PMO-RALG

KASULU DC CWIQ
Survey on Poverty, Welfare and Services in Kasulu DC

NOVEMBER 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, Batista John, Gloria Joseph, Placidia Josephat, Justina Katoke, Makarius Kiyonga, Faustine Misinde, Jesca Nkonjerwa, Kamugisha Robert, Resti Simon, Pius Sosthenes, Aissa Soud, Adella Theobald, and Honoratha Wyclife. The data processing software was written by Jim Otto and Neil Chalmers. The data entry team consisted of Marystella 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, Mujobu Moyo, Godius Kahyarara, Teddy Neema, John Ibembe and Victor Geofrey 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 percent 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 DPT: Diphtheria, Pertussis3, Tetanus 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

1. INTRODUCTION……. 1
1.1 The Kasulu DC CWIQ……..….. 1
1.2 Sampling…….……. 1
1.3 Constructed variable to disaggregated tables……..…..... 2
1.3.1 Poverty Status…….……..…. 2
1.3.2 Cluster Location…….……..…. 3
1.3.3 Socio-economic Group……...….. 4

2 VILLAGE, POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLDS CHARACTERISTICS……..... 5
2.1 Introduction……...…..…. 5
2.2Main Population Characteristics……...…..… 5
2.3 Main Household Characteristics……..…..... 7
2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household……..... 9
2.5Orphan and Foster Status……..…..... 11

3 EDUCATION……..…… 13
3.1 Overview Education Indicators……...……...….. 13
3.1.1 Literacy…….……...….. 13
3.1.2 Primary School Access Enrolment and Satisfaction…….…..... 13
3.1.3 Secondary School Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction……..... 15
3.2 Dissatisfaction……...……....…. 17
3.3 Non-Attendance……...…....…. 19
3.4 Enrolment and Drop Out Rates……....….. 19
3.5 Literacy……...…….. 21

4 HEALTH……..…….. 23
4.1 Health Indicators…….....…. 23
4.2 Reasons for Dissatisfaction……..…… 24
4.3 Reasons for Not Consulting When Ill……....…… 25
4.4 Type of Illness……...….. 26
4.5 Health Provider……. 26
4.6 Child Deliveries……..…….. 27
4.7 Child Nutrition…….. 29

5 EMPLOYMENT……..... 33
5.1 Employment Status of Total Adult Population…….....…… 33
5.1.1 Work Status…….….. 33
5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads……...…..... 34
5.1.3 Youth Employment……...…....…… 34
5.2 Working Population……...….…. 35
5.3 Underemployment Population…….....… 37
5.4 Unemployed Inactive Population……..…..... 39
5.5 Household Tasks……...….... 39
5.6 Child Labour……..…... 41

6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES..... 43
6.1 Economic Situation……..…….....….. 43

6.1.1 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Community…..... 43
6.1.2 Perception of Change in the economic Situation of the Household……..... 45
6.2 Self- reported Difficulties in Satisfying Household Needs…….....…….. 46
6.2.1 Food Needs…….....… 46
6.2.2 Paying School Fees…….. 47
6.2.3 Paying House Rent…… 47
6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills……..... 48
6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare……..... 50
6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status……..... 50
6.3.1 Assets Ownership…….. 51
6.3.2 Occupancy Documentation ……..... 51
6.4 Agriculture……..... 52
6.4.1 Agriculture Inputs……..… 52
6.4.2 Landholding…….....…. 54
6.4.3 Cattle Ownership…….. 55
6.5 Perception of Crime and Security in the Community……..... 55
6.6 Household Income Contribution……...……... 57
6.7 Other House Items……..….. 57

7 HOUESHOLD AMENITIES……...…….. 59
7.1 Housing Materials and Typing of housing Unit……..... 59
7.2 Water and Sanitation……...…… 61
7.3 Type of Fuel……..…..…..... 64
7.4 Distance to Facilities……..…...… 65
7.5 Anti -Malaria Measures…….……... 67

8 GOVERNANCE……..……..….. 69
8.1 attendance at Meeting…….…….……. 69
8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders…….…… 69
8.3 Public Spending……...……..…… 71

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Variables used to predict consumption expenditure……..... 1
Table 1.2 Predicted vs. actual poverty, Kigoma Region, 2000/01…….....……. 3
Table 1.3 Cluster location……..……..... 3
Table 1.4 Socio-economic group…….....…… 4
Table 1.5 Socio-economic group and gender of household head…….....……. 4
Table 1.6 Socio-economic group and main economic activity…….....…..... 4
Table 2 1 Percent distribution of total population by gender and age…….....……... 5
Table 2.2 Dependency ratio ……..…….....…... 6
Table 2.3 Percent distribution of households by number of household members……........ 6
Table 2.4 Percent distribution of total population by relation to head of household…….....…… 7
Table 2.5 Percent distribution of the total population age 12 and above by marital status…….....…… 7
Table 2.6 Percent distribution of the total population age 5 and above by socio-economic group…….....… 8
Table 2.7 Percent distribution of the total population age 5 and above by highest level of education…….....…. 9
Table 2.8 Percent distribution of heads of households by marital status……..…….....…..... 9
Table 2.9 Percent distribution of heads of households by socio-economic group…….....…... 10
Table 2.10 Percent distribution of heads of household by highest level of education …….....… 11
Table 2.11 Percent distribution of children under 18 years old who have lost their mother and /or father…….....…. 11
Table 2.12 Percent distribution of children under 18 year's old living without mother and/or father…….....… 12
Table 3.1 Education indicators…….....… 14
Table 3.2 Percent of students currently enrolled in school with reasons for dissatisfaction…….....…….....… 16
Table 3.3 Percent of children 7-9 years who ever attended school by reasons not currently attending…….....…. 18
Table 3.4 Primary school enrolment and drop out rates by age and gender…….....…..…… 19
Table 3.5 Secondary school enrolment and drop out rates by age and gender…….....……. 20
Table 3.6 Adult literacy rates by age and gender (persons age 15 and above)…….....…..…. 20
Table 3.7 Youth literacy rates by age and gender (persons age 15-24)…….....……. 21
Table 4.1 Health Indicators…….....……. 23
Table 4.2 Percent of persons who consulted a Health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and were not satisfied, and the reasons for dissatisfaction..... 24
Table 4.3 Percent of persons who did not consulted a Health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and the reasons for not consulting..... 25
Table 4.4 Percent of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks preceding the survey, and those sick or injured the percent by type of sickness/injury..... 26
Table 4.5 Percent distribution of health consultation in past 4 weeks by type of health provider consulted…..…… 27
Table 4.6 Percent of women aged 12-49 who had a live birth in the year preceding the survey by age of the mother and the percent of those births where the mother received pre-natal care..... 27
Table 4.7 Percent distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by place of birth…….....……. 28
Table 4.8 Percent distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by person who assisted in delivery of the child…….... 29
Table 4.9 Nutrition status indicators and program participating rates……..... 30
Table 4.10 Percent distribution of children vaccination by type of vaccination received…….....……..….. 31
Table 4.11 Percent Distribution of Children Vaccinated by Source of Information……..... 32
Table 5.1 Percent distribution of the population by working status (age 15 and above)…….....…..…. 33
Table 5.2 Principal labour force indicators (persons age 15 and above)…….…… 34
Table 5.3 Percent distribution of the population by work status (age 15 -24)…….....…..… 35
Table 5.4 Percent distribution of the working population by type of payment in main job…….....……... 35
Table 5.5 Percent distribution of the working population by employer…….....……..….. 36
Table 5.6 Percent distribution of the working population by activity…….....…..…. 36
Table 5.7 Percent distribution of the working population by employer, sex and activity…….....……..… 37
Table 5.8 Percent distribution of the working population by employer, sex and employment status…….....……..… 37

Table 5.9 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by employment status……………………......……….. 38
Table 5.10 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by employer…………………………......……….….. 38
Table 5.11 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by activity……………………………………........…. 39
Table 5.12 Percent distribution of the unemployed population by reason………………………….………….....…...…. 40
Table 5.13 Percent distribution of the economically inactive population by reason………………………........…..…. 40
Table 5.14 Activities normally undertaken in the household (age 15 and over)………………………………….….….. 41
Table 5.15 Activities normally undertaken in the household (age 5 to 14)……………………………………....…….. 41
Table 5.16 Child Labour (age 5 to 14)………………………………………………………………………….....……. 42
Table 6.1 Percent of Household by the percent of the economic situation of the community compared to the year before the survey.. 43
Table 6.2 Percent distribution of households by the percent of the economic situation of the household to the year before the survey.. 44
Table 6.3 Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in satisfying the food needs of the household during the year before the survey... 45
Table 6.4 Percent distribution of households but the difficulty in paying during the year before the survey…...……...... 47
Table 6.5 Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying house rent during the year before the survey… 48
Table 6.6 Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying utility bills during the year before the survey... 49
Table 6.7 Percent distribution of households by the difficult in paying for health care during the year before the survey 50
Table 6.8 Percent of households owning certain assets……………………......…………………………………………. 51
Table 6.9 Percent distribution of households by occupancy status…………………………………………………...….. 52
Table 6.10 Percent distribution of household by type of occupancy documentation……………………………..…… 52
Table 6.11 Percent of household using agricultural inputs and the percent using certain inputs………..........….……... 53
Table 6.12 Percent distribution of households using agricultural inputs by the main source of the inputs………......….. 53
Table 6.13 Percent distribution of households by the area of land owned by the household……………………………. 54
Table 6.14 Percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned by the household……………………..…. 55
Table 6.15 Percent distribution of households by the perception of the crime and security situation of the community 55
compared to the year before the survey………………………………………………………………..........…. 56
Table 6.16 Percent distribution of households by principal contributor to household income……………………......…. 57
Table 6.17 Percent of households owning selected household items…………………………………………….....……. 58
Table 7.1 Percent distribution of households by material used for roof of the house…………………………………..…. 59
Table 7.2 Percent distribution of households by material used for walls of the house…………………………………. 60
Table 7.3 Percent distribution of households by material used for floors of the house……………………………….. 61
Table 7.4 Percent distribution of households by type of housing unit……………………………………………...….. 61
Table 7.5 Percent distribution of households by main source of drinking water………………………………………… 62
Table 7.6 Percent distribution of households by main type of toilet…………………………………………….…….. 63
Table 7.7 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for cooking…………………………………………….….. 63
Table 7.8 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for lighting……………………………………...…....…… 64
Table 7.9 Percent distribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach nearest drinking water supply and health facility ……………………………………………………………………………………............................ 65
Table 7.10 Percent distribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach the nearest primary and secondary school….. 66
Table 7.11 Percent distribution of household by time (in minutes) to reach nearest food market and public transportation.. 67
Table 7.12 Percent of households taking anti-malaria measures and percent taking specific measures……..…..........…. 68
Table 8.1 Percent distribution of attendance of meetings (any household members within past 12 months)…..........…… 69
Table 8.2 Distribution of leaders' satisfaction ratings and reasons for dissatisfaction…………………………………… 70
Table 8.3 Percent distribution of households who received financial information in the past 12 months……….....……. 71
Table 8.4 Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction……………………………………….…. 72

Generic Core Welfare Indicators (2006)

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Household characteristics						
Dependency ratio	1.2	0.0	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.1
Head is male	90.0	1.5	87.6	92.9	95.2	88.3
Head is female	10.0	1.5	12.4	7.1	4.8	11.7
Head is monagamous	64.6	2.2	62.0	67.8	73.6	61.8
Head is polygamous	21.8	2.1	22.1	21.4	18.0	23.0
Head is not married	13.6	1.9	15.9	10.8	8.5	15.2
Household welfare						
Household economic situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	51.9	3.0	48.2	56.5	58.6	49.8
Better now	24.8	2.6	27.9	21.2	13.4	28.5
Neighborhood crime/security situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	15.7	2.5	15.3	16.3	13.7	16.4
Better now	50.8	3.6	54.7	46.1	46.0	52.3
Difficulty satisfying household needs						
Food	24.6	3.2	25.7	23.1	42.5	18.8
School fees	2.2	0.8	1.7	2.8	2.5	2.1
House rent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Utility bills	0.8	0.8	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.0
Health care	26.5	2.7	23.6	29.9	40.2	22.1
Agriculture						
Land owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	3.2	0.8	3.3	3.0	3.6	3.0
More now	5.5	1.2	7.3	3.3	4.1	5.9
Cattle owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	5.0	1.2	6.1	3.7	3.2	5.6
More now	5.4	1.3	4.1	6.9	2.7	6.2
Use of agricultural inputs						
Yes	18.0	3.2	19.0	16.9	13.4	19.5
Fertilizers	80.5	6.1	93.6	62.9	56.8	85.8
Improved seedlings	18.6	6.2	7.1	34.2	23.8	17.5
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	19.4	7.0	14.8	25.6	33.3	16.3
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Household infrastructure						
Secure housing tenure	4.7	2.1	7.5	1.4	0.9	5.9
Access to water	95.0	2.0	96.9	92.6	90.2	96.5
Safe water source	63.6	5.7	67.0	59.5	54.4	66.6
Safe sanitation	0.5	0.3	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.7
Improved waste disposal	6.7	1.9	5.9	7.6	5.9	6.9
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	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.3
Mobile phone	4.9	1.5	6.2	3.3	0.0	6.4
Radio set	55.2	2.9	61.6	47.5	32.4	62.5
Television set	0.4	0.3	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.5

