 | 16.5 | 97.5 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 0.0 | 7.9 | 18.2 | 29.8 | 26.0 | 9.8 | 14.7 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 0.0 | 5.0 | 41.1 | 42.8 | 27.1 | 12.3 | 18.6 | 95.1 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 4.7 | 31.1 | 45.4 | 41.4 | 18.7 | 18.6 | 96.4 |
| Non-poor | 0.0 | 8.5 | 27.8 | 32.2 | 16.4 | 3.3 | 14.9 | 98.5 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 0.0 | 7.5 | 34.7 | 36.8 | 25.2 | 12.9 | 17.2 | 97.1 |
| Self-employed - other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.7 | 32.3 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 100.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.0 | 48.6 | 0.0 | 13.5 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base is females aged 12 or older.

The breakdown by cluster location shows strong difference between remote and accessible villages for the age groups 20-24 and 25-29 at 41 vs. 18 percent and 42 vs. 30 percent, respectively.

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 women from non-poor households, at 15 percent. Furthermore in poor households women between age groups 25 to 40 had a higher share of live births than women from non-poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that the highest rates correspond to the self-employed agriculture at 17 percent, whereas the employees report the lowest overall rate, of just 8 percent overall. Looking at each age-group, the employees and the 'other' show the highest rates: 50 percent for the 25-29 cohort; and 49 percent for the 30-39 cohort, respectively.

Table 4.7 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey. Roughly, 59 percent of births in the 5 years preceding the survey took place at home, 29 percent in a hospital and 9 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 a higher share of births at home (68 percent), households in accessible villages had more births in hospital (35 percent). Both groups show similar rates of deliveries at health centres, around 2 percent.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor had a higher share of deliveries in hospitals (with shares of 33 and 23 percent, respectively), whereas poor households had deliveries at home more frequently (67 and 54 percent, respectively).

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that homes are the most common place for deliveries, with shares of between 51 percent for the self-employed in non-agricultural activities and highest at 74 for the employees. Hospital and dispensaries take the second and third place. While hospitals represent 33 percent of deliveries for self-employed in non-agricultural activities, 16 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 10 deliveries were attended by a health professional mostly midwives (37 percent of births). 42 percent of the child deliveries took place without assistance. Traditional birth assistants (TBA) and trained TBA accounted for 14 and 5 percent, whereas doctors and nurses attended 2 percent of the deliveries in the district.

The analysis by cluster location shows that midwives were more common in

**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** | 28.9 | 2.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 59.0 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 35.4 | 2.1 | 10.1 | 0.0 | 51.1 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 21.4 | 1.9 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 68.1 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 23.3 | 0.4 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 66.6 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 33.0 | 3.2 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 53.5 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 18.1 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 73.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 29.3 | 1.8 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 59.3 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 33.2 | 5.7 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 50.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 16.2 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 0.0 | 64.4 | 3.1 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

**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** | 2.2 | 37.0 | 4.7 | 14.2 | 41.5 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 43.9 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 2.5 | 45.2 | 2.3 | 9.8 | 39.9 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 50.0 |
| Remote | 1.8 | 27.6 | 7.4 | 19.2 | 43.4 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 36.9 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 1.6 | 29.6 | 2.2 | 16.9 | 49.1 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 33.4 |
| Non-poor | 2.7 | 42.5 | 6.5 | 12.1 | 35.9 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 51.7 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 57.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 26.4 |
| Self-employed - agric | 2.2 | 36.6 | 4.2 | 15.7 | 41.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 43.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 3.6 | 45.5 | 10.7 | 1.7 | 36.9 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 59.8 |
| Other | 0.0 | 32.5 | 3.1 | 9.5 | 54.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 35.6 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

accessible villages (45 vs. 28 percent), whereas unassisted deliveries were slightly more common in remote villages (43 against 40 percent). Furthermore professional health attendants were more common in accessible villages than in remote village, at 50 vs. 37 percent.

As expected, non-poor households show a higher share of deliveries attended by a professional, 51 percent, against 33 for poor households. Similarly non-poor households have a higher share of deliveries attended by midwives than poor households (43 vs. 30) In turn, poor households report higher share of deliveries without assistance (49 and 36 percent, respectively).

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households in the 'self-employed other' category report the highest share of deliveries attended by professionals: 60 percent, against 43, 36 and 26 of self-employed agriculture, 'other' and employees. In turn, employee and 'other' report no deliveries attended by a doctor or nurse but report the highest share of deliveries unassisted deliveries at 58 and 55 percent respectively. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities report the highest proportion of deliveries by midwives.

## 4.7 Child Nutrition

Two standards of physical measurement of growth that describe the nutritional status of a child are presented in this chapter:

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

| | Nutritional status indicators | | Program participation | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Stunted (-2SD) | Wasted (-2SD) | Nutrition | Weigh-in | Vaccinated |
| **Total** | 28.4 | 1.7 | 59.1 | 96.0 | 90.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 28.9 | 0.9 | 62.7 | 97.7 | 90.8 |
| Remote | 27.9 | 2.7 | 55.1 | 94.0 | 89.1 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 30.4 | 0.8 | 59.1 | 92.4 | 84.9 |
| Non-poor | 27.0 | 2.4 | 59.2 | 98.6 | 93.8 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 12.8 | 0.0 | 50.8 | 88.7 | 77.4 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 28.7 | 1.5 | 62.3 | 96.1 | 90.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 25.9 | 0.0 | 46.7 | 100.0 | 95.5 |
| Other | 41.4 | 16.2 | 20.2 | 85.3 | 84.0 |
| **Gender and age in completed years** | | | | | |
| **Male** | 24.5 | 2.3 | 59.0 | 96.2 | 90.3 |
| 0 | 28.0 | 2.6 | 39.6 | 99.0 | 96.1 |
| 1 | 35.4 | 0.0 | 70.4 | 98.2 | 93.7 |
| 2 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 66.6 | 96.4 | 86.4 |
| 3 | 26.7 | 2.3 | 66.1 | 92.5 | 83.9 |
| 4 | 17.4 | 6.6 | 59.3 | 93.8 | 89.2 |
| **Female** | 31.8 | 1.2 | 59.3 | 95.8 | 89.7 |
| 0 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 51.0 | 92.4 | 90.3 |
| 1 | 43.8 | 1.7 | 63.0 | 95.8 | 96.0 |
| 2 | 43.9 | 3.8 | 56.6 | 96.8 | 86.9 |
| 3 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 60.5 | 96.9 | 88.7 |
| 4 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 63.4 | 96.3 | 86.4 |
| **Orphan status** | | | | | |
| Orphaned | 28.1 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 100.0 | 87.7 |
| Not-orphaned | 28.4 | 0.9 | 59.9 | 95.7 | 90.0 |
| **Foster status** | | | | | |
| Fostered | 26.7 | 0.0 | 73.3 | 73.3 | 73.3 |
| Not-fostered | 28.2 | 0.8 | 59.0 | 96.1 | 90.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

- 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

**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** | 77.5 | 94.7 | 95.2 | 93.9 | 92.1 | 44.6 | 95.4 | 94.0 | 92.2 | 73.1 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 81.6 | 95.3 | 96.8 | 95.2 | 94.9 | 55.4 | 96.8 | 95.2 | 94.9 | 78.1 |
| Remote | 73.0 | 93.9 | 93.5 | 92.3 | 88.8 | 32.4 | 93.8 | 92.7 | 89.2 | 67.4 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 73.3 | 91.5 | 92.5 | 90.4 | 87.7 | 39.4 | 92.5 | 90.4 | 87.7 | 65.9 |
| Non-poor | 80.7 | 97.1 | 97.3 | 96.5 | 95.3 | 48.5 | 97.6 | 96.8 | 95.6 | 78.4 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employed | 88.7 | 88.7 | 88.7 | 88.7 | 88.7 | 42.5 | 88.7 | 88.7 | 88.7 | 88.7 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 76.0 | 95.2 | 95.2 | 93.6 | 91.5 | 44.4 | 95.2 | 93.6 | 91.5 | 72.4 |
| Self-employed - other | 87.0 | 92.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 55.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 75.8 |
| Other | 81.8 | 92.1 | 86.7 | 86.7 | 86.7 | 20.2 | 92.1 | 92.1 | 92.1 | 68.9 |
| **Gender and age in completed years** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 75.0 | 95.7 | 96.2 | 93.9 | 91.8 | 46.9 | 96.2 | 93.9 | 91.8 | 70.8 |
| 0 | 20.3 | 87.7 | 90.1 | 81.5 | 74.1 | 35.3 | 90.1 | 81.5 | 74.1 | 12.5 |
| 1 | 92.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 51.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 86.2 |
| 2 | 87.9 | 98.2 | 95.1 | 95.1 | 93.4 | 56.1 | 95.1 | 95.1 | 93.4 | 88.4 |
| 3 | 98.6 | 98.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 58.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 93.7 |
| 4 | 95.7 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 37.7 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 97.3 | 95.7 |
| **Female** | 79.9 | 93.8 | 94.4 | 93.8 | 92.3 | 42.5 | 94.7 | 94.1 | 92.7 | 75.1 |
| 0 | 19.7 | 88.8 | 90.9 | 87.3 | 80.0 | 36.9 | 90.9 | 87.3 | 80.0 | 25.4 |
| 1 | 93.5 | 97.5 | 94.8 | 94.8 | 94.8 | 40.1 | 96.3 | 96.3 | 96.3 | 78.2 |
| 2 | 89.5 | 93.3 | 92.1 | 92.1 | 92.1 | 43.1 | 92.1 | 92.1 | 92.1 | 84.2 |
| 3 | 92.6 | 94.6 | 96.3 | 96.3 | 95.0 | 53.9 | 96.3 | 96.3 | 95.0 | 90.5 |
| 4 | 89.8 | 93.3 | 96.9 | 96.9 | 96.9 | 36.9 | 96.9 | 96.9 | 96.9 | 86.3 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

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, around 2 percent of all the children are wasted, and 28 percent are stunted. More than half the children (58 percent) participate in nutrition programs.

Cluster location and poverty status are correlated with nutrition. Households in remote villages have higher rates of wasted and almost equal rates of stunted children than households in accessible villages, with rates of 3 and 28 percent, against 1 and 29 percent, respectively. Conversely, poor households report 1 percent of wasted children and 30 percent of stunted children, whereas the figures for non-poor households are 2 and 30 percent.

Regarding socio-economic group, households in the 'other' category show the highest rates both for wasted and stunted children, at 16 percent and 41 percent respectively. Children from households where the main income earner is an employee show the lowest rates of wasting and stunting, at 0 and 13 percent, respectively.

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

| | Health Card | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 97.8 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | |
| Accessible | 98.9 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 96.4 | 3.6 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | |
| Poor | 97.8 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 97.7 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic group** | | | |
| Employed | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 97.3 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age in completed years** | | | |
| **Male** | 97.2 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| 0.0 | 90.9 | 9.1 | 100.0 |
| 1.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2.0 | 96.9 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| 3.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 4.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 98.3 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| 0.0 | 93.9 | 6.1 | 100.0 |
| 1.0 | 98.8 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| 2.0 | 97.6 | 2.4 | 100.0 |
| 3.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 4.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

Table 4.10 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by type of vaccination received. Overall, 78 percent of children under 5 has been vaccinated against measles, 95 against BCG, and roughly between 92 and 95 percent received vaccinations against all DPT and all OPV except for OPV0 at 45 percent. Finally, 73 percent of the children in the district receive vitamin A supplements.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that children from accessible villages report higher shares of children receiving vaccinations than remote villages for every type of vaccination. A similar trend is observed by poverty status, with non-poor households reporting higher shares of vaccinated children than poor households.

Except for measles and vitamin A, where the employees have the highest rates, and BCG, where self-employed agriculture has the highest rate, the self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the children receiving the highest rates of vaccination, mostly 100 percent.

The gender breakdown shows that females have slightly higher vaccination rates against measles (80 against 75 percent), but similar shares than men for the rest of vaccines. The age breakdown shows that the share of children consuming vitamin A increases with age.

4.11 show the percent distribution of children vaccinated by source of information. Overall, the information for 98 percent of the vaccinated children was supported by a vaccination card.

There is a slight difference by cluster location, with children from accessible households reporting 99 percent against 96 percent for those from remote villages. There is no strong difference by poverty status. The main difference by socio-economic group is that virtually all vaccinated children from all categories had vaccination cards, whereas in the 'self-employed agriculture' the share was around 97 percent.

Further, all children aged 3 and above had vaccination cards. Children between 0 and 11 months had vaccination cards in 94 and 91 percent of the cases, for girls and boys, respectively.

Although there seems to be no significant difference in the proportion of boys and girls participating in nutrition programs, girls report higher rates of wasting with the maximum being 44 percent compared to 28 percent for boys. In turn boys show stunted growth more often, at 7 against 4 percent for girls

There seems to be no significant difference between the health status of orphaned and fostered children. 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 receives vaccinations.