Employment						
Employer in the main job						
Civil service	0.9	0.4	1.3	0.4	0.0	1.2
Other public serve	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Parastatal	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.3
NGO	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.5
Private sector formal	1.0	0.4	1.2	0.6	0.0	1.3
Private sector informal	63.5	3.9	69.6	55.7	50.3	68.4
Household	30.1	3.5	24.7	37.1	44.0	25.0
Activity in the main job						
Agriculture	72.3	2.7	70.5	74.6	69.8	73.2
Mining/quarrying	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Manufacturing	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2
Services	1.4	0.4	1.5	1.1	0.2	1.8
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))	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0
Male	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.0
Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Underemployed (age 15 and above)	17.3	1.7	17.8	16.6	13.6	18.7
Male	24.5	2.7	25.3	23.5	16.9	27.4
Female	10.4	1.3	10.7	10.1	10.4	10.4
Education						
Adult literacy rate						
Total	66.4	1.9	67.4	65.3	65.1	66.9
Male	77.0	2.2	76.7	77.4	73.3	78.5
Female	56.0	2.5	58.2	53.2	56.5	55.8
Youth literacy rate (age 15-24)						
Total	76.0	2.9	75.3	76.9	85.2	72.2
Male	85.1	3.1	83.4	87.4	90.3	82.6
Female	67.0	3.2	66.8	67.3	79.1	62.7
Primary school						
Access to School	83.6	3.8	81.2	86.2	77.3	87.5
Primary Gross Enrollment	112.4	3.9	113.8	110.8	109.7	114.0
Male	111.7	4.6	112.2	111.0	110.3	112.5
Female	113.2	4.6	115.9	110.6	109.2	116.0
Primary Net Enrollment	79.4	2.2	77.6	81.5	79.3	79.5
Male	76.7	3.3	74.5	79.5	77.1	76.5
Female	82.6	2.1	81.6	83.4	81.6	83.3
Satisfaction	59.1	4.4	68.1	49.0	58.0	59.7
Primary completion rate	5.5	1.1	6.6	4.4	2.3	7.5
Secondary school						
Access to School	27.7	6.5	35.9	14.5	29.0	27.1
Secondary Gross Enrollment	11.6	2.6	12.0	11.0	5.8	14.3
Male	13.7	3.2	13.0	15.1	6.5	17.3
Female	9.4	3.1	10.8	7.6	4.9	11.4
Secondary Net Enrollment	8.1	2.2	8.9	6.9	4.8	9.6
Male	7.4	2.1	8.2	6.1	4.7	8.8
Female	8.8	3.0	9.7	7.6	4.9	10.5
Satisfaction	40.9	9.6	37.8	46.3	60.5	37.2
Secondary completion rate	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.5

Medical services						
Health access	62.0	5.4	68.0	54.9	54.7	65.3
Need	20.0	1.3	17.4	23.1	18.8	20.6
Use	26.2	1.7	25.5	27.2	22.7	27.9
Satisfaction	87.0	1.9	88.7	85.1	83.9	88.1
Consulted traditional healer	1.8	0.5	2.4	1.1	2.7	1.5
Pre-natal care	99.1	0.9	100.0	98.1	100.0	98.7
Anti-malaria measures used	53.9	4.1	57.0	50.1	35.6	59.7
Person has physical/mental challenge	1.3	0.2	1.6	0.9	1.3	1.3
Child welfare and health						
Orphanhood (children under 18)						
Both parents dead	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.4
Father only	3.7	0.8	4.7	2.6	3.4	3.9
Mother only	1.5	0.6	0.7	2.5	1.5	1.6
Fostering (children under 18)						
Both parents absent	2.7	0.6	2.6	2.8	2.0	3.0
Father only absent	6.9	1.6	9.4	4.0	5.2	7.8
Mother only absent	1.8	0.5	1.4	2.3	1.9	1.8
Children under 5						
Delivery by health professionals	56.3	3.9	59.5	53.0	50.3	59.1
Measles immunization	79.7	2.0	79.7	79.6	79.7	79.7
Fully vaccinated	56.9	4.2	69.2	44.1	52.1	59.1
Not vaccinated	3.3	0.8	3.1	3.5	5.2	2.4
Stunted	40.1	3.5	38.4	41.7	47.0	36.9
Wasted	1.2	0.7	0.8	1.6	2.1	0.8
Underweight	19.3	2.3	17.3	21.2	20.9	18.5

** 1.96 standard deviations*

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Kasulu DC CWIQ

This report presents district level analysis of data collected in the Kasulu DC 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 Kasulu 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, Bukombe DC, Bunda DC, Dodoma MC, Hanang 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, 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 Kasulu DC 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, the data entry was done by scanning the questionnaires, to minimise data entry errors and thus ensure that the final dataset is of the highest quality.

Table 1.1 Variables Used to Predict Consumption Expenditure in Kigoma Region

Basic Variables	***Household Assets***
Age of the household head	Ownership of a radio
Household size	Ownership of a bicycle
Level of education of the household head	Ownership of an iron
Main source of income	Ownership of a watch or clock
Main activity of the household head	Main material in the roof
	Main material in the walls
Food Security	Main material in the floor
Problems satisfying food needs	Landholding
	Village level variables
Household Amenities	Share of households with piped water
Type of toilet	
Source of fuel	

Source: HBS 2000/2001 for Kigoma Region

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 Kigoma region to ensure that the model developed accurately represents Kasulu district.

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

Once the consumption level of a household has been predicted, it is compared to the Basic Needs Poverty Line set by National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) on the basis of the 2000/01 HBS. The Basic Needs Poverty Line is defined by what a household, using the food basket of the poorest 50 percent of the population, needs to consume to satisfy its basic food needs to attain 2,200 Kcal/day per adult equivalent. The share of non-food expenditures of the poorest 25 percent of households is then added. With this procedure, the Basic Needs Poverty Line is set at TZS 7,253 per 28 days per adult equivalent unit in 2000/01 prices. Households consuming less than this are

assumed to be unable to satisfy their basic food and non-food needs1.

The Kasulu 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 8.9 percent of the cases, and vice versa in 10.2 percent of the households. This gives an overall percentage of correct predictions of 80.9 percent.

When the model is applied to the CWIQ data for Kasulu 2006, the estimated population living in poverty is 24 percent, very much consistent with the 29 percent of poverty obtained from the HBS for Kigoma Region.

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

Expenditure surveys, such as the 2000/2001 Household Budget Survey, are much better suited for informing on poverty rates. However, such large scale surveys have insufficient number of observations to inform on district-level trends. The Kasulu 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.

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

Predicted	Observed		
	Non-Poor	Poor	Total
Non-Poor	61.5	10.2	71.7
Poor	8.9	19.4	28.3
Total	70.4	29.6	100.0

Source: HBS 2000/01 for Kigoma Region

1.3.2 Cluster Location

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

Table 1.3 shows that the poverty rates differ by cluster location: households in accessible villages are less likely to be poor than households in more villages. Whereas the poverty rate in remote villages is 14 percent, the figure for accessible villages is 45 percent of the households.

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	30.0	15.0	180.0	44.7	30,870
Accessible	15.0	10.0	120.0	14.3	61,935

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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	0.0	80.3	19.7
Self-Employed Agriculture	26.7	66.1	33.9
Self-Employed Other	8.5	75.8	24.2
Other	28.4	47.7	52.3

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

	Male	Female	Total
Socio-economic Group			
Employees	100.0	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	89.5	10.5	100.0
Self-Employed Other	94.3	5.7	100.0
Other	82.5	17.5	100.0
Total	90.0	10.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1.3.3 Socio-economic Group

The socio-economic group that a household belongs to depends on the employment of the main income earner. Throughout the report households where the main income earner is employed in the private sectors, formally or informally, as well as Government and Parastatal employees are categorised as 'Employee'. 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 (e.g. domestic workers) 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 where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture or belongs to the 'other' group. Furthermore, households in the category 'employee' have a practically null poverty rate. Employees are more likely to be located in remote villages, households in the 'other' socio-economic group are evenly split between remote and accessible villages, and the remaining categories are more likely to be located in remote villages.

The gender composition of the socio-economic group is shown in Table 1.5. 90 percent of the households in the district are headed by a male. Virtually all households where the main income earner is an employee are headed by males. The share of female household heads is highest in the 'other' category at 18 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 roughly 3 out of 4 household heads are dedicated. Virtually in all households from the employee category the household head is dedicated to mining, manufacturing, energy or construction. Household heads from the 'self-employed agriculture' category are mostly dedicated to agriculture (89 percent). Similarly, the self-employed in non-agricultural activities are almost fully dedicated to services (88 percent). Finally, the household heads from the 'other' category are divided between agriculture (36 percent) and household duties (15 percent) and 'other activities' (42 percent).

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

	Agriculture	Mining Manufacturing Energy Construction	Private and Public Services	Household Duties	Other	Total
Socio-economic Group						
Employees	0.0	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	88.5	1.3	4.1	1.0	5.2	100.0
Self-Employed Other	8.1	0.0	88.0	0.0	3.9	100.0
Other	36.2	0.0	6.4	15.3	42.1	100.0
Total	77.0	3.8	12.0	1.3	5.9	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

2 VILLAGE, POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the Kasulu 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, 5 percent of the population is over 60 years old, whereas 50 percent is under 15 years old. The remaining 45 percent is between 15 and 59 years old. Poor households and households in remote villages have higher shares in the 0-14 group and less in then 15-59 groups than non-poor households or households in accessible villages.

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. On average poor households and households in remote villages' present higher dependency ratios (1.3 and 1.4, respectively) than non-poor households and households from accessible villages (1.1 in both cases).

The dependency ratio increases with the number of household members, from 0.8 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 (1.6), whereas the employees have the lowest (0.8).

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that the dependency ratio in male-headed households is higher than in female-headed households, at 1.2 and 0.8, respectively.

Table 2.3 shows the percent distribution of households by number of household members. The mean household size is 5.3 individuals. Households with at most two individuals only represent 13 percent of all households in the district. The figure for households with 7 or more members is 32 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	25.7	21.5	3.2	50.5	24.4	23.1	2.1	49.5	50.1	44.6	5.3	100.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	24.3	22.2	3.4	49.9	24.1	23.9	2.1	50.1	48.5	46.1	5.5	100.0
Remote	27.4	20.8	3.1	51.2	24.6	22.1	2.1	48.8	52.0	42.8	5.1	100.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	28.1	19.8	2.6	50.5	28.1	20.6	0.8	49.5	56.2	40.4	3.4	100.0
Non-poor	24.6	22.4	3.6	50.5	22.5	24.2	2.7	49.5	47.1	46.6	6.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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	1.6	2.7	2.5	0.2	5.3	1.2
Cluster Location							
Accessible	0.9	1.6	2.5	2.5	0.2	5.2	1.1
Remote	1.1	1.7	2.8	2.4	0.2	5.4	1.3
Poverty Status							
Poor	1.3	2.5	3.9	2.9	0.1	6.9	1.4
Non-poor	0.9	1.4	2.3	2.3	0.2	4.8	1.1
Household size							
1-2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.7	1.7	0.8
3-4	0.9	0.5	1.3	2.1	0.1	3.6	0.7
5-6	1.2	1.8	2.9	2.5	0.1	5.5	1.2
7+	1.4	3.2	4.7	3.4	0.1	8.1	1.4
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.5	2.6	3.1	4.2	0.2	7.4	0.8
Self-employed - agriculture	1.0	1.6	2.6	2.4	0.2	5.3	1.2
Self-employed - other	1.3	1.7	3.0	2.5	0.0	5.5	1.2
Other	0.8	1.2	2.0	1.6	0.6	4.2	1.6
Gender of Household Head							
Male	1.1	1.7	2.8	2.5	0.2	5.5	1.2
Female	0.3	0.9	1.2	1.7	0.3	3.2	0.8

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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
Total	13.3	28.2	26.4	32.2	100.0	5.3
Cluster Location						
Accessible	14.6	28.4	25.2	31.7	100.0	5.2
Remote	11.7	27.9	27.7	32.7	100.0	5.4
Poverty Status						
Poor	2.9	12.1	23.4	61.6	100.0	6.9
Non-poor	16.7	33.2	27.5	22.6	100.0	4.8
Socio-economic Group						
Employed	3.7	19.6	17.7	59.0	100.0	7.4
Self-employed - agriculture	13.5	28.7	25.8	32.0	100.0	5.3
Self-employed - other	2.7	31.1	39.0	27.2	100.0	5.5
Other	44.1	13.9	14.8	27.1	100.0	4.2
Gender of Household Head						
Male	10.4	26.8	27.4	35.3	100.0	5.5
Female	39.0	40.2	16.9	4.0	100.0	3.2

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote villages tend to be larger than households in accessible villages, with means of 5.4 and 5.2 members, respectively. The difference by poverty status is more pronounced, with poor households reporting a mean household size of 6.9 members, and non-poor households reporting 4.8.

Regarding socio-economic groups, the employees have the highest mean household size, at 7.4, and the 'other' has the lowest at 4.2 members.

Finally, households headed by males are larger than female headed households: the former have 5.5 members in average, whereas the latter have only 3.2 members. This difference partly owes to the fact 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 split-up shows that males are more likely to be household heads than females, with shares of 34 and 4 percent, respectively. In turn, females are more likely to be spouses to the household head than males, at rates of 33 and 1 percent, respectively.

Table 2.5 shows the percent distribution of the population age 12 and above by marital status. Overall, 37 percent of the population has never been married. In addition, 42 percent is married and monogamous, and 14 percent is married and polygamous. Despite virtually nobody in the district being 'officially' divorced, 2 percent of the population is 'unofficially' separated. Informal unions constitute 1 percent of the population and 4 percent is widowed.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that the people of remote villages are more likely to be married-monogamous than the people in accessible villages, who are more likely to have never been married.

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 63 percent. For the population after 25 years old, married-monogamous is the most common category. Neither divorced nor separated show a trend but, 'widowed' is higher for the older cohorts. 'Never married' also shows correlation with age, decreasing as the population gets older.

Around 41 percent of the men have never been married, but for women the figure is only 32 percent. While 7 percent of

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

	Head	Spouse	Child	Parents	Other relative	Not related	Total
Total	18.8	16.4	59.9	0.8	4.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	19.0	16.0	58.9	0.9	5.1	0.0	100.0
Remote	18.6	16.9	61.2	0.7	2.6	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	14.6	13.3	68.4	0.6	3.1	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	20.8	17.8	56.0	1.0	4.4	0.0	100.0
Age							
0- 9	0.0	0.0	95.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	100.0
10-19	0.5	2.4	91.0	0.0	6.1	0.0	100.0
20-29	27.3	43.8	25.7	0.0	3.2	0.0	100.0
30-39	50.8	45.6	2.2	0.0	1.3	0.0	100.0
40-49	61.1	37.5	0.7	0.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-59	49.3	44.1	0.0	5.0	1.6	0.0	100.0
60 and above	71.8	16.8	0.0	10.6	0.7	0.0	100.0
Gender							
Male	33.6	0.1	62.5	0.2	3.6	0.0	100.0
Female	3.8	33.0	57.3	1.5	4.3	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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	36.8	42.1	14.1	0.6	0.0	2.4	3.9	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	38.0	40.0	14.1	0.5	0.0	3.4	4.0	100.0
Remote	35.4	44.8	14.2	0.7	0.0	1.2	3.7	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	45.9	40.4	9.7	0.0	0.0	1.7	2.3	100.0
Non-poor	33.1	42.7	16.1	0.8	0.0	2.8	4.5	100.0
Age								
12-14	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	92.4	5.8	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
20-24	40.3	44.7	7.8	2.3	0.0	4.1	0.8	100.0
25-29	10.4	69.5	14.9	2.4	0.0	2.8	0.0	100.0
30-39	1.2	73.7	19.8	0.4	0.0	2.2	2.8	100.0
40-49	1.5	62.7	29.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.1	100.0
50-59	0.0	51.4	29.8	0.0	0.0	7.2	11.5	100.0
60 and abov	0.0	48.3	26.7	0.0	0.0	2.5	22.5	100.0
Gender								
Male	41.4	42.4	14.2	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.9	100.0
Female	32.3	41.8	14.1	0.6	0.0	4.4	6.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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	1.2	38.3	2.9	57.6	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	1.5	40.7	3.7	54.1	100.0
Remote	0.9	35.4	1.9	61.8	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.2	29.7	1.7	68.4	100.0
Non-poor	1.7	42.4	3.3	52.6	100.0
Age					
5- 9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
10-14	0.0	0.8	0.2	99.0	100.0
15-19	0.0	22.1	2.2	75.7	100.0
20-29	1.6	58.3	7.6	32.5	100.0
30-39	2.2	76.7	6.5	14.5	100.0
40-49	3.3	83.4	5.5	7.8	100.0
50-59	3.2	79.6	1.7	15.5	100.0
60 and above	3.6	77.8	0.0	18.6	100.0
Gender					
Male	1.9	38.3	5.0	54.7	100.0
Female	0.5	38.2	0.8	60.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

women are widowed and 4 percent separated, the shares for males are 1 and 0 percent, respectively.

Table 2.6 shows the percent distribution of the population age 5 and above by socio-economic group. Overall, 38 percent of the population is self-employed in agriculture, with 58 percent in other activities. Individuals living in remote villages seem to be somewhat less likely to be self-employed in agriculture, as poor households. Remote villages and poor households report higher shares in the 'other' category.

The analysis of the age-groups is particularly interesting. The share of self-employed in agriculture tends to increase with age, peaking at 83 percent for the 40 to 49 group. On the contrary, the category 'other' tends to decrease with age, showing a sharp decrease between 15-19 and 20-29, from 76 to 33 percent, then decreases steadily until stabilising at around 15 percent.
The gender breakdown shows that males are more likely to be self-employed in non-agricultural activities than women. In turn, females are more likely to be in the 'other' category, with a share of 60 percent against 55 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, 35 percent has some primary, and 25 percent has completed primary. The remaining levels have shares of at most 3 percent each.

The breakdown by cluster location shows no strong differences between accessible and remote clusters. However, the breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households have a higher in 'some primary' than non-poor households, who in turn have a higher share in 'completed primary'.

The age breakdown shows that 71 percent of the children between 5 and 9 have no formal education, but 87 percent of the children 10-14 have at least some primary. Rates of no education are lowest for the population 10-19 (10 percent for each group) and higher for the older groups. In the groups between 20 and 49 years old, the most common is completed primary.
The gender breakdown shows that females have a higher share of uneducated population than males: 41 against 28 percent, but at the same time similar shares with complete primary (roughly one quarter of each group). The share of males reporting some primary is higher than that of females (39 and 30 percent, respectively).

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	34.3	2.9	34.5	24.3	1.7	0.1	2.2	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	33.0	3.0	34.6	24.8	1.8	0.2	2.6	100.0
Remote	35.8	2.9	34.3	23.8	1.6	0.0	1.6	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	35.5	2.5	38.8	21.7	0.5	0.0	1.0	100.0
Non-poor	33.8	3.0	32.6	25.5	2.2	0.2	2.7	100.0
Age								
5- 9	70.9	12.0	17.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	9.6	2.5	86.8	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	9.9	0.5	56.9	25.7	6.1	0.0	0.9	100.0
20-29	29.9	0.0	14.6	49.4	4.3	0.4	1.5	100.0
30-39	20.8	0.0	9.5	67.2	0.3	0.5	1.7	100.0
40-49	31.7	0.0	16.2	47.0	0.9	0.0	4.1	100.0
50-59	52.2	0.0	29.0	8.3	1.8	0.0	8.7	100.0
60 and above	60.0	0.0	25.9	2.2	0.0	0.0	11.9	100.0
Gender								
Male	27.7	3.2	39.3	25.0	1.7	0.2	2.9	100.0
Female	40.8	2.7	29.8	23.6	1.7	0.0	1.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household

Table 2.8 shows the percent distribution of household heads by marital status. Overall, 65 percent of the household heads is married and monogamous, 11 divorced, separated or widowed, 22 percent married and polygamous, 1 percent has never been married and a further 1 percent lives in an informal union.

The breakdown by cluster location shows a weak relationship between location and marital status. Remote villages remote a higher share of 'married monogamous' and a lower share of 'divorced, separated, or widowed' than accessible villages.

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

Analysis by age-groups shows that married-monogamous is the category with the highest share of household heads after 20years old. Some trends may be extracted from this panel. For instance, the married-monogamous category decreases with age, as 'divorced/separated or widowed' increases. The share of household heads married and polygamous peaks at 28 percent of the 60+ age-group.

Most female household heads are divorced, separated or widowed (95 percent), whereas for males, this category roughly represents 2 percent. Most male household heads are married, monogamous or polygamous (96 percent).

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	1.4	64.6	21.8	0.9	11.3	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	1.7	62.0	22.1	0.8	13.4	100.0
Remote	1.0	67.8	21.4	1.1	8.7	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.9	73.6	18.0	0.0	7.6	100.0
Non-poor	1.6	61.5	23.1	1.2	12.5	100.0
Age						
15-19	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
20-29	1.2	80.9	11.3	3.7	2.9	100.0
30-39	0.0	76.9	16.5	0.7	5.9	100.0
40-49	2.5	54.2	34.5	0.0	8.8	100.0
50-59	0.0	53.5	21.9	0.0	24.6	100.0
60 and above	0.0	50.7	27.8	0.0	21.5	100.0
Gender						
Male	1.5	71.8	23.6	1.0	2.0	100.0
Female	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	95.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

	Employed	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	2.8	84.9	8.9	3.3	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	3.4	82.5	11.2	2.9	100.0
Remote	2.2	87.8	6.2	3.8	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.0	93.0	3.0	3.9	100.0
Non-poor	3.7	82.5	10.6	3.2	100.0
Age					
15-19	0.0	64.5	35.5	0.0	100.0
20-29	0.0	79.6	18.3	2.0	100.0
30-39	3.0	84.2	11.1	1.6	100.0
40-49	2.8	85.6	8.2	3.4	100.0
50-59	3.4	90.3	3.5	2.7	100.0
60 and above	5.0	87.6	0.0	7.4	100.0
Gender					
Male	3.1	84.4	9.4	3.1	100.0
Female	0.0	89.1	5.1	5.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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 9 percent of the household heads, the 'other' category (unemployed, inactive and household workers) represents 3 percent, and the employees are a further 3 percent.

The analysis by location shows that the share of household heads self-employed in agriculture in remote villages is higher than in accessible villages, with shares of 88 and 83 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 6 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 'employee' or 'self-employed other' groups more often than the heads of poor households.

The breakdown by age of the household head shows interesting insights. First, it is important to notice that the small number of household heads aged 15 to 19 impedes drawing solid statistical conclusions about them, so they will be excluded from the following discussion. For all age-groups, 'self-employed agriculture' is the most important category, representing at least 4 out of 5 household heads in each age-group. The 'employee' category peaks at 5 percent for the60+ age-group. The 'self-employed – other' category starts at 18 percent for the 20-29 group and then decreases steadily down to virtually zero percent for the cohort aged 60 and above. The 'other' category gains importance in the latter group, with a share 7 percent, as 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 an employee or self-employed in non-agricultural activities than in female-headed households. In the latter, the main income earner is more likely to be self-employed in agriculture.

Table 2.10 shows the percent distribution of the heads of household by highest level of education. Overall, around only 8 percent of the household heads has any education after primary. 29 percent of the household heads has no education, 22

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	28.6	22.1	41.4	0.9	0.3	6.7	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	27.4	23.8	39.6	0.5	0.5	8.2	100.0
Remote	30.1	20.1	43.5	1.4	0.0	4.9	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	31.3	24.0	41.8	0.0	0.0	3.0	100.0
Non-poor	28.0	21.7	40.8	1.2	0.3	8.0	100.0
Age							
15-19	0.0	66.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.8	100.0
20-29	30.9	21.6	47.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-39	16.5	13.9	64.8	0.6	0.9	3.3	100.0
40-49	22.6	13.2	58.4	1.5	0.0	4.2	100.0
50-59	30.0	35.6	16.9	3.6	0.0	14.0	100.0
60 and above	49.2	32.9	3.0	0.0	0.0	14.9	100.0
Gender							
Male	24.1	23.6	44.4	1.0	0.3	6.6	100.0
Female	68.7	8.5	14.6	0.0	0.0	8.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

percent some primary and 41 percent have completed primary.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that, as would be expected, household heads in remote villages are more likely to have no education than the ones from accessible villages, with shares of 30 and 27 percent, respectively. Furthermore, household heads in accessible villages are more likely to have post-primary education, with a share of 8 percent against 5 percent of household heads in remote villages. Similar differences are observed by poverty status.

The age breakdown shows that 50 percent of household heads aged 60 or over has no education, and a further 33 percent just some primary. Completed primary peaks at 65 percent for the 30-39 cohort. Post-secondary education peaks at nearly 15 percent for the 50-59 and 60+ cohorts.

The analysis by gender shows that female household heads are more likely to have no education than males, with rates of 69 and 24 percent, respectively. 44 percent of the male household heads has completed primary, against 15 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, less than 1 percent of children under 18 lost both parents, 2 percent lost only their mother and 4 percent lost only their father. This amounts to 7 percent of children who lost at least one parent at the time of the survey.

There is no evident correlation by accessibility of the village, poverty status of the household or gender of the child. However, as would be expected, the share of orphaned children increases with age. Up to 13 percent of children in the 15-17 cohort lost at least one of their parents.

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	1.5	3.7	0.3
Cluster Location			
Accessible	0.7	4.7	0.2
Remote	2.5	2.6	0.5
Poverty Status			
Poor	1.5	3.4	0.2
Non-poor	1.6	3.9	0.4
Age			
0-4	0.4	1.3	0.0
5-9	2.4	2.6	0.3
10-14	2.0	5.4	0.5
15-17	1.8	10.0	1.3
Gender			
Male	1.0	3.9	0.7
Female	2.1	3.5	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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 11 percent of children under 18 were living in non-nuclear households at the time of the survey.