# 5 EMPLOYMENT

This chapter examines employment indicators for the population of Hanang DC. 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 the district 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 80 percent of the adult population is employed and 15 percent underemployed. Unemployment is virtually 0 percent and the inactivity rate is 5 percent. There are no clear differences by cluster location. In turn, poor

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

| | Working | | | Not working | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Employed | Under emp. | Total | Unemploy. | Inactive | Total | Total |
| **Total** | 79.7 | 15.3 | 95.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 80.6 | 13.8 | 94.4 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 78.6 | 17.0 | 95.6 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 82.5 | 13.5 | 96.1 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 78.0 | 16.3 | 94.3 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 73.7 | 19.8 | 93.5 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 76.4 | 17.6 | 94.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 71.9 | 26.5 | 98.4 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 66.7 | 24.3 | 91.1 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 72.9 | 5.1 | 78.0 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 86.1 | 10.5 | 96.5 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 88.6 | 7.1 | 95.7 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 83.3 | 16.4 | 99.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 93.5 | 6.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 76.7 | 3.0 | 79.6 | 0.0 | 20.4 | 20.4 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang 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.

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

| | Total population | | | Heads of household | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Active population | Unemployment rate | Underemployment rate | Active population | Unemployment rate | Underemployment rate |
| **Total** | 95.0 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 95.1 | 0.0 | 26.2 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 94.4 | 0.0 | 14.6 | 94.8 | 0.0 | 24.6 |
| Remote | 95.6 | 0.0 | 17.8 | 95.6 | 0.0 | 28.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 96.1 | 0.0 | 14.1 | 91.5 | 0.0 | 21.3 |
| Non-poor | 94.3 | 0.0 | 17.3 | 96.8 | 0.0 | 28.2 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 93.5 | 0.0 | 21.2 | 94.5 | 0.0 | 28.2 |
| 15-29 | 94.0 | 0.0 | 18.7 | 99.3 | 0.0 | 48.5 |
| 30-49 | 98.4 | 0.0 | 27.0 | 98.3 | 0.0 | 25.8 |
| 50-64 | 91.1 | 0.0 | 26.7 | 90.8 | 0.0 | 27.5 |
| 65+ | 78.0 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 80.5 | 0.0 | 6.9 |
| **Female** | 96.5 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 98.1 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
| 15-29 | 95.7 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 30-49 | 99.7 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 30.4 |
| 50-64 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
| 65+ | 79.6 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 92.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang 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 |
| **Total** | 85.8 | 8.6 | 94.4 | 0.0 | 94.4 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 89.3 | 4.3 | 93.5 | 0.0 | 93.5 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 81.8 | 13.5 | 95.3 | 0.0 | 95.3 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 90.8 | 8.3 | 99.1 | 0.0 | 99.1 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 82.3 | 8.8 | 91.1 | 0.0 | 91.1 | 8.9 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 84.2 | 10.1 | 94.3 | 0.0 | 94.3 | 5.7 | 100.0 |
| 15-16 | 95.6 | 1.7 | 97.4 | 0.0 | 97.4 | 2.6 | 100.0 |
| 17-19 | 88.0 | 5.5 | 93.5 | 0.0 | 93.5 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| 20-21 | 72.5 | 17.9 | 90.4 | 0.0 | 90.4 | 9.6 | 100.0 |
| 22-23 | 67.6 | 25.2 | 92.8 | 0.0 | 92.8 | 7.2 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 87.7 | 6.7 | 94.5 | 0.0 | 94.5 | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| 15-16 | 93.5 | 6.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 17-19 | 90.0 | 4.6 | 94.6 | 0.0 | 94.6 | 5.4 | 100.0 |
| 20-21 | 80.0 | 4.6 | 84.6 | 0.0 | 84.6 | 15.4 | 100.0 |
| 22-23 | 80.2 | 14.7 | 94.9 | 0.0 | 94.9 | 5.1 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang 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.

households show a higher employment rate than non-poor households. For both genders, underemployment peaks for the cohort aged between 30 and 49. Around

27 percent of the males in this group are underemployed, whereas the share for females is 16 percent

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. As would be expected, the share of inactive population is higher in the 65+ cohort.

## 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. The rate of underemployment is higher in remote villages and non-poor households, for the total population as well as for household heads.

The gender breakdown shows that in the general population males are more likely to be underemployed than females, with rates of 21 and 11 percent, respectively. A similar difference is observed for the household heads.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that underemployment decreases with age of the household head. The trend is less clear for the general population.

## 5.1.3 Youth Employment

Table 5.3 shows the distribution of the youth (ages 15 to 24) by work status. The activity rate of this group is similar to the overall population, at 91 percent. However, underemployment is lower: 9 percent of workers is underemployed, as opposed to 15 percent of workers for the whole adult population. The youth from remote villages has higher underemployment than their counterparts.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report a higher share of active population, at 99 percent, than non-poor households, at 91 percent.

The gender breakdown shows that underemployment rate among the male youth is higher than that for the female youth. It can be seen that underemployment is remarkably higher in the 22-23 group.

**Table 5.4 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employment status**

| | Employee | Self-employed Agriculture | Self-employed Other | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 1.3 | 50.2 | 4.8 | 43.7 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 2.1 | 51.9 | 5.8 | 40.2 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 0.5 | 48.1 | 3.7 | 47.6 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.6 | 49.7 | 2.7 | 47.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 1.8 | 50.4 | 6.1 | 41.7 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | |
| **Male** | 2.0 | 62.6 | 7.2 | 28.2 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.7 | 37.9 | 5.5 | 55.9 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 2.5 | 87.4 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 7.8 | 86.4 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 85.8 | 9.4 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 0.7 | 37.3 | 2.3 | 59.6 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 18.9 | 1.7 | 79.4 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 1.4 | 47.9 | 3.9 | 46.7 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 1.3 | 62.8 | 0.0 | 35.8 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 56.0 | 0.0 | 44.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

| | State/NGO/ Other | Private | Household | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 1.0 | 55.6 | 43.5 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 1.4 | 58.4 | 40.2 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 0.5 | 52.3 | 47.1 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 53.0 | 47.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 1.6 | 57.1 | 41.3 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | |
| **Male** | 1.3 | 71.0 | 27.7 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 45.0 | 55.0 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 1.5 | 98.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 7.8 | 91.4 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 95.2 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 0.7 | 39.7 | 59.6 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 20.6 | 79.4 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 1.4 | 51.9 | 46.7 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 1.3 | 62.8 | 35.8 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 56.0 | 44.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

## 5.2 Working population

Table 5.4 shows that the vast majority of the working population is formed by self-

employed in agriculture at 50 percent, or in other activities (inactive, unemployed, unpaid workers, domestic workers) at 44 percent. 5 percent is self-employed in non-agricultural activities and employees only account for 1 percent of the working population. The population self-employed in agriculture is higher in accessible villages, whereas the 'other' group is bigger in remote villages. Poor households report a lower share of self-employed workers in non-agricultural activities and a higher share in other activities than non-poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that a higher share of males is self-employed in agriculture or in non-agricultural activities, while females report a higher share in 'other' activities. The cut down by age-groups shows that the share of employees peaks for males in the 50-64 cohort (8 percent), the self-employed in agriculture for 50-64 and 65+ males (86 percent), the 'self-employed other' for 30-49 males (10 percent) and 'other' for 15-29 females (79 percent).

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 56 percent of the working population, which combined with individuals who work for their own households represent up to 99 percent of the working population.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote villages report a higher share of the working population working for the household, while accessible villages report a higher share working for a private employer. Similarly, poor households report a higher share of the working population working for the household and a lower share working for a private employer than non-poor households.

Males report a higher share working for a private employer, while females report a higher share working for the household. Most males work for a private employer, except in the 15-29 cohorts, where 55 percent of them work in the household. The share of females working in the private sector increases gradually with age, but is always lower than the respective shares of males. At the same time, the share of females working for the household decreases with age.

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. Overall, agriculture and domestic duties together account for 92 percent of the working population. 79 percent of the population is engaged in agriculture, and 13 percent in domestic duties.

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

| | Agriculture | Mining/manuf/ energy/constr | Pub & priv services | Domestic duties | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 78.8 | 1.1 | 5.1 | 13.2 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 76.5 | 1.7 | 6.1 | 14.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 81.4 | 0.4 | 4.0 | 11.9 | 2.4 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 82.1 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 13.5 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 76.8 | 1.2 | 6.8 | 13.0 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 75.9 | 2.1 | 6.2 | 12.8 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 64.5 | 1.4 | 4.8 | 25.4 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 87.4 | 3.7 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 86.4 | 2.2 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 85.8 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 8.4 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 81.8 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 13.6 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 69.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 27.5 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 91.3 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 95.2 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 85.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

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

| | Employee | | Self-employed Agriculture | | Self-employed Other | | Other | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | 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 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Agriculture | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 73.9 | 75.6 | 81.1 |
| Mining & non-primary | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| Services | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.9 | 82.8 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 6.2 | 3.9 |
| Domestic duties | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 45.2 | 23.5 | 13.3 | 14.2 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.3 | 17.2 | 6.0 | 0.6 | 2.8 | 0.8 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

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

| | Government | | 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 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 88.6 | 93.3 | 54.9 | 76.4 | 76.6 | 81.7 |
| Mining & non-primary | 11.5 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
| Services | 88.5 | 100.0 | 8.1 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 6.6 | 4.0 |
| Domestic duties | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 39.4 | 20.7 | 12.8 | 13.6 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 5.7 | 0.4 | 2.4 | 0.7 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

The split-up by remoteness of the village and poverty status of the household shows that accessible villages and non-poor households report lower shares working in agriculture than their respective counterparts.

The gender breakdown shows that the most common activities for females are agriculture and household duties, accounting for 96 percent of the working population. These are the main activities for men as well, but they are less concentrated, with 11 percent in other activities.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that, for both genders, younger cohorts have higher shares dedicated to household duties. The share of males in agriculture is around 86 percent for the cohorts over 30 years of age. In turn, the share of women in agriculture is lower for the youngest and the oldest cohorts, where the shares dedicated to domestic duties are higher.

Table 5.7 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by employment status, gender and activity. Overall, around 77 percent of the male labour force is in agriculture, whereas the share for females is 82 percent. Domestic duties have the second highest shares for both genders: 13 percent for males and 14 percent for females. Each of the remaining activities occupies less than 10 percent of the labour force for each gender, but with the shares for males higher than or equal to those for females.

For both genders, virtually all the employees work in services. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities work also mostly in services, with shares of 56 percent for males and 83 percent for females. The female population in the 'other' group is concentrated in agriculture, whereas the male in this category are almost evenly split between agriculture and domestic duties (48 and 45 percent, respectively).

The percentage distribution of the working population by employer, gender, and activity is shown 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 concentrated in agriculture. Among the individuals who were employed by the household, the main activity was agriculture (55 percent of males, 76 percent of females), but domestic duties also reports important shares (39 percent of males, 21 percent of females in this category).

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

| | Employee | Self-employed Agriculture | Self-employed Other | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 3.0 | 64.8 | 11.0 | 21.2 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 5.1 | 68.4 | 12.3 | 14.2 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 0.9 | 61.4 | 9.8 | 27.9 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 2.1 | 58.9 | 10.1 | 28.9 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 3.4 | 67.7 | 11.4 | 17.5 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | |
| **Male** | 3.8 | 76.5 | 14.1 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 2.4 | 69.6 | 15.3 | 12.8 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 1.6 | 85.6 | 12.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 16.0 | 73.7 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 64.8 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 1.3 | 41.3 | 4.7 | 52.7 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 92.2 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 2.1 | 57.5 | 5.6 | 34.7 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 0.0 | 71.6 | 0.0 | 28.4 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

| | State/NGO/Other | Private | Household | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 2.8 | 76.9 | 20.3 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 3.7 | 82.1 | 14.2 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 2.1 | 71.9 | 26.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 71.1 | 28.9 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 4.2 | 79.7 | 16.1 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | |
| **Male** | 3.6 | 92.3 | 4.1 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 90.5 | 9.5 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 3.8 | 96.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 16.0 | 84.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 1.3 | 46.0 | 52.7 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 92.2 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 2.1 | 63.2 | 34.7 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 0.0 | 71.6 | 28.4 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

## 5.3 Underemployed Population

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status is shown in Table 5.9. Overall, 65 percent of the underemployed population is self-employed in agriculture, 11 percent self-employed in other activities, 21 percent is in 'other' activities and 3 percent is formed by employees. Even though self-employed in agriculture are 50 percent of the working population, they represent almost 65 percent of the underemployed.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that the underemployed population in accessible villages is composed by higher shares of employees and self-employed in agriculture than the underemployed population from remote villages. In turn, the latter shows a higher share in 'other' activities than the former.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households report a higher share self-employed in agriculture, while poor households report a higher share in 'other' activities.

The gender breakdown shows that in the underemployed population, females are more likely than males to be in 'other' activities. In turn, males are more likely to be self-employed, either in agriculture on in non-agricultural activities, than females.