Overall, 13 percent the children from accessible villages live in non-nuclear households, while the share for remote villages is lower, at 9 percent. Children from non-poor households tend to be fostered more often than children from non-poor households (with shares of 13 and 9 percent, respectively).

The gender split-up does not show stark differences, but the analysis of age-groups shows that the share of children living in non-nuclear households increases with age, from 7 percent for the 0-4 cohort to 22 percent for the 15-17 cohort. The share is lower and relatively constant for children living with their father only.

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	6.9	1.8	2.7	11.4
Cluster Location				
Accessible	9.4	1.4	2.6	13.4
Remote	4.0	2.3	2.8	9.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	5.2	1.9	2.0	9.1
Non-poor	7.9	1.8	3.1	12.8
Age				
0-4	6.2	0.4	0.4	7.0
5-9	5.6	2.1	2.7	10.5
10-14	7.0	2.5	3.8	13.3
15-17	12.1	3.5	6.5	22.1
Gender				
Male	6.9	1.8	2.4	11.0
Female	6.9	1.9	3.0	11.7

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

3 EDUCATION

This chapter examines selected education indicators in Kasulu 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

3.1.1 Literacy

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. Overall, the adult literacy rate[1] in this district is 66 percent.

Analysis of by cluster location shows that there is a small difference in the literacy rates between households located in accessible and remote clusters at 67 and 65 percent respectively. The same pattern is observed when the data are disaggregated by poverty status. While the literacy rate among non-poor households is at 67 percent, the literacy rate among poor households is 65 percent.

The socio-economic category of the household shows high correlation with adult literacy rates. Households that belong to the employee socio-economic group (the main income earner is formally employed) have the highest literacy rate (92 percent). Households from the self-employed other socio-economic group follow with a literacy rate of 82 percent; self-employed agriculture with 64 percent and finally the 'other' socio-economic group (those involved in domestic work, unemployed and inactive) with a 57 percent literacy rate. Furthermore, data shows that there is a large gap in the literacy rates among men and women. The literacy rate among men is 21 percent higher than that among women at 77 and 56 percent respectively.

The data was also disaggregated by orphan[2] status and foster[3] status. Since adult literacy is defined for individuals above 15 years of age then the literacy rates reported here reflect those between 15 and 18 years of age. Results show that non-orphaned children have a higher literacy rate than orphaned children at 88 and 75 percent respectively. The literacy gap between fostered and non-fostered children appears to be higher than the literacy gap between orphaned and non-orphaned children. Non-fostered children have a literacy rate of 88 percent while fostered children have a literacy rate of 60 percent.

3.1.2 Primary School Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction

Access

Primary school access rate is defined as the proportion of primary school-age children (7 to 13 years) reporting to live within 30 minutes to the nearest primary school. About 84 percent of all primary school children live within 30 minutes travel to the nearest primary school.

Households located in remote clusters have a higher primary school access rate (86 percent) than households located in

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

[2] A child is considered orphaned if he/she has lost at least one parent, for children up to 18 years old.

[3] A child is considered fostered if he/she does not live with any of his/her parents, for children up to 18 years old.

accessible clusters (81 percent). Primary school access rates are 10 percentage points higher among non-poor households than among poor households. The socio-economic group of the household, gender and foster status of the individual do not show strong correlation with primary school access rates as the access rates don't vary much across socio-economic groups, gender or foster status. However, orphan status shows some correlation with primary school access rates. While 84 percent of non-orphaned children lives within 30 minutes travel to the nearest primary school, only 75 percent of orphaned children reports the same.

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 are 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.

Table 3.1: Education indicators

		Primary				Secondary			
	Adult Literacy rate	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction
Total	66.4	83.6	112.4	79.4	59.1	16.8	11.6	8.1	40.9
Cluster Location									
Accessible	67.4	81.2	113.8	77.6	68.1	21.9	12.0	8.9	37.8
Remote	65.3	86.2	110.8	81.5	49.0	8.7	11.0	6.9	46.3
Poverty Status									
Poor	65.1	77.3	109.7	79.3	58.0	12.4	5.8	4.8	60.5
Non-poor	66.9	87.4	113.9	79.2	60.7	19.0	14.4	9.7	37.2
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	92.1	86.6	112.9	90.6	39.4	16.5	63.9	47.7	60.9
Self-Employee - agriculture	63.7	83.1	113.2	79.0	63.4	17.9	8.5	5.3	29.6
Self-Employee - other	82.1	85.5	101.7	75.1	32.2	6.6	15.7	15.7	54.1
Other	57.1	86.7	123.7	92.0	31.0	17.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender									
Male	77.0	84.3	111.7	76.7	60.8	18.9	13.7	7.4	43.6
Female	56.0	82.8	113.2	82.6	57.1	14.7	9.4	8.8	36.8
Orphan status									
Orphaned	74.9	75.2	120.3	75.7	68.4	34.2	6.4	6.4	48.1
Not-orphaned	87.7	84.3	110.8	79.7	58.4	14.9	7.7	7.7	42.8
Foster status									
Fostered	59.7	80.7	134.3	91.6	55.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	0.0
Not-fostered	88.2	83.9	111.9	79.5	58.7	17.3	7.9	7.9	44.3

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Literacy is defined for persons age 15 and above.
2. Primary school:
   Access is defined for children of primary school age (7-13) in households less than 30 minutes from a primary school.
   Enrollment (gross) is defined for all persons currently in primary school (Kindergarden, Grade 1 to Grade 8) regardless of age.
   Enrollment (net) is defined for children of primary school age (7-13) currently in primary school (Kindergarden, Grade 1 to Grade 8).
   Satisfaction is defined for all persons currently in primary school who cited no problems with school.
3. Secondary school:
   Access is defined for children of secondary school age (14-19) in households less than 30 minutes from a secondary school.
   Enrollment (gross) is defined for all persons currently in secondary school (Form 1 to Form 5) regardless of age.
   Enrollment (net) is defined for children of secondary school age (14-19) currently in secondary school (Form 1 to Form 5).
   Satisfaction is defined for all persons currently in secondary school who cited no problems with school.

The 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 112 percent at the time of the survey. This figure indicates that all individuals who were at primary school constitute 112 percent of all children of primary school-age in the district.

The NER further shows that 79 percent of all primary school-age children were attending school. While the GER is 3 percentage points lower in clusters located in remote areas compared to those in accessible areas, the NER for clusters located in the accessible areas is 4 percentage points higher than that of clusters located in remote areas.

Data shows that there is a very small difference in primary school GER between the poor and non-poor and there is no difference in the NER between the two groups. When enrolment rates are broken down by socio-economic group, it is observed that the 'other' socio-economic group has the highest GER (124 percent) while the self-employed other group has the lowest GER of 102 percent. The remaining socio-economic groups have the same GER of 113 percent. Three quarters of primary school age children living in households where the main income earner is self-employed in a non-agricultural sector are currently enrolled in school. This ratio is small compared to those living in households belonging to other socio-economic groups.

While the GER does not differ much by gender, the NER among women is 6 percentage points higher than the NER among men at 83 and 77 percent respectively. If we look at enrolment rates by orphan status, results show that the GER is higher among orphaned children while the NER is higher among non-orphaned children . On the other hand, fostered children have higher GER and NER compared to non-fostered children.

Satisfaction

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

Above half (59 percent) of primary school individuals are satisfied with the schools they attend. 68 percent of those living in accessible clusters report being satisfied with their schools and only 49 percent of those living in remote clusters report the same. Primary school satisfaction rates do not differ much by poverty status.

Households belonging to the self-employed agriculture socio-economic group have the highest share of individuals who reported satisfaction with their primary schools. Aggregation of the data by gender shows that the satisfaction rates between male and female are about the same. Furthermore, results show that the share of orphaned children satisfied with their schools exceeds that of non-orphaned children by 10 percentage points at 68 and 58 percent respectively. Finally, foster status of the individual does not appear to show correlation with satisfaction rates as the shares of satisfied individuals do not differ much across the two group.

3.1.3 Secondary school Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction

Access

Secondary school access rate is defined as the proportion of secondary school-age children (14 to 19 years) reporting to live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary 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	40.5	27.8	8.3	85.0	3.3	26.1	17.7	1.9	1.3
Cluster Location									
Accessible	32.7	39.6	7.7	79.5	2.6	27.8	12.5	3.4	0.0
Remote	49.2	18.9	8.8	89.2	3.9	24.8	21.6	0.9	2.2
Poverty Status									
Poor	40.5	21.3	8.2	87.7	3.7	30.4	24.1	2.1	3.5
Non-poor	39.6	32.6	8.7	82.9	3.2	24.5	14.5	1.9	0.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	47.1	65.4	0.0	91.9	2.3	32.7	15.0	2.3	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	37.1	24.8	8.3	85.3	3.6	26.6	20.0	2.3	1.7
Self-employed - other	61.0	23.2	16.0	75.3	3.3	22.1	5.9	0.0	0.0
Other	64.9	24.8	0.0	100.0	0.0	14.5	16.4	0.0	0.0
Gender									
Male	39.5	32.3	7.2	83.1	1.5	27.7	14.2	2.8	0.5
Female	41.6	22.9	9.6	87.1	5.3	24.3	21.5	1.0	2.2
Type of school									
Primary	40.9	26.1	6.1	84.9	3.6	27.8	17.8	0.9	1.3
Government	40.9	26.1	6.1	84.9	3.6	27.8	17.8	0.9	1.3
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	59.1	44.6	25.9	94.5	2.1	11.7	17.5	13.6	0.0
Government	64.8	51.6	19.8	92.8	2.8	15.3	15.5	0.0	0.0
Private	32.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	57.5	32.5	69.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	36.5	36.5	0.0
Other	17.4	30.0	25.8	58.7	0.0	16.2	14.2	0.0	4.7
Government	14.2	19.6	20.9	79.1	0.0	21.8	19.1	0.0	6.4
Private	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	70.2	60.2	39.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

Overall, only 17 percent of secondary school age individuals live within 30 minutes travel to the nearest secondary school. Most of those who have good access to secondary schools live in accessible clusters (22 percent). Only 9 percent of those living in remote clusters live within 30 minutes travel to the nearest secondary school. Observations from the table show that in general secondary school access rates are very low. Only 12 percent of individuals living in poor households have access to secondary schools compared to 19 percent for individuals living in non-poor households.

There is no difference in the secondary school access rates between the employee, self-employed agriculture and the 'other' socio-economic groups, but the self-employed other category reports a lower share. Analysis of secondary school access rates by gender shows that males have a slightly higher access rate of 19 percent compared to 15 percent for females. Orphan status appears to be correlated with secondary school access rates. Orphaned children appear to live closer to secondary schools than non-orphaned children. The ratio of orphaned children living within 30 minutes travel to the nearest secondary school (34 percent) is nearly twice that of non-orphaned children (15 percent). The situation is the opposite for foster status as the number of non-fostered children living close to a secondary school is about four times greater (17 percent) than that of fostered children at 4 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, the district has a 12 percent GER and 8 percent NER. There is a 1 percentage difference in the GER and NER between households located in accessible and remote clusters. Poverty status of the household seems to correlate with secondary school GER and NER. There seems to be higher GER and NER among non-poor households compared to poor households. While non-poor households have a 10 percent NER, the NER among poor households is only 5 percent.

Households belonging to the employee socio-economic category have higher GER and NER at secondary level than the other groups. Since the NER provides more information in terms of actual participation, it is important to note that 48 percent of those living in employee households, 16 percent from self-employed other, 5 percent from self-employed agriculture and 0 percent from the 'other' socio-economic category are currently enrolled in secondary schools.

Results also show that the NER for females in secondary schools exceeds that of males by 2 percentage points but the GER for males is 5 percentage points higher than that of females. While the GER and NER among orphaned children and non-orphaned children are quite similar, the GER and NER for non-fostered children are about twice the ratios for fostered children.

Satisfaction

Just above two-fifths (41 percent) of the total population enrolled in secondary schools reported being satisfied with school. Among those living in accessible clusters, 38 percent reported being satisfied with their schools while 46 percent of those living in remote clusters reported the same. Looking at the data by poverty status, results show that a larger share of individuals living in poor households report being satisfied with the schools they attend compared to those living in non-poor households.

Analysis of satisfaction rates by socio-economic category shows that 61 percent of those living in employee households, 54 percent from self-employed other, 30 percent from self-employed agriculture and 0 percent from the 'other' socio-economic group (unemployed, involved in domestic work, inactive) report being satisfied with the secondary schools they attend. Furthermore, 44 percent of males and 37 percent of females report being satisfied with their schools. The share of orphaned children who reported satisfaction with their schools is about 5 percentage points higher than the share of non-orphaned children who reported the same. On the other hand, there exists a big difference between fostered and non-fostered children. While 44 percent of non-fostered children report satisfaction with their schools, all fostered children reported dissatisfaction. However, part of the difference may be due to the small sample size.

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 the schools they were attending at the time of the survey were asked to provide reasons for their dissatisfaction. Complaints regarding lack of books and other resources were allocated into the 'Books/Supplies' category, while those relating to quality of teaching and teacher shortages were grouped into the 'Teaching' category. The 'Facilities' category incorporates complaints regarding overcrowding and bad condition of facilities. The results are shown in Table 3.2.

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	16.3	26.0	0.0	7.5	1.3	4.6	1.4	4.2	40.7	22.9	0.0	0.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	19.3	24.0	0.0	8.3	0.6	3.1	2.1	2.5	44.3	22.4	0.0	0.0
Remote	12.6	30.0	0.0	6.0	2.7	7.3	0.0	7.5	33.6	23.7	0.0	0.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	16.0	27.2	0.0	6.8	0.0	5.4	1.1	2.5	43.9	16.6	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	16.6	25.4	0.0	7.9	2.0	4.1	1.5	5.2	38.9	26.3	0.0	0.0
Socio-economic Group												
Employed	7.5	16.4	0.0	0.0	16.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.8	46.8	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - agric	16.3	24.1	0.0	7.8	1.1	5.5	1.6	4.1	39.6	23.9	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	18.6	24.2	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	57.6	17.0	0.0	0.0
Other	26.1	81.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender												
Male	15.6	28.8	0.0	5.8	2.6	3.0	0.0	0.0	51.3	15.6	0.0	0.0
Female	17.1	23.1	0.0	9.3	0.0	6.2	2.8	8.6	29.7	30.3	0.0	0.0
Age												
7-13	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.8	0.0	0.0	81.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
14-19	35.0	30.1	0.0	8.7	1.5	3.0	1.6	4.9	34.3	26.4	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

Overall, 41 percent of all pupils enrolled in either primary or secondary schools reported dissatisfaction with the schools they attend. Looking at the dissatisfaction rates by cluster location, data shows that 49 percent of those living in remote clusters are dissatisfied with their schools compared to 33 percent of those living in accessible clusters. Dissaggregation of the data by poverty status does not show wide differences between groups.

Analysis of the data by socio-economic group shows that the largest share of those reporting dissatisfaction are from households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group and the smallest share is by those belonging to the self-employed agriculture socio-economic group.

While there are no differences in the dissatisfaction rates between males and females, there are large differences when the data are analysed by type of school. 41 percent of those attending primary education reported dissatisfaction. It should be noticed that all the observations are related to government schools.

Overall, the percentage of people dissatisfied with their secondary schools at the time of the survey was 59 percent. The shares of people reporting dissatisfaction at the secondary level vary by type of school. Among those attending government secondary schools, the dissatisfaction rate was 65 percent; 33 percent for those attending private schools and 58 percent for those attending other schools.. For those attending other types of schools such as vocational training schools, the dissatisfaction rate was 17 percent. 14 percent of those attending government schools reported dissatisfaction while the rate for other schools was 70 percent.

Those who reported being dissatisfied with their schools were asked to give reasons as to why this was so. Overall, the most prominent reason for dissatisfaction was the lack of teachers (85 percent) followed by the lack of books and supplies (28 percent) and lack of space (26 percent). Independently of the selected household characteristic, the three reasons mentioned above remain prominent.

The pattern changes when data are analysed for secondary schools. Overall, 95 percent of those attending secondary schools are dissatisfied because of the lack of teachers, 45 percent are dissatisfied because of the lack of books and supplies while 26 percent are dissatisfied because of poor teaching. More variation is

observed when secondary schools are divided into government, private and other. While those in government schools are mostly dissatisfied with lack of teachers, lack of books and supplies and poor teaching, those enrolled in private schools are dissatisfied most with lack of teachers and high school fees. Those attending secondary schools belonging to the 'other' category are most dissatisfied with lack of teachers, poor teaching, lack of books and supplies, bad condition of facilities and high school fees.

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.

At the time of the survey, 16 percent of children aged between 7 and 19 years in the district were not attending school. Individuals within the age range who reported not attending school were asked for the reason. 41 percent said that it was useless/uninteresting, 26 percent had already completed school (standard seven, O-level or A-level) and 21 percent failed exams and therefore could not continue with school. It is important to note that none reported non-attendance due to awaiting admission, distance to school or dismissal.

Non-attendance by cluster location shows that 19 percent and 13 percent of those living in accessible and remote clusters respectively reported non-attendance. The most prominent reasons given for non-attendance were useless/uninteresting, completed school and failed exam. The same pattern is observed when analysis is done by poverty status.

The same reasons appear to be most prominent when the data are disaggregated by socio-economic group. It is interesting to see that while other groups do not have individuals not attending school because of illness, 6 percent of those belonging to the self-employed agriculture group reported non-attendance due to illness. While 16 percent of those belonging to the employee socio-economic group reported non-attendance due to work, only 1 percent of those living in self-employed agriculture group and none belonging to the other groups reported the same.

Analysis of non-attendance rates by gender show that while no males reported non-attendance due to marriage or pregnancy, 9 and 3 percent of females respectively reported this. Furthermore, 51 percent of males and 30 percent of females reported non-attendance because they thought school was useless or uninteresting. It is also observed that the share of females that reported non-attendance due to failing exams (30 percent) is twice the share for males (16 percent).

A larger share of those not attending school are between ages 14 and 19 (35 percent) compared to 4 percent of those between ages 7 and 13. Among those between 7 and 13 years reporting non-attendance, 81 percent say they don't attend school because it is useless/uninteresting and 15 percent because of illness. Reasons for non-attendance among the 14 to 19 year olds are more dispersed. However, the most prominent reasons for non-attendance are useless/uninteresting, completed school and failed exam.

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	76.7	82.6	79.4	0.4	0.7	0.5
7	46.6	39.6	42.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	54.2	78.1	65.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	84.0	90.5	87.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10	81.1	95.6	86.6	1.7	0.0	1.1
11	90.7	91.6	91.1	0.0	5.2	2.4
12	82.8	95.1	88.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
13	93.3	92.4	92.8	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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	7.4	8.8	8.1	4.9	4.1	4.5
14	3.9	0.0	1.7	3.9	5.8	5.0
15	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	2.2
16	5.9	18.5	11.4	3.5	6.2	4.7
17	21.7	7.6	13.9	12.2	4.7	8.0
18	13.3	14.6	14.0	7.1	4.1	5.5
19	9.8	19.9	15.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

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 about 0.5 percent, too low to arrive to solid statistical conclusions. Therefore, only enrolment rates will be analysed.

Overall, 79 percent of primary school-aged children in this district were enrolled at the time of the survey. Out of those in primary school-age (7 to 13 years), 83 percent of females and 77 percent of males were enrolled. The required age at which children should start standard one is 7 years. However, data on primary school enrolment shows that at the time of the survey only 42 percent of all seven year olds were enrolled. Females are more likely to be enrolled in school at an earlier age than males. While most females are likely to be in school by age 9 where the NER is 91 percent, most males are likely to be in school by age 11 where the NER is also 91 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. About 8 percent of secondary school-aged children were enrolled compared to 83 percent at the primary level.

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. From this table we see that NER increases gradually with age. The biggest difference in enrolment rates is observed between age 16 and 17. While a large number of boys are enrolled in secondary school at the age of 17 and 18, most girls are enrolled in secondary at 16 and 19 years of age.

Secondary school drop-out rates among secondary school-age individuals (14 to 19 years) are higher compared to those at primary level. 5 percent of secondary school-age students had dropped out in the year prior to the survey. In general, the highest drop-out rate is observed at 17 years of age (8 percent). The highest drop-out rates among males are at ages 14 and 16 while female drop out rates are highest at ages 17 and 18.

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	77.0	56.0	66.4
15-19 years	90.6	79.5	85.4
20-29 years	71.6	62.3	66.3
30-39 years	75.9	68.5	72.1
40-49 years	83.0	44.5	65.6
50-59 years	78.3	20.9	44.3
60+ years	59.3	9.1	39.7
Accessible	76.7	58.2	67.4
15-19 years	87.8	77.3	83.1
20-29 years	70.5	66.8	68.4
30-39 years	70.2	72.6	71.5
40-49 years	84.9	41.3	64.3
50-59 years	79.3	24.8	47.5
60+ years	63.5	16.8	45.7
Remote	77.4	53.2	65.3
15-19 years	95.9	82.8	89.3
20-29 years	72.5	57.4	64.3
30-39 years	81.5	63.8	72.7
40-49 years	80.3	50.1	67.6
50-59 years	76.7	15.3	39.6
60+ years	53.9	0.0	32.1

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is population age 15+

Adult Literacy

Overall, 66 percent of the population aged 15 and above in the district are literate. A larger share of men is literate compared to women. While 23 percent of males is illiterate, 44 percent of women is illiterate. The difference in literacy rates among men and women is 21 percent at 77 and 56 percent respectively. Individuals aged between 15 and 19 have the highest literacy rate (89 percent) while only 32 percent of those who are above 60 years know how to read and write. There are remarkable gender differences in literacy, being larger for the older cohorts.

Analysis of adult literacy by cluster location shows that in general, literacy rates in accessible clusters are quite similar to those in remote clusters at 67 and 65 percent respectively. Independent of location, there is a clear pattern in literacy rates. Literacy rates are highest among 15 to 19 year olds, they slightly decrease among 20 to 29 year olds then they slightly increase again among 30 to 39 year olds and finally continue dropping with increases in age.

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 youth literacy rate in this district is 76 percent. 85 percent of males and 67 percent of females are literate.

Overall, literacy rates among youth tend to decrease with increase in age. As observed from the table, 90 percent of 15 to 19 year olds are literate while 58 percent of 24 to 25 year olds know how to read and write. Literacy rates in remote clusters are 2 percentage points higher than literacy rates in accessible clusters.

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	85.1	67.0	76.0
15-17 years	92.4	80.8	87.5
18-20 years	85.5	64.8	74.4
21-22 years	73.5	50.2	60.0
23-24 years	66.6	61.0	63.5
Accessible	83.4	66.8	75.3
15-17 years	91.3	79.4	86.2
18-20 years	82.2	61.4	72.3
21-22 years	56.5	52.4	54.2
23-24 years	84.0	64.2	71.0
Remote	87.4	67.3	76.9
15-17 years	94.4	83.2	89.6
18-20 years	90.8	68.1	77.1
21-22 years	96.8	47.3	67.8
23-24 years	58.1	57.7	57.9

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is population aged 15-24

4 HEALTH

This chapter examines health indicators for the population in Kasulu DC. 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 to 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, 62 percent of the households have access to medical services. Conversely, 38 percent of the households in the district do not have access to medical services.

As would be expected, household in accessible villages have higher access to medical services than households in remote villages. Both show similar proportions of need and use, but households in accessible villages report higher satisfaction rates (89 percent) than households in remote villages (at 85 percent).

Non-poor households have higher access rates than poor households, with shares of 65 and 55 percent, respectively. The breakdown by poverty status does not show sharp differences by need, use or satisfaction.

Regarding socio-economic status, the self-employed in non-agricultural activities show the highest access, at 66 percent. Employees showed the lowest rate of need (17 percent), and lowest satisfaction, at 76

Table 4.1 - Health Indicators

	Medical Services			
	Access	Need	Use	Satisfaction
Total	62.0	20.0	26.2	87.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	68.0	17.4	25.5	88.7
Remote	54.9	23.1	27.2	85.1
Poverty Status				
Poor	54.7	18.8	22.7	83.9
Non-poor	65.2	20.3	27.7	88.0
Socio-economic group				
Employed	39.9	17.3	21.2	76.3
Self-employed - agriculture	62.5	20.2	26.4	87.3
Self-employed - other	66.0	18.7	28.7	88.0
Other	64.0	22.9	21.0	84.9
Gender				
Male	63.2	18.4	25.1	87.5
Female	60.7	21.7	27.4	86.5
Age				
0-4	59.7	29.0	65.0	94.3
5-9	62.3	14.7	14.0	88.3
10-14	65.6	8.7	7.9	83.2
15-19	63.5	12.9	10.9	82.5
20-29	56.3	18.1	19.9	84.3
30-39	64.6	20.2	20.0	89.3
40-49	66.3	21.2	21.5	56.4
50-59	67.7	32.3	0.0	0.0
60+	60.9	36.4	32.0	74.8

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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.

percent. Households where the main income earner was self-employed in non-agricultural activities showed the highest satisfaction rate, at 88 percent.

There are no gender differences in access, with both genders at about 60 percent. Females report higher need rates than males (22 and 18 percent, respectively), a slightly higher rate of use, and lower satisfaction.

Access does not vary widely by age-groups, but the rate of need does. It starts at 29 percent for children under 5, reduces to around 15 percent for the population aged between 5 and 9, and then further declines to 9 percent for the age-group between 10-14 then starts going up again, peaking at 36 percent for the 60+ group. The rate of use follows a similar trend: it starts decreasing with age but then increases for the older cohorts (except for the age-group 50-59). Satisfaction is lowest for the 50-59 group, the heaviest users of the service; and highest for the 0-4 group.

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 8 users of healthcare facilities is dissatisfied, mostly because of long waits (17 percent), the cost (34 percent) and unsuccessful treatment (46 percent). Surprisingly, drug unavailability was reported just by 10 percent of the users.

The analysis by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages are more commonly dissatisfied by the cost of the treatment (42 percent, against 27 percent for households in remote villages), whereas households in remote villages report long waits more often (22 percent, against 10 percent of the households in accessible villages).