For males, the employees peak at 16 percent in the 50-64 cohorts. The share self-employed in agriculture tends to decrease with age. The 'self-employed other' group shows a higher share in the 65+ cohort, and the 'other' group shows positive rates only in the 15-29 age-group. In the case of females, the share self-employed in agriculture increases with age until the 50-64 cohort, and the share in 'other' activities is higher in the 15-29 (92 percent) and in the 65+ cohorts (100 percent).

Table 5.10 shows the percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer. Overall, the underemployed population mostly works for a private employer at 77 percent and in second place for the household at 20 percent. The State, NGOs, and other types of employer only account for 3 percent of the underemployed population.

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

| | Agriculture | Mining/manuf/ energy/constr | private services | Domestic duties | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 81.9 | 1.2 | 14.4 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 80.1 | 1.0 | 16.4 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 83.6 | 1.4 | 12.4 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 86.7 | 1.3 | 10.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 79.5 | 1.1 | 16.0 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 80.1 | 1.8 | 16.9 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 77.8 | 1.0 | 18.5 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 85.6 | 3.2 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 73.7 | 0.0 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 64.8 | 0.0 | 35.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 85.3 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 77.9 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 13.6 | 4.5 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 87.0 | 0.0 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible villages report a higher percentage of underemployed population working for a private employer than remote villages, and the latter report a higher share working for the household.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report higher shares of underemployed population working for the household, while non-poor households report higher shares in the remaining types of employers.

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed males are strongly concentrated in private employers at 92 percent. In turn, underemployed females are almost evenly split between private employers and household, with shares of 46 and 53 percent.

The age breakdown shows that underemployed males report positive shares working for the household only in the 15-29 cohorts. Underemployed females report higher shares working for the household in the youngest and the oldest cohorts (15-29 and 65+), while in the remaining groups, the highest shares are observed in private employers.

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by main economic activity is presented in Table 5.11. Overall, 82 percent of the underemployed workers are dedicated to agriculture, and 14 percent to services, with the remaining activities reporting shares between 1 and 2 percent.

Remote villages and poor households report higher shares in agriculture and lower shares in services than their respective counterparts.

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed women have a higher share dedicated to agriculture than underemployed males, who have a higher share in services. The age breakdown shows that the share of underemployed males dedicated to agriculture decreases with age, while the share in services increases. In turn, the share of underemployed females increases constantly with age.

## 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

**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 | Infirmity | Retired | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Remote | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Non-poor | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 30-49 | 0.0 | 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 | 0.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Female** | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 30-49 | 0.0 | 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 | 0.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

**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 | Infirmity | Retired | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 0.0 | 0.0 | 43.5 | 5.4 | 23.7 | 0.0 | 24.4 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 0.0 | 0.0 | 49.3 | 6.7 | 19.9 | 0.0 | 24.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 0.0 | 0.0 | 35.1 | 3.6 | 29.3 | 0.0 | 24.8 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 48.4 | 0.0 | 42.1 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.4 | 7.4 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 17.8 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.5 | 8.6 | 21.6 | 0.0 | 28.5 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.6 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 100.0 |
| 30-49 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 50-64 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 69.9 | 0.0 | 12.0 | 100.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.0 | 63.0 | 0.0 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Female** | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.2 | 0.0 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 15-29 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 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 | 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 | 0.0 |
| 65+ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 61.1 | 0.0 | 38.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

person). Table 5.12 shows the main causes for unemployment. None of the respondents in the district was classified as unemployed.

Table 5.13 shows the main causes of economic inactivity. Overall, being a student is the main cause for inactivity (44 percent), followed by being too old and infirmity (24 percent each).

The breakdown by cluster location shows that being a student is a more common cause for economic inactivity in accessible clusters than in remote clusters. In turn, being too old is more common in the latter.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that, as would be expected, being a student is a more common cause for economic inactivity among non-poor households. Being too old and being sick was reported by higher shares of the inactive population in poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that females report being a student or being too old more

**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** | 68.7 | 61.3 | 55.3 | 59.0 | 56.5 | 89.6 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 66.7 | 59.1 | 60.6 | 61.0 | 56.1 | 88.9 |
| Remote | 71.0 | 64.0 | 49.1 | 56.6 | 57.0 | 90.5 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 71.2 | 65.7 | 50.4 | 57.3 | 68.1 | 89.4 |
| Non-poor | 67.2 | 58.8 | 58.1 | 60.0 | 49.7 | 89.7 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 60.5 | 45.0 | 42.5 | 23.1 | 36.4 | 86.9 |
| 15-29 | 79.5 | 58.5 | 53.4 | 33.0 | 34.4 | 87.4 |
| 30-49 | 54.1 | 36.4 | 36.5 | 15.0 | 41.5 | 94.9 |
| 50-64 | 22.6 | 23.4 | 26.1 | 7.1 | 46.5 | 82.5 |
| 65+ | 24.5 | 26.9 | 24.0 | 15.4 | 19.8 | 64.1 |
| **Female** | 77.4 | 78.6 | 68.8 | 97.0 | 77.8 | 92.4 |
| 15-29 | 89.1 | 82.3 | 72.5 | 96.9 | 76.4 | 91.9 |
| 30-49 | 80.2 | 82.0 | 71.7 | 100.0 | 92.1 | 98.9 |
| 50-64 | 45.4 | 82.8 | 65.5 | 98.0 | 54.8 | 90.8 |
| 65+ | 33.0 | 32.9 | 34.6 | 79.2 | 36.1 | 62.3 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

frequently than males, who in turn report infirmity more often. For both genders, being a student and being too old are concentrated in specific age-groups: the youngest (15-29) and the oldest (65+) cohorts. Infirmity is also concentrated in the oldest cohort for females, but is relatively more widespread among males.

## 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. The most common activities in the district are taking care of the elderly and sick (90 percent) and fetching water (69 percent).

Remote villages report higher shares of population fetching water and firewood than accessible villages. In turn, the latter report higher shares cleaning the toilet and cooking than the former.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report higher shares of population fetching water, firewood and taking care of children, while non-poor households report a higher share cleaning the toilet.

The most important differences are shown in the gender and age-breakdown. Females report remarkably higher shares in all the activities, with rates fluctuating between 69 and 97 percent. The shares for males range from 23 to 61 percent, except for taking care of the sick and elderly (87 percent).

The analysis of age-groups shows that for males the shares decrease with age in all activities. In the case of females the shares show sharp decreases in the oldest cohort.

## 5.6 Child Labour

Table 5.15 shows that the most common activity for children between 5 and 14 years old is fetching water. It is interesting to notice that the share of children fetching water is higher than that for the rest of the population. Children from accessible villages report higher shares in most activities than children from remote villages, the exceptions being taking care of children and of the sick and elderly. Children from poor households, in turn, report similar or higher rates than children from non-poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that girls report similar or higher rates than boys for all household activities. The analysis by age-groups shows that the 10-14 cohorts for both genders have higher rates than the youngest children, for all household tasks.

**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** | 74.2 | 51.9 | 37.1 | 41.2 | 56.8 | 57.4 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 83.7 | 54.0 | 39.7 | 43.4 | 54.3 | 56.4 |
| Remote | 62.6 | 49.5 | 34.0 | 38.5 | 59.9 | 58.6 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 72.9 | 55.9 | 35.9 | 42.9 | 65.0 | 58.5 |
| Non-poor | 75.7 | 47.5 | 38.5 | 39.2 | 47.8 | 56.3 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 74.3 | 44.6 | 36.3 | 28.6 | 50.5 | 56.8 |
| 5-9 | 67.8 | 31.7 | 19.9 | 16.9 | 51.4 | 44.1 |
| 10-14 | 79.8 | 55.7 | 50.4 | 38.6 | 49.7 | 67.8 |
| **Female** | 74.1 | 58.7 | 37.8 | 52.9 | 62.7 | 58.0 |
| 5-9 | 57.9 | 32.6 | 14.6 | 17.8 | 62.6 | 33.9 |
| 10-14 | 88.6 | 82.0 | 58.5 | 84.1 | 62.8 | 79.5 |
| **Orphan status** | | | | | | |
| Orphaned | 81.5 | 59.5 | 31.5 | 54.2 | 60.1 | 52.1 |
| Not-orphaned | 73.2 | 51.0 | 37.7 | 39.8 | 56.3 | 58.2 |
| **Foster status** | | | | | | |
| Fostered | 75.5 | 68.7 | 57.8 | 58.4 | 19.7 | 70.6 |
| Non Fostered | 73.8 | 50.3 | 35.8 | 40.4 | 59.8 | 56.4 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

The breakdown by orphan status shows that orphaned children are more likely to undertake most of the activities, except for cleaning the toilet and taking care of the elderly and sick. Similarly, fostered children are more likely to undertake most of the household tasks under analysis than non-fostered children.

The main descriptive statistics for child labour are presented in Table 5.16. The most important result of the table is that 54 percent of the children are economically active. Their main economic activity is mostly household duties at 75 percent. The share of working children is higher in poor households. The particular activity does not show evident correlation with cluster location or poverty status.

The gender breakdown shows that girls are more likely to work in household duties than boys, while the latter are more likely to be involved in other activities (services, mining, manufacturing, etc.). However, the main difference is given by the age breakdown. Roughly one third of children in the 5-9 cohort were part of the working population, whereas virtually all the children in the 10-14 cohort were working at the time of the survey. Virtually all the children in the 10-14 cohort work in the household while around 15 percent of children in the 5-9 cohort work 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 70 and 53 percent, respectively. Similarly, fostered children are more likely to be working than non-fostered children, at rates of 78 and 52 percent, respectively. Orphaned children are more likely to work in agriculture than non-orphaned children, who in turn report higher shares in the remaining categories.

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

| | | Main activity | | | Employer | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Working | Agriculture | Household | Other | Private | Household |
| **Total** | 54.1 | 7.3 | 75.3 | 17.4 | 7.0 | 93.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 54.6 | 8.3 | 75.8 | 15.8 | 6.2 | 93.8 |
| Remote | 53.5 | 6.0 | 74.7 | 19.3 | 7.9 | 92.1 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 58.2 | 8.0 | 73.0 | 19.0 | 7.1 | 92.9 |
| Non-poor | 50.0 | 6.5 | 78.0 | 15.5 | 6.8 | 93.2 |
| **Gender and age** | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 53.7 | 7.1 | 72.2 | 20.7 | 6.3 | 93.7 |
| 5-9 | 34.6 | 0.4 | 71.4 | 28.2 | 13.1 | 86.9 |
| 10-14 | 99.3 | 12.8 | 72.9 | 14.3 | 0.6 | 99.4 |
| **Female** | 54.4 | 7.4 | 78.2 | 14.4 | 7.6 | 92.4 |
| 5-9 | 36.3 | 0.0 | 73.8 | 26.2 | 15.8 | 84.2 |
| 10-14 | 98.6 | 14.1 | 82.1 | 3.8 | 0.3 | 99.7 |
| **Orphan status** | | | | | | |
| Orphaned | 70.0 | 18.3 | 67.6 | 14.1 | 4.1 | 95.9 |
| Not-orphaned | 52.8 | 5.8 | 76.3 | 17.9 | 7.4 | 92.6 |
| **Foster status** | | | | | | |
| Fostered | 78.1 | 9.2 | 76.3 | 14.4 | 4.5 | 95.5 |
| Non Fostered | 52.8 | 7.1 | 75.0 | 17.9 | 7.3 | 92.7 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

# 5 Employment

# 6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES

This chapter presents the perceptions on welfare status and changes in Hanang DC. The first section shows perceptions of changes in the economic situation both of the communities and of the households. Section two summarises 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 better, worse or remained the same compared to the year prior to 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 64 percent of all households in the district reported a positive change in the economic situation of their community. 14 percent of the population reported observing no changes in their community's economic situation. Even though up to 20 percent of the respondents reported the community's economic condition to have deteriorated; only 9 percent reported the situation to be much worse.

Cluster location and poverty status of the household show some correlation with the perceived economic change. 30 percent of the households in remote clusters reports deterioration in their community's economic situation compared to 10 percent of those living in accessible clusters. Likewise, while 22 percent of poor households reports deterioration in their community's economic situation, the share for non-poor households is 19 percent.

The percentage of households with one or two members who reported deterioration in their community's economic situation is higher than that of households with seven or more members at 23 and 21 percent respectively. In contrast, while 62 percent of households with seven or more members reported an improvement in their community's economic situation, the share for households with one or two members is 56 percent. Furthermore, there is a difference of 23 percentage points between households owning six or more hectares of land and those owning no land who reported an improvement in their community's economic situation at 73 and 50 percent respectively. Likewise, the percentage of households owning no livestock who reported improving conditions in their community's economic situation is higher than that of households owning both small and large livestock at 69 and 59 percent respectively.