The breakdown by poverty status shows similar dissatisfaction rates. However, the reasons for dissatisfaction are different: 48

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	13.0	3.5	16.6	7.9	34.2	9.6	45.7	0.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	11.3	3.0	10.0	6.1	42.0	2.6	44.7	0.0
Remote	14.9	4.0	22.0	9.3	27.8	15.4	46.5	0.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	16.1	4.0	21.2	8.1	35.5	13.1	40.7	0.0
Non-poor	12.0	3.3	14.2	7.7	33.6	7.8	48.2	0.0
Socio-economic group								
Employed	23.7	0.0	41.1	65.6	24.5	15.5	34.4	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	12.7	4.3	12.8	3.4	35.9	10.6	45.5	0.0
Self-employed - other	12.0	0.0	39.3	13.4	34.4	0.0	40.0	0.0
Other	15.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Gender								
Male	12.5	3.8	15.2	3.2	38.3	10.4	44.6	0.0
Female	13.5	3.3	17.7	11.9	30.7	8.9	46.6	0.0
Type of provider								
Public hospital	11.7	6.9	22.4	15.4	15.6	14.8	45.2	0.0
Private hospital	29.5	0.0	30.8	0.0	46.5	10.3	56.9	0.0
Religous hospital	27.6	0.0	8.6	0.0	41.4	0.0	63.1	0.0
Village health worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private Doctor/Dentist	48.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Pharmacist	10.7	0.0	3.6	0.0	65.8	3.6	30.6	0.0
Trad. Healer	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

percent of poor households report dissatisfaction due to cost, 8 points above non-poor households. In turn, the latter report a higher share of dissatisfaction by the long wait (21 against 14 percent).

Self-employees in non-agricultural activities are the socio-economic group with the lowest dissatisfaction rate. Dissatisfaction does not vary by gender, but the reasons do so. Males point out the treatment cost and the lack of medicine more often than females (38 and 30 percent against 10 and 9 percent, respectively).

Regarding health provider, the main cause of dissatisfaction in public hospitals is the unsuccessful treatment long wait, whereas in private and religious hospitals, as well as in pharmacists, the cost of healthcare. Furthermore, private doctor/dentist shows 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, 73 percent of the population did not consult a health provider, typically because there was no need (97 percent of the cases). However, 1.3 percent of the people who did not consult a health provider had other reasons, mainly the cost of healthcare.

Neither cluster location nor poverty status seems to be correlated with the reasons for not consulting. Nevertheless, the division by socio-economic shows such differences. For the employees, 99 percent of the people who did not consult health facilities had no need to do so, whereas in "other" the share was 96 percent. The main reason was cost, reported by 3 percent of the households in "other".

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

	Percent not consulting	Reasons for not consulting				
		No need	Cost	Distance	No confidence	Other
Total	73.5	97.5	1.3	0.4	0.2	0.7
Cluster Location						
Accessible	74.5	98.1	1.1	0.0	0.2	0.6
Remote	72.2	96.7	1.6	0.9	0.2	0.9
Poverty Status						
Poor	76.6	96.2	1.9	0.9	0.0	1.2
Non-poor	72.2	98.1	1.1	0.1	0.3	0.5
Socio-economic group						
Employed	78.8	99.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	73.5	97.4	1.4	0.3	0.2	0.8
Self-employed - other	71.0	97.7	1.0	1.4	0.0	0.6
Other	72.7	96.7	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender						
Male	74.4	97.8	0.7	0.4	0.1	1.2
Female	72.5	97.2	2.0	0.4	0.3	0.3
Type of sickness/injury						
Fever/malaria	2.9	0.0	70.0	0.0	0.0	30.0
Diarrhea/abdominal pains	5.3	0.0	86.8	0.0	13.2	0.0
Pain in back, limbs or joints	19.4	0.0	80.0	5.8	20.0	0.0
Coughing/breathing difficulty	9.0	12.8	66.4	23.4	0.0	20.8
Skin problems	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Ear, nose, throat	16.7	0.0	54.5	0.0	0.0	45.5
Eye	43.8	0.0	64.4	24.8	0.0	35.6
Dental	10.4	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Accident	15.8	74.1	25.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	15.1	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

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	20.0	49.2	27.7	11.9	11.0	2.5	2.5	1.2	1.3	2.4	2.3
Male Total	18.4	50.2	25.7	11.4	11.8	2.0	1.9	1.3	0.6	3.4	2.7
0-4	29.6	62.9	25.6	1.4	9.8	4.6	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
5-9	16.7	57.9	10.1	10.1	19.1	3.5	0.0	0.0	1.1	4.9	0.0
10-14	7.3	48.7	20.3	0.0	11.9	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	9.1	7.6
15-29	13.7	51.4	19.7	13.9	5.5	0.0	5.3	2.5	2.8	3.0	2.0
30-49	15.3	30.4	54.6	13.3	1.1	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	9.2	2.1
50-64	25.4	37.4	26.9	39.2	17.1	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.0	4.9	6.5
65+	39.9	32.8	19.2	24.0	30.9	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9
Female Total	21.7	48.4	29.4	12.4	10.3	3.0	3.2	1.2	1.9	1.5	2.0
0-4	28.3	66.6	36.6	2.1	4.9	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.6
5-9	12.9	54.2	22.1	0.0	8.4	0.0	12.2	0.0	0.0	8.6	0.0
10-14	10.3	43.0	30.1	15.5	12.0	0.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15-29	18.7	46.2	31.7	7.8	12.8	10.4	1.2	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.9
30-49	25.7	43.6	26.1	18.5	5.9	1.5	2.3	0.0	4.1	3.0	4.2
50-64	39.5	25.6	29.4	32.9	19.2	4.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65+	47.3	44.5	16.4	23.1	18.7	0.0	7.1	13.4	3.8	0.0	12.6

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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.

The gender breakdown shows that for 74 percent of the males who did not consult health facilities reported no need. Females show a lower share, at 72 percent. Around 2 percent of females reported cost as the reason for not consulting health providers, whereas the share for men was 1 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 the relatively low percentage of people not receiving attention (3%) for fever/malaria.

4.4 Type of Illness

Table 4.4 shows the percentage of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, fever or malaria is the most common sickness, affecting 49 percent of the total population. In turn, diarrhoea, abdominal pain, pain in back, joints or limbs , and coughing and breathing difficulties come in second, third and fourth place, with 28, 12 and 11 percent of the population, whereas other illnesses were reported by minor shares of the population.

The gender breakdown reveals that females make up a higher share of sick or injured population: 22 vs. 18 percent of males, but there are no stark differences by type of illness. The age breakdown shows that the share of sick/injured population starts at around 30 percent for children under 5, decreases for the 5-9 cohort, and then starts increasing again for the 30-49 cohort, peaking at for the population aged 65 and over (40 percent for males, and 47 percent for females in that group). The share of ill 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, 56 percent of the consultations were made in a public hospital, 32 percent to a pharmacist or chemist, 4 percent in a religious hospital, and 2 percent to traditional healers. Private hospitals were consulted just in 5 percent of the cases.

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

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

	Public hospital	Private hospital	Religious hospital	Village health worker	Private doctor, dentist	Pharmacistch emist	Traditional healer	Other	Total
Total	56.5	4.9	4.4	0.0	0.3	31.9	1.8	0.2	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	61.5	4.7	3.7	0.0	0.0	27.7	2.4	0.0	100.0
Remote	51.1	5.1	5.1	0.0	0.7	36.5	1.1	0.4	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	53.1	7.4	4.1	0.0	0.6	31.5	2.7	0.6	100.0
Non-poor	58.1	4.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	32.6	1.5	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic group									
Employed	68.5	5.8	5.6	0.0	0.0	20.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	55.5	5.1	3.7	0.0	0.2	33.2	2.1	0.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	62.1	3.5	10.1	0.0	1.7	22.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	51.6	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.6	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is population who consulted a health provider

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	8.0	32.1	27.2	25.1	17.4	18.0	99.1
Cluster Location								
Accessible	0.0	11.7	31.3	24.4	20.8	16.3	16.9	100.0
Remote	0.0	2.3	32.9	30.6	29.8	19.4	19.2	98.1
Poverty Status								
Poor	0.0	1.4	16.2	25.3	27.4	44.6	16.9	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	10.8	37.2	27.7	22.7	4.7	18.4	98.7
Socio-economic group								
Employed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - agric	0.0	7.8	31.1	27.3	25.4	17.9	17.8	98.9
Self-employed - other	0.0	16.9	61.5	38.1	32.5	0.0	29.9	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.6	61.4	18.5	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is females aged 12 or older.

villages, and the latter to chemists and traditional healers.

Non-poor households make their consultations in public hospitals more often than poor households, with shares of 58 and 53 percent, respectively.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that employees and self-employed in non-agricultural activities go to public hospitals more often than the rest (with rates of 69 and 63 percent). In turn, the rest of socio-economic groups report higher shares of visits to religious hospitals and chemists than the employees.

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, 18 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 females between 15 and 19 gave birth. The rate peaks at 32 percent for the 20-24 group and then decreases, ending in 17 percent for the group aged 40 to 49. In addition, 99 percent of pregnant women received prenatal care.

The breakdown by cluster location shows no strong difference between remote and accessible villages. Households in remote villages show higher rates for women

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	21.1	4.5	8.1	0.0	65.6	0.7	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	27.7	4.3	11.5	0.0	55.4	1.0	100.0
Remote	14.2	4.8	4.6	0.0	76.1	0.3	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	14.8	4.7	6.5	0.0	74.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	24.2	4.5	9.0	0.0	61.4	1.0	100.0
Socio-economic group							
Employed	82.3	0.0	17.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	19.0	4.8	8.7	0.0	66.7	0.8	100.0
Self-employed - other	30.7	4.5	2.1	0.0	62.7	0.0	100.0
Other	14.8	0.0	8.9	0.0	76.2	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

between 20 and 24 years old, whereas households in accessible villages show higher rates for the 25-29 cohorts.

The analysis by poverty status reveals that 17 percent of women from poor households had a live birth in the year preceding the survey, slightly lower than the share for non-poor, at 18 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that the highest rates of live birth correspond to the self-employed, with shares of 18 and 30 for agricultural and non-agricultural, respectively, whereas the employees shows the lowest share, of 0 percent overall. Self-employed in non-agricultural activities show highest rates: 61 percent for women between 20 and 24 years old; and in second place self-employed in agriculture 38 percent for the 25-29 cohort.

Table 4.7 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey. Roughly, 21 percent of births in the 5 years preceding the survey took place in a hospital, almost 66 percent at home, 8 percent at a dispensary. The ordering remains across cluster location, poverty status, and socio-economic group of the household head.

While 14 percent of households in remote villages had births in hospitals, households in accessible villages had births in hospitals and dispensaries. Both groups show highest rates of deliveries at home, 55 and 76 percent, respectively.

The breakdown by poverty status shows slight differences, whereas non-poor had more deliveries in hospitals (with shares of 24 and 15 percent, respectively), poor households had more deliveries at home (74 and 61 percent, respectively).

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that hospitals were the most common place for deliveries. Home and dispensaries take the second and third place. While home represents 67 percent of deliveries for self-employed in agriculture, 9 percent of deliveries for the “other” category occurred in dispensaries.

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	2.9	31.3	22.1	27.1	16.5	0.0	100.0	56.3
Cluster Location								
Accessible	3.7	41.2	14.6	22.0	18.5	0.0	100.0	59.5
Remote	2.0	21.1	29.8	32.5	14.5	0.0	100.0	53.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	2.8	23.5	24.0	26.1	23.6	0.0	100.0	50.3
Non-poor	3.0	35.3	21.1	27.5	13.1	0.0	100.0	59.4
Socio-economic group								
Employed	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	2.3	30.6	22.5	28.6	16.0	0.0	100.0	55.4
Self-employed - other	6.6	30.7	21.6	20.7	20.4	0.0	100.0	59.0
Other	8.9	20.8	21.5	21.8	26.9	0.0	100.0	51.2

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

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, 56 deliveries were attended by a health professional. Traditional birth assistants (TBA) and trained TBA accounted for 22 and 27 percent, whereas doctors or nurses attended 3 percent of the deliveries in the district.

The analysis by cluster location shows that TBA were more common in remote villages (33 vs. 22 percent), whereas other forms of deliveries were more common in accessible villages (4 against 1 percent).

As expected, non-poor households show a higher share of deliveries attended by a professional, 59 percent, against 50 for the poor. In turn, poor households report slightly higher share of deliveries attended by trained TBA (24 and 21 percent, respectively).

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households in the employed categories' report the highest share of deliveries attended by professionals: 100 percent, against 55, 59 and 51 of employees, self-employed in non-agricultural activities and other. In turn, the self-employed in non-agricultural activities show the lowest share of deliveries attended by a doctor or nurse, and the highest for midwives.

4.7 Child Nutrition

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

- Height-for-age (stunting)
- Weight-for-height (wasting)

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

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

Weight-for-height is a measure of body mass in relation to body height and is an indicator of immediate nutritional status. A child who is below minus two standard deviations from the median of the reference population is classed as too thin for his/her height – a condition called

wasting. Wasting is an immediate indicator of acute malnutrition and reflects insufficiency in tissue and fat mass compared to the amount expected according to the child's height. Wasting occurs as a result of inadequate intake of nutrients immediately preceding the survey. Therefore, wasting is not necessarily the result of insufficient food intake, but could also be, for instance, the result of recent severe illness. Occurrence of wasting may be subject to seasonal variations.