**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** | 8.6 | 10.5 | 13.6 | 60.6 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 3.4 | 7.0 | 18.0 | 66.1 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 14.6 | 14.6 | 8.6 | 54.2 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 11.1 | 10.5 | 12.0 | 59.6 | 2.3 | 4.6 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 7.5 | 10.5 | 14.3 | 61.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 8.7 | 14.0 | 17.7 | 47.3 | 9.0 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 8.9 | 6.6 | 9.4 | 66.1 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 8.9 | 10.6 | 16.4 | 61.2 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 8.1 | 12.5 | 13.4 | 60.2 | 1.5 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 11.0 | 10.3 | 18.9 | 48.3 | 2.4 | 9.2 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 21.0 | 0.0 | 21.0 | 58.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 4.0 | 8.3 | 16.8 | 63.1 | 1.3 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 6.5 | 9.3 | 14.9 | 63.6 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 10.5 | 14.8 | 18.2 | 51.3 | 3.7 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 9.2 | 10.6 | 2.9 | 70.1 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 9.3 | 8.4 | 11.2 | 64.2 | 4.5 | 2.4 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 4.6 | 4.1 | 11.9 | 61.2 | 6.0 | 12.2 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 9.5 | 9.9 | 12.6 | 64.1 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| Both | 8.9 | 14.0 | 16.2 | 56.7 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.8 | 68.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 8.3 | 10.9 | 12.7 | 61.4 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 13.5 | 9.9 | 13.3 | 53.7 | 5.1 | 4.5 | 100.0 |
| Other | 9.8 | 9.9 | 20.8 | 55.0 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 9.1 | 10.6 | 14.6 | 58.2 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 6.5 | 10.1 | 8.6 | 72.5 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Single | 4.9 | 0.0 | 40.5 | 54.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 8.5 | 10.7 | 14.6 | 60.4 | 1.9 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 11.2 | 10.9 | 8.5 | 60.3 | 5.2 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 15.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 84.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 7.4 | 11.4 | 11.8 | 60.7 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 8.8 | 7.8 | 14.7 | 61.0 | 4.7 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 8.9 | 12.5 | 13.5 | 59.2 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 3.1 | 11.2 | 4.6 | 76.4 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

While 68 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category reported an improvement in their community's economic situation, the share for households whose main income earner belongs to the 'other' category is 55 percent. In contrast, while 24 percent of the households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed other' category reported deterioration in their community's economic situation, the share for households belonging to the 'employee' category is virtually null. Furthermore, 85 percent of households where the household head has a loose union reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their communities whereas, the share for households where the household head is single is 55 percent. In contrast, 41 percent of households

where the head is singe reported same conditions in their community's economic situation whereas, the share for households where the head has a loose union is virtually null.

It is also observed that the percentage of households where the head has secondary education or more and reported an improvement in their community's economic situation is 10 percentage points higher than that of households where the head has no formal education. Finally, while 73 percent of female-headed households reported an improvement in their community's economic situation, the share for male-headed households is 62 percent.

**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** | 14.0 | 17.5 | 18.2 | 48.2 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 11.2 | 18.0 | 22.2 | 46.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 17.3 | 17.0 | 13.5 | 49.7 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 15.9 | 16.8 | 19.4 | 46.8 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 13.2 | 17.8 | 17.6 | 48.8 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 26.3 | 13.3 | 24.8 | 30.8 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 15.0 | 16.0 | 17.4 | 47.7 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 11.0 | 17.2 | 17.0 | 54.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 11.3 | 20.5 | 17.3 | 49.3 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 23.7 | 21.2 | 24.5 | 30.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 37.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 22.7 | 21.0 | 16.2 | 40.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 10.8 | 19.0 | 21.1 | 47.2 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 15.1 | 19.5 | 19.9 | 42.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 7.3 | 10.1 | 11.0 | 68.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 20.3 | 15.0 | 17.4 | 45.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 16.2 | 16.9 | 14.3 | 51.2 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 4.2 | 11.4 | 33.7 | 50.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Both | 11.1 | 21.1 | 15.9 | 48.7 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 13.6 | 41.0 | 45.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 14.5 | 17.0 | 16.4 | 49.6 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 14.7 | 19.4 | 16.9 | 49.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 10.8 | 25.2 | 38.0 | 26.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 13.4 | 17.4 | 15.6 | 51.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 17.1 | 18.1 | 31.0 | 33.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Single | 25.6 | 16.8 | 5.7 | 51.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 12.0 | 17.1 | 20.0 | 49.6 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 9.7 | 18.0 | 8.2 | 58.9 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 15.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 84.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 21.4 | 19.3 | 22.1 | 34.5 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 14.4 | 12.6 | 25.8 | 44.4 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 14.5 | 20.6 | 12.9 | 50.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 3.1 | 23.5 | 15.1 | 58.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

Table 6.2 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of their economic situation compared to the year before the survey. 50 percent of the households reported an improvement in their economic conditions, while 18 percent reported same conditions compared to the year preceding the survey.

While 34 percent of people living in remote clusters reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households, the share for accessible clusters was 29 percent.
Non-poor households expressed positive views on the change in their economic condition more frequently than poor households, with a difference of 4 percentage points at 52 and 48 percent respectively.

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their households is higher than that of households with one or two members at 51 and 36 percent respectively. Likewise, while 72 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their households, the share for households owning no land is 31 percent. Disaggregation of the data further shows that 35 percent of households owning no livestock expressed negative views on their households' economic conditions compared to 15 percent of households owning large livestock.

The percentage of households in the 'other' category who reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households is remarkably higher than that of households whose main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category at 36 and 14 percent respectively. Likewise, while 43 percent of households where the head is single reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households, the share for a household where the head has a loose union is 15 percent. In contrast, 85 percent of households where the head has a loose union reported an improvement in their households' economic situation.

35 percent of female-headed households reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households compared to 30 percent of male-headed households. On the other hand, 58 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more reported an improvement in their household's economic situation compared to 47

**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** | 34.9 | 28.4 | 35.0 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 38.5 | 23.8 | 36.2 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 30.9 | 33.7 | 33.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 28.7 | 35.1 | 34.5 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 37.7 | 25.4 | 35.2 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 38.4 | 16.3 | 44.0 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 41.8 | 27.7 | 30.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 25.4 | 32.4 | 40.0 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 35.7 | 30.0 | 31.4 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 26.1 | 23.9 | 39.2 | 10.8 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 37.0 | 0.0 | 63.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 20.7 | 30.5 | 48.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 35.9 | 30.7 | 32.8 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 31.3 | 33.7 | 34.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 48.1 | 25.0 | 25.6 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 26.2 | 29.5 | 41.5 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 36.3 | 22.8 | 38.1 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 41.7 | 17.3 | 39.1 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| Both | 39.6 | 31.7 | 28.1 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 54.4 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 36.1 | 28.3 | 34.2 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 30.2 | 42.6 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 16.2 | 10.9 | 64.2 | 8.7 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 34.2 | 30.7 | 33.3 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Female | 38.6 | 16.6 | 43.0 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Single | 32.0 | 36.6 | 31.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 34.7 | 33.3 | 30.9 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 40.1 | 20.9 | 33.3 | 5.7 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 0.0 | 35.6 | 64.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 34.0 | 18.1 | 46.6 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | |
| None | 32.2 | 21.7 | 44.2 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 34.9 | 34.1 | 29.3 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 63.6 | 15.3 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

percent of households where the head has no formal education or more.

## 6.2 Self-reported Difficulties in Satisfying Household Needs

This section analyses the difficulties households faced in satisfying household needs during the year prior to 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, 63 percent of the district's households never/seldom experienced food shortages whereas the remaining population experience food shortages frequently (often/always). While 39 percent of households in accessible clusters never experienced food shortages, the share for households in remote clusters is 31 percent. Likewise, 38 percent of non-poor households never experienced food shortages compared to 29 percent of poor households.

73 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land never/seldom experienced problems satisfying food needs compared to 50 percent of households owning no land. Furthermore, while 66 percent of households with seven or more members never/seldom experienced food shortages, the share for households with one or two members is 54 percent. There is also some correlation between livestock ownership and satisfying food needs. While 42 percent of households owning large livestock never experienced food shortages, the share for households owning no livestock is 26 percent.

The socio-economic group of the household also shows some correlation with the household's ability to satisfy its food needs. 54 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' socio-economic group never experienced problems satisfying food needs compared to only 16 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category. In contrast, 73 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category reported frequent problems satisfying food needs. Furthermore, while 40 percent of households where the head is polygamous had never experienced food shortages, the share for households where the head has a loose union is virtually null. On the other hand, 64 percent of households where the head has a loose union frequently

**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** | 96.5 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 95.0 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 98.3 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 95.9 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 96.8 | 0.3 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 97.2 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 98.0 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 93.6 | 2.4 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 98.3 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 98.6 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 95.7 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 96.2 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 95.5 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 98.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 94.6 | 2.1 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Both | 94.6 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 90.8 | 0.0 | 9.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 96.3 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 98.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 97.0 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 94.4 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Single | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 96.8 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 96.1 | 2.5 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 95.6 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | |
| None | 97.0 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 96.9 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 87.3 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

experienced food shortages.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households reported having food shortages less frequently than male-headed households as 39 percent of female-headed households never experienced food shortages compared to 34 percent of male-headed households. Likewise, while 64 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more never experienced food shortages, the share for households where the head has no education is 32 percent.

**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** | 99.8 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 99.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 99.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 99.3 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 98.3 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 99.5 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 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 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 99.8 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 98.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Single | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 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 | 99.2 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | |
| None | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 99.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

## 6.2.2 Paying School Fees

Table 6.4 shows the percentage distribution of households by the difficulty in paying school fees during the year before the survey. At the time of the survey, 97 percent of the households in the district reported that they never had problems paying school fees and only 2 percent of the households reported that they often/always had problems paying school fees. It is worth noting 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).

98 percent of households located in remote clusters never experienced problems paying school fees compared to 95 percent of households located in accessible clusters. On the other hand, poverty status does not show strong correlation with the ability to pay school fees.

Furthermore, smaller households find problems paying school fees less frequently than larger households. While all (100 percent) households with one or two members never had problems with paying school fees, the share for households with seven or more members is 94 percent.

Virtually all households owning 1 hectare of land never experienced problems paying school fees compared to 96 percent of households owning 6 or more hectares of land. Likewise, virtually all households owning small livestock never had problems paying school fees, whereas the share for households owning large livestock and those owning both small and large livestock is 95 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that virtually all households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category never had problems with paying school fees compared to 91 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee.

Furthermore, virtually all households where the head is single and those where the head has a loose union never had problems paying school fees, compared to about 96 percent of the remaining categories. Finally, 97 percent of households where the household head has no education never experienced problems paying school fees compared to 87 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more.

## 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. Virtually all households in the district reported that they never had problems paying house rent although a small percentage (2 percent) of households owning no land reported that they often

**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** | 99.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 98.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 98.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 98.4 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 98.6 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 99.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 98.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 96.9 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 99.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 98.9 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 97.9 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Both | 99.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 99.1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 99.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 99.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Single | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 99.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 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 | 98.3 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | |
| None | 99.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 98.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

**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** | 47.3 | 35.6 | 16.8 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 47.3 | 34.8 | 17.3 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 47.4 | 36.5 | 16.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 45.5 | 31.9 | 21.5 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 48.1 | 37.2 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 45.8 | 43.4 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 50.7 | 37.1 | 12.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 40.6 | 36.8 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 50.5 | 30.5 | 18.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 47.9 | 30.4 | 19.7 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 37.0 | 21.0 | 42.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 31.8 | 51.3 | 16.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 42.9 | 42.8 | 13.8 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 52.8 | 32.4 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 56.5 | 26.0 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | |
| None | 46.3 | 34.6 | 19.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 31.9 | 47.6 | 18.8 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 54.0 | 28.4 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Both | 50.4 | 35.0 | 14.2 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 81.6 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 47.8 | 36.9 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 44.7 | 28.6 | 26.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 29.7 | 31.4 | 32.5 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 48.4 | 33.7 | 17.5 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Female | 42.1 | 45.0 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Single | 59.5 | 34.8 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 49.7 | 33.7 | 16.4 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 48.5 | 30.0 | 20.1 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 0.0 | 20.3 | 79.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 40.5 | 45.6 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | |
| None | 42.4 | 36.1 | 20.6 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 48.6 | 36.5 | 14.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 78.8 | 16.7 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

had problems paying house rent. Other household characteristics such as cluster location, poverty status, household size, livestock ownership, socio-economic group, gender, marital status and level of education do not show strong 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. 99 percent of all households in the district faced no problems paying utility bills although a small percentage (3 percent) of households owning between one and two hectares of land often had problems paying utility bills. Other selected household characteristics such as cluster location, poverty status, household size, livestock ownership, socio-economic group, gender, marital status and level of education do not show correlation with the 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. 83 percent of the households reported that they never/seldom experienced problems paying for healthcare in the year prior to the survey. Cluster location does not show correlation with the ability to pay for healthcare. On the other hand, while 23 percent of poor households frequently experienced problems paying for healthcare, the share for non-poor households 15 percent.

51 percent of households with seven or more members never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 46 percent of households with one or two members. Likewise, while 57 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for landless households is 48 percent.

Furthermore, 54 percent of households owning large livestock never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 32 percent of those owning small livestock. On the other hand, while 82 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group is 30 percent.

60 percent of households where the household head is single never had problems paying for healthcare, whereas

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

| | Home | Land | Livestock | | | Vehicle | Motor-cycle | Bicycle | Wheel barrow |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Small | Large | Both | | | | |
| **Total** | 94.7 | 89.6 | 11.2 | 10.9 | 43.9 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 41.5 | 14.7 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 94.7 | 88.9 | 9.5 | 14.1 | 44.6 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 38.3 | 13.6 |
| Remote | 94.6 | 90.5 | 13.2 | 7.2 | 43.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 45.1 | 16.1 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 96.0 | 92.2 | 12.4 | 10.6 | 58.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 35.4 | 18.9 |
| Non-poor | 94.0 | 88.5 | 10.7 | 11.0 | 37.2 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 44.1 | 12.9 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 96.0 | 91.4 | 7.0 | 8.0 | 12.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 1.0 |
| 3-4 | 93.5 | 88.6 | 11.4 | 9.4 | 39.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 39.7 | 7.1 |
| 5-6 | 94.3 | 87.6 | 12.2 | 10.1 | 45.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 44.6 | 15.0 |
| 7+ | 95.4 | 91.6 | 11.8 | 13.8 | 58.0 | 1.8 | 3.6 | 51.7 | 25.6 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 60.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 64.2 | 37.1 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 94.3 | 92.4 | 12.1 | 11.6 | 45.2 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 41.9 | 15.1 |
| Self-employed - other | 94.9 | 65.1 | 5.4 | 6.7 | 20.5 | 4.6 | 5.3 | 51.5 | 11.8 |
| Other | 97.9 | 79.0 | 10.4 | 3.3 | 50.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 4.3 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 94.8 | 89.7 | 11.4 | 11.0 | 45.8 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 46.4 | 17.2 |
| Female | 93.9 | 89.2 | 10.2 | 10.5 | 34.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 2.5 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

the share for households where the household head has a loose union is virtually null. On the other hand, 80 percent households where the head has a loose union frequently experienced problems paying for healthcare. 48 percent of male-headed households never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 42 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, 79 percent of household heads with secondary education or more never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 42 percent of household heads with no education.

## 6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status

This section discusses ownership of selected assets and household occupancy status. These assets are 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, 95 percent of the district's households own their dwellings while 90 percent owns some land. 44 percent of all households own both small and large livestock while 11 percent of all households own either large or small livestock. While 42 percent of households own a bicycle, the share of households owning a motorcycle is 1 percent.

Table 6.9 shows the percent distribution of households by occupancy status. Cluster location, poverty status, household size and gender do not show strong correlation with dwelling and land ownership. However, further breakdown of data shows that 44 percent of non-poor households owns a bicycle compared to 35 percent of poor households. Likewise, 45 percent of households located in remote clusters owns a bicycle compared to 38 percent of households located in accessible clusters.

Disaggregation of the data shows that 52 percent of households with seven or more members owns a bicycle compared to 10

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

| | Own | Rent | Free | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 94.7 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 94.7 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 94.6 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 3.6 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 96.0 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 94.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 96.0 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 93.5 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 94.3 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 95.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 94.3 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 2.6 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 94.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 100.0 |
| Other | 97.9 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 94.8 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| Female | 93.9 | 1.1 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

percent of households with one or two members. Furthermore, virtually all households belonging to the 'employee' category owns their dwellings whereas, the share for households whose main income earner is self-employed in agriculture is 94 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further show that 46 percent of male-headed households own a bicycle compared to 17 percent of female-headed households. Similarly, while 64 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee own a bicycle, the share for households where the head belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group is 10 percent.

It is also noticeable that virtually all households belonging to the 'employee' category own some land compared to 65 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category.

### 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 do not have any documentation to verify their occupancy status. Only 2 percent of the households has formal occupancy documentation, which include a title deed, renting contract or payment receipt. 93 percent of households in this district have no documentation at all.

## 6.4 Agriculture

The 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

The survey collected information on agricultural practices. The dataset includes information regarding usage of farm inputs and the main source from which the farmers got the inputs. Table 6.11 shows the percent distribution of households using certain inputs. This information is complimented by Table 6.12, which shows the main source of agricultural inputs.

**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** | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 5.3 | 92.8 | 100.0 | 1.8 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 5.8 | 90.7 | 100.0 | 3.4 |
| Remote | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 95.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 97.9 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Non-poor | 1.6 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 6.7 | 90.6 | 100.0 | 2.7 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 6.9 | 91.5 | 100.0 | 1.6 |
| 3-4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 6.1 | 91.3 | 100.0 | 2.6 |
| 5-6 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 5.0 | 93.6 | 100.0 | 1.4 |
| 7+ | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 4.4 | 94.0 | 100.0 | 1.6 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.8 | 83.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 3.8 | 95.3 | 100.0 | 0.9 |
| Self-employed - other | 6.9 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 19.3 | 67.1 | 100.0 | 13.6 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 96.7 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 6.0 | 91.8 | 100.0 | 2.2 |
| Female | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 97.8 | 100.0 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang 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** | 52.0 | 82.6 | 38.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 57.7 | 79.5 | 44.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 0.0 |
| Remote | 45.4 | 87.0 | 31.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.1 | 0.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 61.1 | 91.1 | 28.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.2 | 0.0 |
| Non-poor | 47.9 | 77.7 | 44.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.9 | 0.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 26.6 | 62.6 | 42.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3-4 | 43.8 | 84.2 | 40.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.5 | 0.0 |
| 5-6 | 51.3 | 88.3 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 0.0 |
| 7+ | 68.1 | 81.0 | 38.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.4 | 0.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 48.5 | 66.2 | 51.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.8 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 53.1 | 84.8 | 37.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.1 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 44.6 | 47.5 | 66.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.2 | 0.0 |
| Other | 46.2 | 100.0 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.2 | 0.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 54.4 | 80.4 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.1 | 0.0 |
| Female | 39.8 | 97.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base for column 1 is all households. For columns 2 to 7 is households using agricultural inputs

52 percent of all farmers apply agricultural inputs to their farms and the majority (83 percent) of those who use farm inputs apply fertilizers. 58 percent of households located in accessible clusters use agricultural inputs compared to 45 percent of households located in remote clusters. Further breakdown of data shows that 87 percent of households in remote clusters use fertilisers compared to 80 percent of

**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** | 40.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 57.4 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 44.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 52.6 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 33.3 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 64.4 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 30.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68.7 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 45.6 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 50.8 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 42.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.4 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 41.8 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.5 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 37.9 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 58.4 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 40.1 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 57.7 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | |
| Employee | 51.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 48.6 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 38.3 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 58.7 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 72.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.9 | 100.0 |
| Other | 20.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 79.3 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | |
| Male | 41.2 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 55.8 | 100.0 |
| Female | 32.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 67.6 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

1. Base is households using agricultural inputs

households in accessible clusters. Furthermore, while 61 percent of poor households uses agricultural inputs, the share for non-poor households is 48 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that as the number of household members increases, the usage of agricultural inputs also tends to increase as 68 percent of households with seven or more members use agricultural inputs compared to 27 percent of households with one or two members. Furthermore, while 53 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category uses agricultural inputs, the share for households belonging to the 'self-employed other' socio-economic group is 45 percent. Likewise, use of agricultural inputs in male-headed households is higher than in female-headed households. While 54 percent of male-headed households uses agricultural inputs, the share for female-headed households is 40 percent.

Most households that use agricultural inputs obtain them by preparing them themselves (57 percent) and in second place obtain them by purchasing them at an open market (40 percent). While 2 percent of the households gets their inputs from the government, 1 percent reports cooperatives and none reports donor agencies as their main source.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that the percentage of households located in remote clusters who obtain agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves is higher than that of households located in accessible clusters at 64 and 53 percent respectively. In contrast, 45 percent of households located in accessible clusters purchases agricultural inputs at an open market compared to 33 percent of households located in remote clusters. While 69 percent of poor households obtains agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves, the share for non-poor households is 51 percent. On the other hand, 46 percent of non-poor households purchases agricultural inputs at an open market compared to 30 percent of poor households.

In addition, while 43 percent of households with one or two members purchases agricultural inputs at an open market, the share for households with seven or more members is 40 percent

**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** | 10.4 | 3.0 | 12.4 | 28.0 | 22.4 | 23.8 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 11.1 | 5.6 | 20.5 | 30.7 | 20.6 | 11.5 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 9.5 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 24.9 | 24.6 | 37.9 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 7.8 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 33.9 | 20.4 | 26.9 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 11.5 | 4.3 | 13.0 | 25.4 | 23.3 | 22.4 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 8.6 | 10.6 | 12.6 | 38.4 | 18.0 | 11.7 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 11.4 | 3.0 | 12.7 | 29.4 | 26.1 | 17.4 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 12.4 | 3.4 | 15.8 | 27.4 | 16.8 | 24.1 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 8.4 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 23.7 | 25.5 | 33.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 23.6 | 8.2 | 54.6 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 7.6 | 2.6 | 11.3 | 29.6 | 23.9 | 25.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 34.9 | 2.3 | 24.7 | 15.8 | 12.2 | 10.2 | 100.0 |
| Other | 21.0 | 11.8 | 10.0 | 23.8 | 20.8 | 12.5 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 10.3 | 1.3 | 11.5 | 26.9 | 23.5 | 26.5 | 100.0 |
| Female | 10.8 | 11.3 | 16.9 | 33.4 | 17.2 | 10.3 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

72 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities purchase their agricultural inputs at an open market compared to 21 percent of households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group. In turn, 79 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category obtain agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves. Finally, while 41 percent of male-headed households purchases agricultural inputs at an open market, the share for female-headed households is 32 percent. In contrast, 68 percent of female-headed households obtain agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves compared to 56 percent of male-headed households.

## 6.4.2 Landholding

Table 6.13 shows the percent distribution of households by the area of land owned. Around 25 percent of households own less than two acres of land (including 10 percent of landless households). 28 percent owns between two and four acres and 46 percent owns four or more acres.

Landless households are more common in accessible clusters and households owning relatively larger portions of land are more common in remote clusters. Likewise, the percentage of landless households among non-poor households is higher than that of poor households, at 12 and 8 percent respectively.

Regarding household size, while 12 percent of households with five or six members are landless, the share for households with seven or more members is 8 percent. In contrast, larger households seem to own larger landholdings more frequently than households with less members.

While households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities reported the highest share of landless households (35 percent), the share for households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category is virtually null. In turn, the majority (63 percent) of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category owns four or more acres of land. Finally, male-headed households report higher a share owning larger landholdings (4 or more acres) than female-headed households at 51 and 27 percent respectively.

## 6.4.3 Cattle Ownership

Table 6.14 shows the percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned. Overall 45 percent of the households own no cattle at all, and 38 percent owns between 2 and 10 heads of

**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** | 45.2 | 3.2 | 38.4 | 8.3 | 3.5 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 41.3 | 4.2 | 46.3 | 5.7 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 49.7 | 2.1 | 29.3 | 11.4 | 6.2 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 30.5 | 5.0 | 46.0 | 9.9 | 6.9 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 51.8 | 2.4 | 35.0 | 7.6 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 79.9 | 1.0 | 15.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 51.5 | 1.4 | 39.8 | 4.8 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 44.8 | 5.8 | 39.7 | 5.2 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 28.2 | 3.5 | 44.4 | 15.2 | 7.6 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 22.2 | 9.7 | 49.2 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 43.1 | 3.1 | 40.4 | 8.4 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 72.8 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 5.1 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| Other | 45.9 | 7.5 | 34.6 | 7.8 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 43.2 | 2.9 | 38.6 | 9.4 | 4.2 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| Female | 55.2 | 4.7 | 37.1 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

cattle. While 50 percent of households in remote clusters own no cattle, the share for households in accessible clusters is 41 percent. Likewise, the percentage of non-poor households that own no cattle is higher than that of poor households at 52 and 31 percent respectively.

80 percent of households with one or two members own no cattle, compared to 28 percent of households with seven or more members. Likewise, about 73 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category owns no cattle compared to 22 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category. Finally, while 55 percent of female-headed households own no cattle, the share for male-headed households is 43 percent.

## 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 categorise the current crime and security situation as the same, better or worse than the previous year. Results are shown in Table 6.15

41 percent the households reported it was improving, 43 percent said it was the same while 16 percent reported it was deteriorating. The percentage of households located in accessible clusters who reported the current crime and security situation as improving is higher than that of households located in remote clusters at 49 and 34 percent respectively. Likewise, 45 percent of non-poor households reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 35 percent pf poor households.

While 21 percent of households with seven or more members reported deterioration in the current crime and security situation, the share for households with one or two members is 13 percent. Similarly, 22 percent of households owning no land reported the current crime and security situation as deteriorating compared to 12 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land. While 52 percent of households owning small livestock reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households owning both small and large livestock is 36 percent.