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

Table 4.9 shows nutritional status indicators and program participation rates. Overall, 1 percent of all the children are wasted, and 38 percent are stunted. More than half the children (59 percent) participate in nutrition programs.

Cluster location and poverty status are correlated with nutrition. Households in remote villages have higher rates of wasted and stunted children than households in accessible villages, with rates of 2 and 42 percent against 0.8 and 38 percent, respectively. Similar differences are observed between poor and

Table 4.9: Nutritional status indicators and program participation rates

	Nutritional status indicators			Program participation		
	2SD)	2SD)		Nutrition	Weigh-in	Vaccinated
Total	40.1	1.2	19.3	59.8	96.8	96.5
Cluster Location						
Accessible	38.4	0.8	17.3	59.8	99.2	96.4
Remote	41.7	1.6	21.2	59.8	94.3	96.5
Poverty Status						
Poor	47.0	2.1	20.9	57.3	93.5	94.8
Non-poor	37.0	0.8	17.9	61.2	98.2	97.6
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	0.0	0.0	0.0	61.4	100.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	41.7	1.4	20.3	59.3	97.0	96.7
Self-employed - other	31.3	0.0	14.3	59.9	97.0	96.1
Other	49.1	0.0	20.6	72.5	88.2	88.2
Gender and age in completed years						
Male	40.7	0.7	19.9	57.6	96.4	96.6
0	28.9	0.0	13.5	51.9	98.3	98.6
1	56.6	0.0	30.4	54.0	97.9	97.4
2	41.7	0.0	24.1	63.4	95.5	98.4
3	34.8	0.0	19.6	61.6	93.5	96.3
4	41.0	3.8	10.1	57.8	96.6	91.5
Female	39.4	1.7	18.6	62.3	97.2	96.3
0	6.7	0.0	10.6	56.0	94.6	90.5
1	37.3	4.7	19.7	75.4	99.3	97.7
2	51.9	0.0	22.2	54.4	100.0	100.0
3	33.5	3.4	14.4	64.3	89.8	94.0
4	53.6	0.0	21.6	62.6	100.0	98.4
Orphan status						
Orphaned	47.8	0.0	32.5	78.0	91.1	100.0
Not-orphaned	40.0	1.2	19.0	59.5	96.9	96.4
Foster status						
Fostered	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Not-fostered	40.1	1.2	19.4	59.8	96.7	96.5

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

non-poor households. Poor households show 2 percent of wasted children and 47 percent of stunted children, whereas the figures for non-poor households are 1 and 37 percent.

Regarding socio-economic status, households in self employed agricultural category show the highest rates for wasted children, at 1 percent, whereas households from the category "other" show the highest rate of stunted children, at 49 percent. Children from households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities show the lowest rates of wasted and stunted, at 0 and 31 percent, respectively.

The gender breakdown shows no gender differences in the rates of wasting , but that the rate of stunted males is higher than that of females (41 against 39 percent, respectively).

Table 4.10 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by type of vaccination received. Overall, 80 percent of children under 5 have vaccination against measles, 95 against BCG between 90 and 96 percent received vaccinations against DPT, between 75 and 96 had OPV vaccination while 72 percent of the children in the district receive vitamin A supplements.

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

The gender breakdown shows that females have higher vaccination rates against measles (82 against 78 percent), but similar shares than women for the rest of vaccines. The age breakdown shows that the share of children consuming vitamin A increases with age. Finally, the vaccination rates (especially BCG, DPT1, DPT2) for children aged 2 are roughly 5 to 10 percent lower than for the rest of children.

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

	Measles	BCG	DPT1	DPT2	DPT3	OPV0	OPV1	OPV2	OPV3	Vitamin A
Total	79.7	94.5	95.9	93.8	90.7	75.0	96.0	93.8	90.2	72.7
Cluster Location										
Accessible	79.7	94.8	96.3	93.6	91.5	85.5	95.8	93.9	90.7	78.4
Remote	79.6	94.3	95.5	94.0	90.0	64.1	96.2	93.8	89.6	66.9
Poverty Status										
Poor	79.7	92.1	94.5	91.3	87.5	70.0	94.9	92.5	86.5	67.6
Non-poor	79.5	95.6	96.5	94.9	92.1	78.1	96.4	94.4	91.8	75.2
Socio-economic group										
Employed	81.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	81.5
Self-employed - agriculture	79.6	94.7	95.7	93.7	90.4	74.0	96.0	94.0	90.0	73.0
Self-employed - other	76.7	91.0	95.8	93.8	91.8	74.6	95.8	92.9	90.9	73.4
Other	93.7	100.0	100.0	93.7	93.7	94.1	93.7	87.8	87.8	57.9
Gender and age in completed years										
Male	78.1	93.5	94.7	92.5	88.7	71.7	95.0	92.9	88.9	72.3
0	20.3	82.5	80.9	74.5	64.1	69.4	83.6	75.5	60.2	23.9
1	88.1	97.8	97.8	96.2	94.5	74.4	96.2	96.2	94.2	75.7
2	96.2	98.3	100.0	100.0	94.6	76.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	85.1
3	97.8	92.1	98.1	95.9	95.9	60.5	98.1	98.1	98.1	93.4
4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	81.2	100.0	98.2	98.2	93.2
Female	81.5	95.8	97.2	95.3	93.1	78.7	97.1	94.9	91.6	73.3
0	22.0	86.8	86.8	77.9	69.2	61.6	86.8	76.8	64.7	14.8
1	95.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.1	80.1	100.0	100.0	96.6	78.9
2	95.9	97.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	82.3	99.4	99.4	99.4	91.9
3	100.0	93.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	81.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.6
4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	91.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

Table 4.11 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by source of information. Overall, the information for 97 percent of the vaccinated children was supported by a vaccination card.

There is no difference by cluster location or poverty status. The main difference by socio-economic group is that all vaccinated children from the "employee" category had vaccination cards, whereas in the other categories the share was around 94 percent.

Further, all the girls aged 1 and above had vaccination cards. Children between 0 and 11 months had vaccination cards in 90 and 82 percent of the cases, for females and males, respectively.

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

	Health Card	Other	Total
Total	96.7	3.3	100.0
Cluster Location			
Accessible	96.9	3.1	100.0
Remote	96.5	3.5	100.0
Poverty Status			
Poor	94.1	5.9	100.0
Non-poor	97.8	2.2	100.0
Socio-economic group			
Employed	100.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	96.9	3.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	95.5	4.5	100.0
Other	93.7	6.3	100.0
Gender and age in completed years			
Male	95.4	4.6	100.0
0	82.7	17.3	100.0
1	98.3	1.7	100.0
2	100.0	0.0	100.0
3	98.1	1.9	100.0
4	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	98.1	1.9	100.0
0	90.4	9.6	100.0
1	100.0	0.0	100.0
2	100.0	0.0	100.0
3	100.0	0.0	100.0
4	100.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

5 EMPLOYMENT

This chapter examines employment indicators for the population of Kasulu 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 78 percent of the adult population is employed and 16 percent underemployed. Unemployment is lower than 1 percent and the inactivity rate is 5 percent. This shows that underemployment is a bigger problem in the area than unemployment. There are no

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	78.4	16.4	94.8	0.1	5.2	5.2	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	78.5	17.0	95.5	0.0	4.5	4.5	100.0
Remote	78.2	15.6	93.9	0.1	6.0	6.1	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	80.4	12.7	93.1	0.2	6.8	6.9	100.0
Non-poor	77.7	17.7	95.4	0.0	4.6	4.6	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	70.6	22.9	93.6	0.1	6.3	6.4	100.0
15-29	73.3	20.4	93.7	0.0	6.3	6.3	100.0
30-49	62.5	32.1	94.6	0.3	5.1	5.4	100.0
50-64	77.0	17.1	94.2	0.0	5.8	5.8	100.0
65+	79.6	8.3	87.9	0.0	12.1	12.1	100.0
Female	86.0	10.0	96.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	100.0
15-29	88.0	8.0	96.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	100.0
30-49	84.3	14.1	98.4	0.0	1.6	1.6	100.0
50-64	88.9	9.9	98.8	0.0	1.2	1.2	100.0
65+	71.6	4.5	76.1	0.0	23.9	23.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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	Underemploy-ment rate	Active population	Unemploy-ment rate	Underemploy-ment rate
Total	94.8	0.1	17.3	94.2	0.2	31.3
Cluster Location						
Accessible	95.5	0.0	17.8	96.0	0.0	34.1
Remote	94.0	0.1	16.6	91.9	0.3	27.8
Poverty Status						
Poor	93.2	0.2	13.6	84.6	0.7	28.8
Non-poor	95.4	0.0	18.5	97.2	0.0	31.9
Gender and age						
Male	93.7	0.1	24.5	94.3	0.2	32.7
15-29	93.7	0.0	21.8	95.6	0.0	52.6
30-49	94.9	0.3	33.8	94.9	0.3	34.0
50-64	94.2	0.0	18.2	94.0	0.0	18.7
65+	87.9	0.0	9.5	89.8	0.0	9.7
Female	96.0	0.0	10.4	92.8	0.0	18.7
15-29	96.0	0.0	8.4	100.0	0.0	0.0
30-49	98.4	0.0	14.3	93.0	0.0	39.0
50-64	98.8	0.0	10.0	100.0	0.0	11.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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.

differences by cluster location. In turn, poor households show a higher employment rate than non-poor households. For both genders, underemployment peaks for the cohort aged between 30 and 49. Around 32 percent of the males in this group are underemployed, whereas the share for females is 14 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 inactivity rate peaks for the population aged 65 and above, reaching 12 percent for males and 24 percent for females.

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. Although there is no difference by cluster location for the total population, heads of household in accessible villages have a higher rate of underemployment. The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households have a higher underemployment rate than poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that in the general population males are more likely to be underemployed than females, with rates of 25 and 11 percent, respectively. Similar differences are observed for the household heads.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that underemployment decreases with age of the household head. For the general population, it peaks for the 30-49 cohorts.

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 higher than for the overall population, at 87 percent. Furthermore, underemployment is lower at 8 percent, as opposed to 16 percent of workers for the overall population.

The youth from non-poor households and the youth from households in remote villages have higher underemployment than their counterparts.

peaks for males in the 50-64 cohort (9

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

	Active population				Active	Employ	
	Employed	Under emp.	Working	Unemployed	Total	ment rate	Total
Total	86.6	8.4	94.9	0.0	94.9	5.1	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	89.3	5.6	94.9	0.0	94.9	5.1	100.0
Remote	83.0	12.0	95.0	0.0	95.0	5.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	94.2	3.9	98.1	0.0	98.1	1.9	100.0
Non-poor	83.4	10.2	93.6	0.0	93.6	6.4	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	84.5	9.7	94.1	0.0	94.1	5.9	100.0
15-16	92.9	5.7	98.5	0.0	98.5	1.5	100.0
17-19	84.8	5.6	90.4	0.0	90.4	9.6	100.0
20-21	81.3	13.3	94.5	0.0	94.5	5.5	100.0
22-23	69.5	21.4	90.9	0.0	90.9	9.1	100.0
Female	88.6	7.1	95.7	0.0	95.7	4.3	100.0
15-16	91.3	0.0	91.3	0.0	91.3	8.7	100.0
17-19	92.7	3.1	95.8	0.0	95.8	4.2	100.0
20-21	81.9	15.7	97.6	0.0	97.6	2.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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.

The gender breakdown shows that underemployment rates among the male and female youth are similar at around 10 percent. It can be seen that underemployment is higher in the 20-23 cohort.

5.2 Working population

Table 5.4 shows that the vast majority of the working population is formed by self-employed in agriculture at 63 percent, or in other activities (inactive, unemployed, unpaid workers, domestic workers) at 30 percent. Moreover, employees only account for 2 percent of the working population. The population self-employed in agriculture is higher in accessible villages, whereas the 'other' group is larger in remote villages. Poor households report a lower share of self-employed workers in agriculture and a higher share in other activities than non-poor households.

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	2.1	63.3	4.8	29.8	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	2.5	66.6	6.1	24.9	100.0
Remote	1.5	59.1	3.1	36.2	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.4	53.7	2.9	43.0	100.0
Non-poor	2.7	66.9	5.3	25.1	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	3.3	63.7	8.5	24.5	100.0
15-29	1.4	36.3	9.7	52.7	100.0
30-49	3.6	84.7	10.9	0.8	100.0
50-64	9.1	87.3	2.7	0.8	100.0
65+	3.9	93.7	0.0	2.4	100.0
Female	0.9	62.9	1.2	35.0	100.0
15-29	0.6	51.1	1.5	46.9	100.0
30-49	1.8	73.7	1.6	22.9	100.0
50-64	0.0	74.6	0.0	25.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

The gender breakdown shows that a higher share of males is self-employed in non-agricultural activities, whereas there is no difference in the share self-employed in agriculture. Females are more likely to do other activities. The breakdown by age-groups shows that the share of employees

percent), the self-employed in agriculture for 65+ males (94 percent), the 'self-employed other' for 30-49 males (11 percent) and 'other' for 15-29 males (53 percent). The share of females self-employed in agriculture is lower for the 15-29 cohorts, where 'other' peaks.