While 49 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed other' category reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households

**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** | 2.7 | 12.8 | 42.5 | 25.3 | 16.1 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 2.1 | 9.6 | 39.0 | 29.5 | 19.1 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 3.5 | 16.4 | 46.6 | 20.5 | 12.6 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 4.6 | 16.6 | 44.2 | 17.5 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 1.9 | 11.0 | 41.8 | 28.8 | 15.7 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 1.4 | 11.8 | 45.9 | 22.7 | 15.3 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 46.4 | 22.4 | 20.9 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 3.3 | 11.9 | 40.2 | 31.6 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 5.0 | 16.4 | 40.0 | 23.6 | 14.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Area of land owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 5.8 | 16.4 | 38.3 | 24.6 | 10.4 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| < 1 ha | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.8 | 6.2 | 21.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 1-1.99 ha | 1.2 | 22.4 | 28.6 | 26.8 | 21.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 2-3.99 ha | 2.3 | 11.3 | 40.9 | 31.4 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 4-5.99 ha | 2.7 | 13.0 | 47.9 | 21.1 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 6+ ha | 3.0 | 9.3 | 44.7 | 24.2 | 18.4 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| **Type of livestock owned by the household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 2.3 | 13.0 | 39.5 | 27.2 | 17.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Small only | 0.0 | 18.1 | 29.8 | 33.2 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Large only | 3.1 | 4.4 | 48.3 | 26.8 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Both | 3.7 | 13.3 | 46.7 | 21.5 | 13.9 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 0.0 | 60.8 | 31.0 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 2.1 | 12.6 | 42.9 | 25.4 | 16.8 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 7.6 | 17.9 | 21.4 | 32.2 | 16.7 | 4.4 | 100.0 |
| Other | 6.7 | 13.3 | 61.8 | 11.3 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 3.3 | 13.0 | 42.0 | 27.2 | 14.1 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Female | 0.0 | 11.5 | 45.3 | 16.1 | 26.0 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| **Marital status of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Single | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.2 | 8.2 | 25.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Monogamous | 2.9 | 15.0 | 38.2 | 27.5 | 16.3 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| Polygamous | 5.6 | 7.9 | 48.8 | 24.9 | 12.0 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| Loose union | 0.0 | 0.0 | 35.6 | 64.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Widow/div/sep | 0.8 | 11.8 | 48.2 | 19.5 | 18.1 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| **Education level of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| None | 1.5 | 9.9 | 49.6 | 21.3 | 17.4 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Primary | 3.5 | 15.3 | 36.4 | 28.7 | 15.6 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Secondary + | 4.5 | 5.4 | 58.7 | 17.3 | 9.3 | 4.8 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category is 18 percent. In turn, 62 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category reported same conditions in the current crime and security situation. On the other hand, 16 percent of male-headed households reported the current crime and security situation as deteriorating compared to 12 percent of female-headed households.

64 percent of households where the household head has a loose union reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation whereas; the share for households where the head is single is 34 percent. Finally, the percentage of households where the head has secondary education or more and reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation is 12 percentage points

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

| | Principal contributor of income | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Head | Spouse | Child | Other | Total |
| **Total** | 84.0 | 9.8 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 80.1 | 12.1 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 88.6 | 7.0 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 72.8 | 17.0 | 6.8 | 3.4 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 89.0 | 6.6 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 86.7 | 4.7 | 1.6 | 6.9 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 88.7 | 5.6 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 85.3 | 8.8 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 78.3 | 15.7 | 5.3 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 86.3 | 8.5 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 85.3 | 8.7 | 2.0 | 3.9 | 100.0 |
| Other | 40.6 | 34.7 | 6.0 | 18.7 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | |
| Male | 83.7 | 11.5 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| Female | 85.7 | 0.9 | 9.3 | 4.2 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

higher than that of household heads with no education at 38 and 26 percent respectively.

## 6.6 Household Income Contributions

Table 6.16 shows the percent distribution of households by main 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. In 84 percent of households the head is the main contributor.

89 percent of households located in remote villages reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 80 percent of households located in accessible villages. Likewise, while 89 percent of non-poor households reported the household head as the main income contributor, the share for poor households is 73 percent.

87 percent of households with one or two members reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 78 percent of households with seven or more members. On the other hand, while 16 percent of households with seven or more members reported the spouse as the main income contributor, the share for households with one or two members is 5 percent.

Furthermore, virtually all households belonging to the 'employee' category reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 41 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category. In contrast, 35 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category reported the spouse as the main income contributor. The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that up to 12 percent of male-headed households reported the spouse as the main income contributor, while the share for female-headed households is 1 percent. In contrast, 86 percent of female-headed households reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 84 percent of male-headed households. It is also observed that up to 9 percent of female-headed households reported the child as the main income contributor compared to 3 percent of male-headed households.

## 6.7 Other Household Items

Table 6.17 shows the percentage distribution of households owning selected

household items. 76 percent of households owns at least one mattress or bed, 52 percent owns a watch or clock, 43 percent owns a radio and 18 percent owns an electric iron. Although no household owns a fixed line phone, 10 percent owns a mobile phone. Households in accessible clusters and non-poor households have higher rates of ownership in almost every selected item.

The breakdown by household size shows that the shares of ownership tend to be 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 in most of the selected household items than the other socio-economic groups.

**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** | 17.5 | 0.2 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 75.9 | 51.6 | 43.4 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 10.1 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 22.2 | 0.3 | 4.8 | 2.0 | 77.8 | 53.4 | 45.9 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 15.0 |
| Remote | 12.1 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 73.8 | 49.6 | 40.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.4 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 55.5 | 45.1 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Non-poor | 23.0 | 0.3 | 4.0 | 2.7 | 85.0 | 54.5 | 54.0 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 14.3 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 56.4 | 25.1 | 22.3 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
| 3-4 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 84.8 | 46.7 | 42.8 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 8.6 |
| 5-6 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 1.4 | 75.9 | 54.6 | 42.9 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 11.5 |
| 7+ | 24.1 | 0.5 | 4.3 | 3.0 | 75.6 | 62.7 | 51.7 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 13.3 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 62.8 | 0.0 | 26.0 | 8.6 | 86.4 | 86.4 | 86.4 | 25.0 | 8.2 | 34.2 |
| Self-employed - agric | 14.7 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 74.3 | 51.9 | 41.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 6.6 |
| Self-employed - other | 44.9 | 2.3 | 15.9 | 2.3 | 97.8 | 56.0 | 74.8 | 16.9 | 2.3 | 47.4 |
| Other | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 64.5 | 25.8 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 19.0 | 0.2 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 76.7 | 55.3 | 47.2 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 11.7 |
| Female | 9.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 71.9 | 33.0 | 24.5 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 2.1 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

# 6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

# 7 HOUSEHOLD AMENITIES

This chapter analyses the main amenities of the households in Hanang DC. 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, 66 percent of households has thatch as their main roof material and 24 percent has iron sheets.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in both remote villages and accessible villages are more likely to use thatch as material for roofing the house (at 74 and 56 percent) than iron sheets (at 25 and 22 percent respectively). The same is observed by poverty status where thatch is more likely to be used than iron sheets in both accessible and remote villages.

The breakdown by household size shows that households with 5 to 6 members have the higher use of thatch (74 percent) while households with 7 or more members have the highest use of iron sheets (28 percent). The split-up by socio-economic group shows that 'other' is the category with highest share of households using thatch for the roof (at 73 percent), and that the self-employed in non-agricultural activities are the group with the lowest use of thatch (30 percent). Conversely, employees are the category with the highest use of iron sheets (at 63 percent).

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no strong differences in the material used of roof of the house.
Table 7.2 shows the distribution of households by type of material used in the

**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** | 9.7 | 65.7 | 0.0 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 0.8 | 74.0 | 0.0 | 25.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 19.9 | 56.3 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 13.3 | 74.6 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 8.1 | 61.8 | 0.0 | 29.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 6.8 | 66.8 | 0.0 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 15.5 | 60.4 | 0.0 | 23.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 8.4 | 73.8 | 0.0 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 7.1 | 63.2 | 0.0 | 27.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 37.2 | 0.0 | 62.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 9.4 | 69.4 | 0.0 | 20.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 13.7 | 29.9 | 0.0 | 56.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 12.9 | 73.0 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 10.3 | 65.4 | 0.0 | 23.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 6.6 | 67.5 | 0.0 | 24.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

**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** | 94.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 91.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 97.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 91.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 98.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 95.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 94.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 91.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 56.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 43.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 96.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 69.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | |
| Male | 93.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 96.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

**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** | 83.7 | 0.0 | 13.5 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 81.7 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 86.1 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 93.9 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 79.1 | 0.0 | 17.3 | 3.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 89.9 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 85.1 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 85.2 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 79.2 | 0.0 | 17.9 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 37.2 | 0.0 | 53.1 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 87.1 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 55.5 | 0.0 | 39.9 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 93.1 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 82.8 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 88.0 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

walls. Overall, 84 percent of houses are built with mud or mud bricks. Burnt bricks occupy the second place, with a share of 14 percent.

The analysis of cluster location reveals that households in remote villages have a higher share of mud and mud bricks than households in accessible villages. The rates are 86 and 82 percent, respectively. Likewise, poor households use mud or mud bricks more often than non-poor households (94 percent and 79, respectively).

**Table 7.4: Percent distribution of households by type of housing unit**

| | Single room | Flat | Two or more rooms | Whole building | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 97.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 96.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 97.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | |
| Poor | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 99.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 1.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 96.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 92.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 95.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 0.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 98.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 97.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 93.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | |
| Male | 1.1 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 96.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 98.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

Analysis by household size indicates that use of mud and mud bricks decreases as the household size increases while conversely, the share for burnt brinks increases as household size also increases.

The 'other' category reports the highest shares living in houses made of mud or mud bricks (93 percent), whereas employees have the highest share living in houses made of burnt bricks (53 percent).

The gender breakdown shows that households headed by males use burnt bricks more often than female-headed households, at rates of 15 and 10 percent of females. The rates for mud and mud bricks for both female and male-headed households are 88 and 83 percent respectively.

The distribution of households by type of material used in the floor is shown in Table 7.3. Overall, the floor in 94 percent of households is made of mud or dirt floor and 6 percent of concrete.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages, with a rate of 9 percent, have a higher share of houses with concrete floor than households in remote villages, with a rate of 3 percent.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that all poor households (100 percent) have mud or dirt floor. Up to 9 percent of non-poor households have concrete flooring. It is noted that as household size increases that share for mud or dirt floor decreases. Households with 7 or more members have the highest share for concrete or cement at 9 percent.

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that employees have the lowest share of mud or dirt floor and the highest share of concrete. In contrast, all households (100 percent) in the 'other' category use mud or dirt.

Finally, households headed by females have a higher share of mud or dirt floor than male-headed households. In turn, 3 percent of female-headed households have concrete or cement flooring, against 7 percent of male-headed households.

Table 7.4 shows the percent distribution of households by type of housing unit they occupy. Overall, 97 percent of households occupy the whole building where they live.

There is no strong correlation between cluster location, poverty status or gender with the type of housing unit.

**Table 7.5: 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** | 17.2 | 34.9 | 26.4 | 1.8 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 45.4 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 25.9 | 55.8 | 8.1 | 3.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 37.4 |
| Remote | 7.1 | 10.8 | 47.5 | 0.0 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 54.5 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 16.8 | 31.3 | 28.6 | 1.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 17.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 46.4 |
| Non-poor | 17.3 | 36.5 | 25.5 | 2.1 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 10.9 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 44.9 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 17.2 | 35.2 | 33.8 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 51.0 |
| 3-4 | 12.2 | 34.2 | 25.7 | 2.1 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 39.9 |
| 5-6 | 15.9 | 39.7 | 24.0 | 1.1 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 41.0 |
| 7+ | 22.2 | 31.4 | 26.5 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 51.3 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 49.6 | 31.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 49.6 |
| Self-employed - agric | 16.5 | 32.5 | 27.5 | 2.1 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 46.1 |
| Self-employed - other | 22.4 | 45.9 | 19.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 41.9 |
| Other | 6.7 | 58.1 | 30.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 37.6 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 17.5 | 33.7 | 27.4 | 1.4 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 46.3 |
| Female | 15.3 | 40.9 | 21.7 | 3.5 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 40.6 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

The breakdown by household size shows that all households with up to 2 members (100 percent) occupy a whole building; compared to 95 percent of households with 5 to 6 members.

The analysis of socio-economic groups shows that the 'other' and 'employee' categories have the highest share of households occupying the whole building, at 100 percent. 7 percent of households with members self-employed in non-agricultural activities occupy two or more rooms.

## 7.2 Water and Sanitation

The percentage distribution of households by source of drinking water is shown in Table 7.5. Overall, 45 percent of households have a safe source of water, whereas 7 percent of them get it from an unprotected well. Safe sources of drinking water are untreated pipes, bore holes, hand pumps, and treated pipes.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 55 percent of households in remote villages has a safe source of drinking water, whereas the share of households in accessible villages is just 37 percent. The shares of households with unprotected wells are 14 percent for remote and 1 percent for households in accessible villages. Poverty status of the household shows no strong differences in access to safe water. However, 8 percent of non-poor households get their drinking water from unprotected wells, while the share for poor households is 4 percent.

The breakdown by household size shows that households with up to 2 members and those with 7 or more members have equal shares on safe drinking sources, at 51 percent. Households with 3 to 4 members and those with 5 to 6 members report shares of around 40 percent.

The employees are the socio-economic category with the highest rate of access to safe sources of drinking water, while the 'other' category have the lowest share of safe sources, at 50 percent and 37 percent respectively.

The split-up by gender of the household head shows that male-headed households have higher access to safe sources of water than female headed households at 46 and 41 percent respectively.

Table 7.6 shows the percentage distribution of households by main type of toilet. Overall, 59 percent of households has safe sanitation.

**Table 7.6: 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** | 25.8 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 58.3 | 15.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 58.8 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 19.4 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 61.7 | 17.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 62.8 |
| Remote | 33.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 54.3 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 54.3 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 33.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 51.8 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 51.8 |
| Non-poor | 22.5 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 61.2 | 15.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 62.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 46.1 | 26.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 46.1 |
| 3-4 | 28.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 11.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 60.7 |
| 5-6 | 27.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.0 | 16.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 56.0 |
| 7+ | 22.1 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 63.0 | 13.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 64.1 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 77.8 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 86.4 |
| Self-employed - agric | 26.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 59.5 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 59.5 |
| Self-employed - other | 7.5 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 69.8 | 15.8 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 74.4 |
| Other | 50.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 13.6 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 25.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 59.5 | 14.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 60.1 |
| Female | 29.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 52.5 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 52.5 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

The cluster breakdown shows that 63 percent of households in accessible villages has safe sanitation, while for households in remote villages the share is 54 percent. The analysis by poverty status shows that 62 percent of non-poor households uses covered pit latrines, driving the share with safe sanitation 10 percentage points above poor households.

Households with 1 or 2 members have the lowest percentage of safe sanitation, at 46 percent. The rates for other groups fluctuate between 56 and 64 percent. Uncovered pit latrines gain importance in households with more than 2 members. It stands out that up to 27 percent of households between 1 and 6 members have no toilet.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that employees have highest rate of safe sanitation, at 86 percent while the 'other' category registers the lowest rate at 16 percent.

The analysis by gender of the household heads reveals that male-headed households are more likely to have safe sanitation than female-headed households. Furthermore, female-headed households are more likely to have no toilet than male-headed households, with rates of 29 and 25 percent, respectively.

## 7.3 Type of Fuel

Table 7.7 shows the distribution of households by fuel used for cooking. Overall, 94 percent of households use firewood. While 98 percent of households in remote villages uses firewood, almost 91 percent of households in accessible villages uses charcoal. The breakdown by poverty status reveals similar differences between poor and non-poor households.

The breakdown by household size shows that the smallest households (with up to 2 members) tend to use firewood more often than the rest, at 97 percent. Households with 3 to 4 members have the highest use of charcoal, at 5 percent.

There are no differences by gender of the household head. However, the split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that all (100 percent) households in the 'other' category uses firewood, whereas 31 percent of those self-employed in non-agricultural activities uses charcoal for cooking.

Table 7.8 shows the distribution of households according to the fuel used for lightning. Overall, 77 percent of the households in the district uses kerosene or paraffin, 20 percent firewood and just 2

**Table 7.7: 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** | 93.9 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 90.5 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Remote | 97.8 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 98.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Non-poor | 91.9 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 96.8 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 3-4 | 94.2 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 5-6 | 92.9 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 7+ | 93.4 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 83.2 | 16.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 96.5 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 65.2 | 30.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 93.9 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| Female | 93.8 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

**Table 7.8: Percent distribution of households by fuel used for lighting**

| | Kerosene/ paraffin | Gas | Mains electricity | Solar panels/ generator | Battery | Candles | Firewood | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 76.6 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 20.4 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 84.6 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 67.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 31.5 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 74.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 24.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 77.5 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 18.5 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 65.9 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.6 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 75.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 81.5 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 77.7 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 75.0 | 0.0 | 16.8 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 79.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 19.6 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 74.8 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Other | 39.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 60.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 77.3 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 19.3 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| Female | 73.2 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

percent uses 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 4 percent of households in accessible villages in the district. Virtually no

**Table 7.9: 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** | 40.0 | 25.7 | 9.8 | 24.5 | 100.0 | 6.3 | 15.8 | 22.6 | 55.4 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 57.3 | 35.7 | 5.2 | 1.8 | 100.0 | 9.0 | 24.8 | 24.5 | 41.7 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 20.0 | 14.1 | 15.2 | 50.7 | 100.0 | 3.3 | 5.3 | 20.4 | 71.0 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 32.2 | 26.3 | 11.6 | 29.9 | 100.0 | 6.7 | 7.8 | 24.9 | 60.6 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 43.4 | 25.4 | 9.0 | 22.1 | 100.0 | 6.2 | 19.3 | 21.5 | 53.0 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 45.8 | 22.1 | 17.5 | 14.5 | 100.0 | 14.9 | 5.1 | 16.7 | 63.3 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 34.5 | 27.7 | 8.7 | 29.2 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 17.9 | 23.5 | 55.8 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 35.6 | 33.4 | 6.9 | 24.1 | 100.0 | 3.9 | 20.9 | 22.1 | 53.1 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 46.0 | 19.1 | 10.4 | 24.6 | 100.0 | 8.1 | 13.7 | 24.3 | 54.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 76.7 | 23.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 16.4 | 8.6 | 22.8 | 52.2 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 37.3 | 26.7 | 10.8 | 25.2 | 100.0 | 5.0 | 13.6 | 23.0 | 58.4 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 62.6 | 11.7 | 5.2 | 20.5 | 100.0 | 18.4 | 37.0 | 18.4 | 26.1 | 100.0 |
| Other | 34.3 | 30.9 | 5.0 | 29.7 | 100.0 | 5.1 | 20.5 | 22.4 | 52.0 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 40.1 | 24.1 | 9.9 | 26.0 | 100.0 | 6.2 | 16.2 | 21.6 | 56.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | 39.6 | 33.5 | 9.5 | 17.4 | 100.0 | 6.8 | 13.6 | 27.3 | 52.3 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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 5 to 6 members, firewood is more likely to be used as source of lighting, with a share of 82 percent.

The analysis by socio-economic group of the household shows that those self-employed in agriculture have the highest rates of use of kerosene/paraffin, with a rate of 79 percent. On the other hand, 'other' has the highest rate of use of firewood, at 60 percent

Finally, female-headed households are more likely to use firewood and less likely to use kerosene/paraffin than male-headed households.

## 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, 66 percent of households are located under 30 minutes of a drinking water supply. In addition, 22 percent of the households are located under 30 minutes of a health facility.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that 93 percent of households in accessible villages has access to a drinking water source and 34 percent to a health facility, whereas the shares for households in remote villages are 34 and 9 percent. Similar differences are observed by poverty status, with non-poor households having higher access rates than poor households.

The breakdown by household size shows that the households with 5 to 6 members have the highest rates of access to sources of drinking water (69 percent), and that households with 7 or more members have

**Table 7.10: 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** | 27.8 | 35.6 | 21.0 | 15.7 | 100.0 | 5.9 | 19.9 | 22.7 | 51.5 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 31.8 | 44.3 | 17.0 | 7.0 | 100.0 | 7.3 | 28.7 | 28.8 | 35.2 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 23.1 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.7 | 100.0 | 4.3 | 9.7 | 15.6 | 70.3 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 32.1 | 30.2 | 23.5 | 14.2 | 100.0 | 1.8 | 17.5 | 21.7 | 59.0 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 25.8 | 37.9 | 19.9 | 16.3 | 100.0 | 7.7 | 21.0 | 23.1 | 48.2 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 31.9 | 20.5 | 28.3 | 19.3 | 100.0 | 9.9 | 12.7 | 18.6 | 58.8 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 23.5 | 36.6 | 23.7 | 16.1 | 100.0 | 3.2 | 19.1 | 28.1 | 49.6 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 27.0 | 36.7 | 20.5 | 15.8 | 100.0 | 5.5 | 22.4 | 20.3 | 51.7 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 30.4 | 39.1 | 16.5 | 13.9 | 100.0 | 7.0 | 21.1 | 21.5 | 50.4 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 55.9 | 44.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 35.3 | 27.5 | 37.2 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 26.7 | 35.3 | 21.5 | 16.6 | 100.0 | 4.0 | 18.8 | 22.0 | 55.2 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 40.8 | 33.0 | 16.5 | 9.7 | 100.0 | 16.4 | 34.7 | 21.3 | 27.6 | 100.0 |
| Other | 14.8 | 40.2 | 28.7 | 16.3 | 100.0 | 8.3 | 11.8 | 30.0 | 49.8 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 27.0 | 36.3 | 20.6 | 16.1 | 100.0 | 6.5 | 18.2 | 22.3 | 53.1 | 100.0 |
| Female | 31.7 | 32.1 | 22.6 | 13.5 | 100.0 | 3.1 | 28.4 | 24.7 | 43.8 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

the highest rate of access to health facilities (29 percent).

Households where the main income earner is an employee have the highest rates of access to drinking water (100 percent). Employees also have the highest rates of access to drinking water sources, whereas households in the 'self-employed agriculture' category have the lowest.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no strong differences in access to health facilities, but households headed by females have higher access rates to water sources, with 73 percent living less than 30 minutes of health facilities, 11 percent points above male-headed households.

Table 7.10 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest primary and secondary school. Overall, 63 percent of households is located within 30 minutes of a primary school, but only 26 percent of households lives within 30 minutes of a secondary school. Moreover, 74 percent of households is located 60 minutes 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 76 percent of households in accessible villages has access to primary school, against 48 of remote villages. For secondary school, the rates go down to 36 and 14 percent for accessible and remote villages, respectively.

The breakdown by poverty status shows no strong differences in access to primary schools but non-poor households have higher access to secondary schools than poor households, at 29 and 19 percent respectively.

The rate of access to primary school appears to increase with household size. Households with 5 to 6 members and those with 7 or more members have the highest rate of access to secondary school education, at 28 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that employees have the highest rates of access to secondary schools, at 100 and 63 percent, respectively. Households in the category 'other' have the lowest access rates to primary schools and secondary schools, at 55 and 20 percent respectively.

There is no strong difference in the access to primary school by gender of the

**Table 7.11: 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** | 17.3 | 20.7 | 21.2 | 40.8 | 100.0 | 18.4 | 16.7 | 15.6 | 49.3 | 100.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 21.5 | 26.1 | 22.8 | 29.6 | 100.0 | 29.1 | 29.3 | 19.8 | 21.8 | 100.0 |
| Remote | 12.5 | 14.5 | 19.4 | 53.6 | 100.0 | 6.1 | 2.2 | 10.7 | 80.9 | 100.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 12.1 | 17.3 | 18.1 | 52.5 | 100.0 | 12.8 | 13.6 | 16.3 | 57.2 | 100.0 |
| Non-poor | 19.6 | 22.2 | 22.6 | 35.6 | 100.0 | 20.9 | 18.1 | 15.2 | 45.8 | 100.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 27.3 | 12.6 | 26.9 | 33.2 | 100.0 | 24.7 | 11.6 | 22.2 | 41.5 | 100.0 |
| 3-4 | 20.8 | 23.5 | 20.9 | 34.8 | 100.0 | 18.4 | 11.4 | 14.5 | 55.7 | 100.0 |
| 5-6 | 16.5 | 17.6 | 24.1 | 41.8 | 100.0 | 13.5 | 24.7 | 14.0 | 47.9 | 100.0 |
| 7+ | 11.5 | 23.7 | 17.1 | 47.6 | 100.0 | 20.1 | 16.5 | 15.4 | 48.0 | 100.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 47.8 | 13.6 | 19.7 | 18.9 | 100.0 | 48.5 | 13.6 | 9.2 | 28.6 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 16.5 | 20.1 | 21.8 | 41.6 | 100.0 | 14.4 | 16.4 | 16.3 | 52.9 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 25.2 | 34.5 | 6.4 | 33.9 | 100.0 | 48.0 | 21.4 | 5.0 | 25.5 | 100.0 |
| Other | 6.1 | 11.8 | 35.1 | 47.1 | 100.0 | 25.1 | 15.4 | 22.4 | 37.1 | 100.0 |
| **Gender of head of household** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 15.5 | 21.6 | 20.9 | 42.0 | 100.0 | 17.1 | 17.2 | 14.2 | 51.5 | 100.0 |
| Female | 26.4 | 16.0 | 23.0 | 34.6 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 14.6 | 22.3 | 38.2 | 100.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

household head. However, households headed by females have higher access rates to secondary school than male-headed households, at 32 percent, against 25 percent of males.

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 has access to a food market, and 46 percent to public transportation.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 48 percent of households in accessible villages lives within 30 minutes of a food market and, against 27 of households in remote villages. The shares for public transportation are 58 percent for accessible and 8 percent for remote villages.

Poor households have a lower rate of access to food markets, at 29 percent, against 42 of non-poor. The same is observed for public transportation, where the rate the rate for non-poor households is 39 percent against 26 percent of poor households.

The breakdown by size of the household shows that households with 3 or 4 members have the highest rates of access to food facilities, and that households with 5 to 6 members have the lowest access rates. For public transportation, households with 5 to 6 members have the highest rates of access, at 38 percent compared to households with 3 to 4 members at 30 percent.

Employees have the highest rates of access to food markets and public transportation, with rates of 61 and 62 percent. Those in the 'other' category have the lowest access to food market, at 18 percent, whereas the self-employed in agriculture have the lowest access to public transportation, at 31 percent.

Analysis of gender of household head reveals that female-headed households have higher access rates for both food market and public transportation, at 42 and 40 percent respectively. In turn, males report access rates of XX and XY percent for food market and public transportation, respectively

## 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, 34 percent of households takes measures against malaria. The most commonly taken are insecticide treated nets (62 percent), bed nets (24 percent), and maintenance of good sanitation (23 percent).

The analysis by cluster location shows that 30 percent of households in remote villages takes measures against malaria, compared to 37 percent of households in accessible villages. Insecticide treated nets (68 percent), bed nets (24 percent) and maintenance of good sanitation (13 percent) are more widespread among accessible villages than among remote villages. Similar differences are observed by poverty status, with non-poor households reporting higher access rates than poor households.

The share of households taking measures increases with the size of the household but there are no clear trends by measure taken. The analysis of socio-economic group shows that 63 percent of households in the category 'employee' takes measures, 57 percent of 'self-employed in non-agricultural activities', 32 percent of 'self-employed agriculture', and only 21 percent of 'other'. Finally, households headed by males are more likely to take measures against malaria than households headed by females. Female-headed households use insecticide treated nets and use anti-malaria drugs more frequently than male-headed households.

**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** | 33.9 | 24.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 61.9 | 0.5 | 12.7 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessible | 37.2 | 24.1 | 6.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 67.7 | 0.9 | 12.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Remote | 30.1 | 23.9 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 53.6 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 4.0 | 6.9 | 0.0 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | 23.1 | 22.3 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 63.8 | 0.0 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Non-poor | 38.7 | 24.5 | 5.8 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 61.4 | 0.7 | 13.0 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 0.0 |
| **Household size** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-2 | 25.5 | 32.4 | 5.2 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 25.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3-4 | 31.7 | 20.6 | 3.4 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 74.3 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 5-6 | 34.5 | 28.4 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 54.3 | 2.0 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 |
| 7+ | 38.2 | 21.2 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 67.2 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Employee | 62.8 | 30.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 69.9 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - agric | 31.8 | 20.8 | 6.4 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 63.2 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed - other | 57.2 | 40.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 51.7 | 4.0 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 21.1 | 27.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 62.0 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| **Gender of the head of household** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 35.5 | 24.0 | 4.8 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 60.6 | 0.6 | 12.7 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
| Female | 25.8 | 23.9 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 70.3 | 0.0 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

# 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. Generally attendance at meetings is higher at lower levels of government. The results show that 94 percent of households had at least one member attending at least one kitongoji meeting in the past 12 months. Attendance at village meetings was also high at 93 percent. Ward and district level meetings did not attain attendance of the majority of households at only 40 and 22 percent respectively.

Data as presented in table 8.1 did not expose any important difference in meeting attendance between households in remote and accessible clusters especially in kitongoji and village. However, the results show that meeting attendance rates at ward and district levels experienced higher attendance of households in accessible clusters than in remote cluster by at most 10 percent point difference.

The breakdown by poverty status, shows that while attendance rates in meetings were slightly higher among poor households in the two lower government levels, the meeting attendance rates in ward and district level were slightly higher among non-poor households. Analysis of the results by socio-economic groups indicates that the employees report an attendance rate of 100 percent in kitongoji level meeting. The results also suggest a poor representation in meetings of households in the 'other' socio-economic category. Generally, ward and district level meetings, are characterised by lower attendance rates by all socio-economic groups.

## 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 that majority of respondents are satisfied with their leaders at all government levels. The rates of satisfaction with leaders are above 80 percent across all government levels and at 77 for the district council. Disaggregation of the data by cluster location exposed that satisfaction rates were slight higher among accessible households in kitongoji and village levels

**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** | 94.2 | 92.6 | 39.7 | 21.5 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 93.5 | 91.8 | 43.9 | 30.7 |
| Remote | 95.1 | 93.4 | 34.9 | 10.9 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 96.3 | 94.1 | 34.4 | 19.6 |
| Non-poor | 93.3 | 91.9 | 42.0 | 22.3 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | |
| Employee | 100.0 | 91.4 | 55.0 | 63.6 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 96.5 | 94.8 | 39.9 | 21.3 |
| Self-employed - other | 84.1 | 83.3 | 46.5 | 23.1 |
| Other | 71.8 | 71.8 | 20.7 | 4.3 |
| **No. of Obs.** | 450 | 450 | 450 | 450 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

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

| | Kitongoji Leaders | Village Leaders | Ward Leaders | District Leaders | District Councillor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | | | | | |
| Satisfied | 93.1 | 89.0 | 85.1 | 81.0 | 77.7 |
| Not Satisfied | 6.6 | 10.1 | 7.0 | 6.3 | 17.4 |
| Don't Know | 0.3 | 0.9 | 7.9 | 12.7 | 5.0 |
| **Share Satisfied by Cluster Location** | | | | | |
| Accessible | 95.5 | 91.3 | 85.3 | 81.1 | 77.6 |
| Remote | 90.4 | 86.4 | 85.0 | 80.8 | 77.7 |
| **Share Satisfied by Poverty Status** | | | | | |
| Poor | 93.8 | 88.4 | 82.0 | 76.6 | 77.5 |
| Non-poor | 92.8 | 89.3 | 86.6 | 82.9 | 77.7 |
| **Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group** | | | | | |
| Employee | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 83.6 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 93.2 | 89.0 | 84.8 | 80.3 | 76.5 |
| Self-employed - other | 95.5 | 90.3 | 89.3 | 86.6 | 81.9 |
| Other | 84.8 | 82.8 | 78.2 | 76.2 | 86.6 |
| **Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)** | | | | | |
| Political differences | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Embezzlement/corruption | 18.9 | 25.1 | 9.3 | 7.8 | 17.1 |
| They do not listen to people | 25.8 | 23.0 | 9.7 | 9.5 | 12.9 |
| Favouritism | 18.5 | 13.2 | 9.2 | 2.0 | 15.4 |
| Lazy/inexperienced | 10.5 | 21.9 | 9.9 | 1.2 | 8.7 |
| Personal Reasons | 2.1 | 2.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.4 |
| I see no results | 20.9 | 15.9 | 18.2 | 17.6 | 28.1 |
| They never visit us | 18.3 | 25.2 | 38.7 | 51.7 | 39.7 |
| **No. of Obs.** | 450 | 450 | 450 | 450 | 450 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang 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?'

but did not expose important differences on satisfaction rates between accessible and remote clusters across other government levels as well as the district councillor. Similarly, the shares of satisfaction do not differ by poverty status across all levels of governments. Shares of satisfaction by socio-economic groups suggest that all employees were satisfied by 100 percent with the work of their leaders across all government levels and by 84 percent with their district councillor. Generally, partitioning of the share of satisfaction by socio-economic group showed that majority of respondents are satisfied by the work of their leaders.

Finally, all respondents who were not satisfied or did not know whether they were satisfied with their leaders where asked to provide reasons. 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.

Results as presented in the bottom part of table 8.2 clearly show that political affiliation of a leader is not important reason for dissatisfaction. Instead, the failure of leaders to pay visits to their communities seems to be the major concern of the majority of respondents. It is clearly shown that the dissatisfaction rates owing to lack of visit increases among respondents with increasing government levels, up to 52 percent at the district level. Dissatisfaction with the district councillor in connection with this reason was also high at 40 percent. Other important reasons for satisfaction include the failure of leaders to listen to opinions

**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** | 23.8 | 32.3 | 11.4 | 8.6 |
| **Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 26.9 | 34.4 | 12.9 | 10.1 |
| Remote | 20.3 | 29.9 | 9.7 | 6.8 |
| **Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 23.1 | 32.7 | 10.5 | 7.7 |
| Non-poor | 24.1 | 32.2 | 11.8 | 9.0 |
| **Socio-economic Group** | | | | |
| Employee | 0.0 | 51.5 | 0.0 | 17.8 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 23.6 | 31.7 | 12.1 | 8.4 |
| Self-employed - other | 35.7 | 44.6 | 12.6 | 9.7 |
| Other | 19.4 | 16.6 | 4.1 | 5.7 |
| **Source** | | | | |
| Letter | 0.0 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 1.4 |
| Notice board | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 4.7 |
| Meeting | 97.5 | 95.9 | 91.1 | 86.5 |
| Rumours/hear-say | 2.4 | 2.4 | 8.5 | 5.6 |
| Radio/newspapers | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 |
| **No. of Obs.** | 450 | 450 | 450 | 450 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

of the communities especially at kitongoji and village levels, lack of observable results and embezzlement/corruption. Personal reasons were not prominent among reasons for dissatisfactions with leadership at all levels of government as well as with the district councillor. The most common reason for dissatisfaction with district councillors is on their failure to pay visits and respondents seeing no results of their work at 40 and 28 percent respectively.

## 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 finances seems to reach small shares of households at all levels. It can be noticed that, kitongoji financial information reached 24 percent of the households. Information on village finances reached relatively higher shares of households at 32 percent and declined to 11 and 9 percent at ward and district finances respectively. Overall, a higher share of households in accessible villages reported to have received financial information in the past twelve months than in remote villages. Disaggregating households by poverty status did not expose differences in access to information on finances at any level of government.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that none of the employees received information on finances at both kitongoji and ward levels but majority of them reported to have received information on village and district finances at 52 and 18 percent, respectively. Respondents in the self-employed and 'other' categories reported to have received information on kitongoji and village finances at 36 and 45 percent respectively. Similar information reached only 24 and 32 percent of the self-employed in agriculture. Relatively higher shares were observed among the self-employed in agriculture and self-employed in non-agricultural activities across all levels.

The data as presented in table 8.3 clearly show that attendance to meetings is the most common means to get information on finances at all government levels. Majority of respondents who received the information on finances did so by

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

| | Kitongoji Spending | Village Spending | Ward Spending | District Spending |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | | | | |
| Satisfied | 69.4 | 61.2 | 54.4 | 54.7 |
| Not Satisfied | 9.3 | 16.4 | 11.4 | 7.5 |
| Don' Know | 21.3 | 22.4 | 34.3 | 37.8 |
| **Share Satisfied by Cluster Location** | | | | |
| Accessible | 77.0 | 67.7 | 60.2 | 62.9 |
| Remote | 60.7 | 53.7 | 47.7 | 45.3 |
| **Share Satisfied by Poverty Status** | | | | |
| Poor | 71.9 | 63.6 | 54.7 | 51.7 |
| Non-poor | 68.3 | 60.1 | 54.2 | 56.1 |
| **Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group** | | | | |
| Employee | 59.6 | 40.7 | 40.7 | 59.3 |
| Self-employed - agriculture | 69.5 | 60.8 | 53.8 | 54.5 |
| Self-employed - other | 69.1 | 62.8 | 55.4 | 50.6 |
| Other | 72.5 | 72.5 | 67.7 | 62.7 |
| **Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)** | | | | |
| I see no results | 12.0 | 19.8 | 12.8 | 6.9 |
| Embezzlement/corruption | 23.7 | 35.9 | 19.1 | 13.0 |
| Favouritism | 0.0 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 |
| This is what I hear | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| They give no information | 60.0 | 50.1 | 72.8 | 80.7 |
| **No. of Obs.** | 450 | 450 | 450 | 450 |

Source:CWIQ 2006 Hanang DC

attending to meetings in all local government levels. Rumours or hear say was the second most common mean to get information on finances across all levels, although notice board and use of letters are also used at ward and district levels. Radio and newspapers were not effective sources of information on public finances.

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 slightly higher for lower levels of government. While around 69 and 61 percent of respondents were satisfied with kitongoji and village spending respectively, satisfaction with public spending at ward and district was reported at 54 and 55 percent respectively. It is worth mentioning that proportions of respondents who are specifically unsatisfied with public spending were low. In essence the shares of respondents reported with ‘I don’t know’ are higher at all levels.

The share of satisfaction by cluster location showed higher shares of satisfaction on public finances in accessible clusters. For instance, the difference in satisfaction with public spending is 18 percent point difference higher in accessible clusters than in remote clusters, at 63 and 45 percent respectively. Satisfaction on public finances does not differ by poverty status. The breakdown of the results by socio-economic groups showed that ‘other’ group displays relatively higher satisfaction rates in government spending at all levels.

Further probing on why respondents were not satisfied, or why they did not know whether they were satisfied, the most common response by the majority at all levels was that they did not receive any information. Other important reasons for this question included embezzlement/corruption in the public spending and that the respondents see no results.