The percentage distribution of the working population by employer is analysed in Table 5.5. The table shows that the private sector (formal or informal) employs more 69 percent of the working population, which combined with individuals who work for their own households represent up to 99 percent of the working population.

Households employ higher shares of workers in remote villages and poor households; and the private sector employs higher shares of workers in accessible villages and non-poor households.

The share of males working for a private agent is higher than that of females, at 73 and 65 percent. Conversely, females are more likely to work for the household than males, at rates of 35 and 25 percent. In the 15-29 cohorts, males have a higher share working for the household than females (53 and 47 percent, respectively). For both genders, the share working for a private agent is higher for the cohorts above 30 years old, at 75 percent for females and from 89 to 97 percent for males.

Table 5.6 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by main activity. The categories are agriculture; mining, manufacturing, energy and construction; services (transport, trade, private and public services); domestic duties; and other. Overall, agriculture and domestic duties together account for 94 percent of the working population. 80 percent of the population is engaged in agriculture, and 14 percent in domestic duties.

Remote villages report a higher share working in agriculture than accessible villages, which report a higher share in domestic duties. Non-poor households report a share of 6 percent working in public and private services, higher than poor households at 1 percent. In turn, poor households report a higher share undertaking domestic duties.

The gender breakdown shows that the most common activities for females are agriculture and household duties, accounting for 98 percent of the female working population. These are the main activities for men as well, but they are less concentrated, with 12 percent in other activities.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that younger cohorts have higher shares dedicated to household duties. The share of males in agriculture increases steadily with age, from 54 to 94 percent. In turn, the share of women in agriculture is lower for the youngest and the oldest cohorts, where the shares dedicated to domestic duties increase.

Table 5.7 shows the percentage

Table 5.5 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employer

	State/NGO/ Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	1.5	68.7	29.8	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	2.0	73.4	24.6	100.0
Remote	1.0	62.6	36.4	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.0	57.0	43.0	100.0
Non-poor	2.1	72.8	25.1	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	2.6	72.9	24.5	100.0
15-29	0.5	46.8	52.7	100.0
30-49	2.1	97.1	0.8	100.0
50-64	10.4	88.8	0.8	100.0
65+	3.9	93.7	2.4	100.0
Female	0.5	64.6	34.9	100.0
15-29	0.6	52.7	46.7	100.0
30-49	0.6	76.5	22.9	100.0
50-64	0.0	74.6	25.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

Table 5.6 - Percentage distribution of the working population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	Pub & priv services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	79.6	1.9	4.6	13.5	0.4	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	75.9	2.3	5.8	15.5	0.5	100.0
Remote	84.4	1.2	3.2	11.0	0.2	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	79.5	2.3	0.9	17.2	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	79.8	1.6	5.9	12.2	0.5	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	72.1	3.8	7.2	16.1	0.8	100.0
15-29	54.0	5.4	5.2	35.0	0.4	100.0
30-49	85.5	3.9	8.9	0.0	1.7	100.0
50-64	88.2	0.0	11.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	93.7	0.0	3.9	2.4	0.0	100.0
Female	86.8	0.0	2.1	11.1	0.0	100.0
15-29	78.3	0.0	2.1	19.6	0.0	100.0
30-49	95.8	0.0	3.4	0.8	0.0	100.0
50-64	94.7	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

distribution of the working population by employment status, gender and activity. Female employees are strongly concentrated in services. Overall, around 60 percent of the male labour force is in agriculture, whereas the share for females is almost 80 percent. Domestic duties have the second highest shares for both genders: 22 percent for males and 17 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 those for females.

Around half the male employees (54 percent) work in services, and the remaining 'other' and mining, manufacturing, energy and construction. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities work mostly in domestic duties.

The population in the 'other' group is concentrated in domestic duties. Virtually no females fall in this category

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 split between services, agriculture, and mining, manufacturing, energy and construction (39, 31 and 30 percent, respectively). None of the women in the survey where working for a private agent. Individuals whose main activity is household duties either work in agriculture or undertake domestic tasks.

5.3 Underemployed Population

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status is shown in Table 5.9. Overall, 76 percent of the underemployed population is self-employed in agriculture, 11 percent self-employed in other activities, and the remaining 10 percent is in 'other' and 3 percent works as an employee. Even though self-employed in agriculture are 63 percent of the population, they represent 76 percent of the underemployed.

The share of underemployed population self-employed in agriculture is higher in accessible villages, whereas the share in 'other' is higher in remote villages. The breakdown by poverty status shows that the shares of self-employed in agriculture and 'other' are higher for poor households. In turn, the shares of employees and self-employed other are higher among non-

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	35.7	66.8	72.4	86.2
Mining & non-primary	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0
Services	90.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	50.4	100.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	2.1
Domestic duties	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	64.3	33.2	16.0	11.7
Other	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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	87.2	97.0	33.3	70.6	72.1	86.8
Mining & non-primary	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0
Services	92.0	100.0	6.3	2.6	0.8	0.3	7.2	2.1
Domestic duties	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4	65.9	29.0	16.1	11.1
Other	8.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	3.4	76.1	11.2	9.3	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	3.1	79.0	10.4	7.5	100.0
Remote	3.8	72.1	12.3	11.8	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.0	82.3	6.4	11.2	100.0
Non-poor	4.4	75.5	11.2	8.9	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	4.0	79.3	14.8	1.9	100.0
15-29	0.0	80.1	15.2	4.7	100.0
30-49	3.7	77.9	18.4	0.0	100.0
50-64	15.1	84.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	29.4	70.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	1.9	68.9	3.0	26.1	100.0
15-29	0.0	59.3	0.0	40.7	100.0
30-49	4.2	66.3	6.7	22.8	100.0
50-64	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

poor households.

Table 5.10 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer

	State/NGO/Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	2.9	87.3	9.9	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	3.1	89.4	7.5	100.0
Remote	2.5	84.4	13.1	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.0	88.8	11.2	100.0
Non-poor	3.7	86.7	9.6	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	3.3	94.8	1.9	100.0
15-29	0.0	95.3	4.7	100.0
30-49	2.1	97.9	0.0	100.0
50-64	15.1	84.9	0.0	100.0
65+	29.4	70.6	0.0	100.0
Female	1.9	70.2	27.9	100.0
15-29	0.0	54.8	45.2	100.0
30-49	4.2	73.0	22.8	100.0
50-64	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

The gender breakdown shows that among the underemployed population, females are more likely than males to be in 'other' (with rates of 26 and 2 percent, respectively). In turn, males are more likely than females to be self-employed in agriculture or in non-agricultural activities, with shares of 79 and 69 percent for agriculture, and 15 and 3 percent for non-agricultural activities, respectively.

For the underemployed females, the share of self-employment in agriculture increases with age, as the shares 'other' decrease. For males, the shares in employees are higher for the older cohorts, whereas the shares in self-employed other are higher in the younger cohorts.

Table 5.10 shows the percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer. Overall, the underemployed population mostly works for a private employer at 87 percent, 10 percent for a household, and 3 percent for the State, an NGO or other employer.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible villages report a higher share working for a private employer, whereas remote villages remote a higher share working for a household. The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households report a higher rate working for the State, an NGO or other employer.

he gender breakdown reveals that the underemployed male population is vastly concentrated in private employers at 95 percent. The share for females is lower, at 70 percent. A further 28 percent of underemployed females works for the household. The age-group analysis shows that only the young cohorts have positive shares of underemployed workers working for the household.

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by main economic activity is presented in Table 5.11. Overall, 85 percent of the underemployed workers are dedicated to agriculture.

The breakdown by cluster location does not show important differences. In poor households, 94 percent of the underemployed population works in agriculture, whereas the share in non-poor households is 84 percent. In contrast, the share in public and private services is higher among non-poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed women have a higher share dedicated to agriculture than underemployed males, who have higher shares in mining, manufacturing, energy and construction, and services. No particular trends emerge when analysing by age-groups

Table 5.11 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	private services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	84.8	4.5	8.9	0.6	1.1	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	85.5	4.0	8.7	1.0	0.8	100.0
Remote	83.9	5.3	9.3	0.0	1.5	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	93.6	4.9	1.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	83.7	3.8	10.4	0.8	1.4	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	80.3	6.5	10.7	0.8	1.6	100.0
15-29	82.7	8.8	6.4	2.1	0.0	100.0
30-49	77.9	6.3	12.4	0.0	3.4	100.0
50-64	84.9	0.0	15.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	70.6	0.0	29.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	95.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-49	89.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

5.4 Unemployed and Inactive Population

Unemployment refers to a person who is actively looking for a job and is ready to work. If the individual is not working but is not looking for a job or is not ready to work, he or she is part of the inactive population. For instance, a full-time student, an ill individual or a retired person are not unemployed, because they either are not looking for a job (the student and the retired), or are not able to work (the ill person). Table 5.12 shows the main causes for unemployment. In the whole sample only 0.1 percent of the adult population is unemployed, resulting in a sample size too small to draw solid statistical conclusions. However, they are from poor households, remote villages, between 30 and 49 years old. The only cause cited is 'no work available'.

Table 5.13 shows the main causes of economic inactivity. Overall, infirmity is the main reason for inactivity, affecting more than one third of the inactive population (39 percent). Being a student has the second highest share (23 percent), followed by being too old or retired (15 percent), and household duties (9 percent). Around 8 percent of the inactive population reported other causes.

Remote villages report a higher share of 'infirmity', and lower shares of 'student' and 'too old' than accessible villages. In turn, poor households report higher shares of seasonal inactivity and infirmity than non-poor households. The latter, in turn, report higher shares of 'student' and 'too old'. It is worth noticing that while 36 percent of the inactive population in non-poor households reported being a student as the cause of inactivity, the share in poor households is virtually null.

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	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	ment rate	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Remote	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
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	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
30-49	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
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 Kasulu DC

The breakdown by age-groups shows that infirmity occurs across the whole inactive population, but the share of females reporting infirmity is higher than that for males (45 percent of females, 35 percent of males). The second most important cause for males was being a student (26 percent), whereas for females was being too old (23 percent), both causes concentrated in particular age-groups.

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 and the elderly, with a share of 92 percent. Fetching water, firewood, and cleaning the toilet are all undertaken by roughly one

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	1.7	4.9	23.2	8.7	12.8	ment rate	38.7	2.3	7.6	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	3.5	3.5	26.5	9.7	19.9	0.0	34.0	0.0	3.1	100.0
Remote	0.0	6.4	19.9	7.7	5.6	0.0	43.5	4.6	12.3	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	0.0	13.9	0.0	10.9	5.0	0.0	56.4	0.0	13.8	100.0
Non-poor	2.7	0.0	35.9	7.5	17.0	0.0	29.0	3.5	4.3	100.0
Gender and age										
Male	2.8	8.0	26.1	8.1	6.4	0.0	34.9	3.7	9.9	100.0
15-29	6.1	5.5	55.5	5.7	0.0	0.0	17.3	0.0	9.9	100.0
30-49	0.0	10.3	0.0	10.7	0.0	0.0	58.0	0.0	21.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	23.3	0.0	22.1	0.0	0.0	54.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.0	0.0	35.6	23.4	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	0.0	18.7	9.7	22.9	0.0	44.7	0.0	4.1	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	41.7	18.5	0.0	0.0	39.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.9	0.0	0.0	89.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.9	0.0	28.3	0.0	10.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

third of the population. Cooking and taking care of the children show shares of around 60 percent.
In remote villages, household activities are undertaken by similar or higher shares of the population than in accessible villages. Similarly, in poor households household activities are generally undertaken by similar or higher shares of the population than in non-poor households.

The most important differences are shown in the gender and age-breakdown. Females report remarkably higher shares in all the activities, with most rates fluctuating between 88 and 96 percent. The shares for males range from 18 to 46 percent, except for taking care of the sick and elderly (92 percent).

The analysis of age-groups shows that for males the shares tend to decrease with age in all activities. Similarly, in the case of females the shares decrease with age, showing 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 fetching water and cleaning the toilet than children from remote villages. Children from non-poor households, in turn, report higher shares cleaning the toilet and taking care of the elderly and the sick than children from poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that girls report higher rates cleaning the toilet, cooking, and taking care of children than boys. The analysis by age-groups shows that the 10-14 cohorts have higher rates than the youngest children, for all household tasks.

The breakdown by orphan status shows that orphaned children report higher shares performing most activities, except taking care of children. Similarly, the breakdown by foster status shows that fostered children have higher shares performing each activity, except taking care of children, the elderly or sick.

The main descriptive statistics for child labour are presented in Table 5.16. The most important result of the table is that 51 percent of the children are economically active. Their main economic activity is mostly household duties at 91 percent. The share of working children is does not vary importantly by cluster location, but is higher in poor households. The particular activity does not show evident correlation with remoteness, poverty status, or even gender.

The main difference is given by the age

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	62.3	64.2	66.1	57.7	61.6	ment rate
Cluster Location						
Accessible	62.9	61.5	67.0	58.7	58.7	90.9
Remote	61.6	67.6	64.8	56.5	65.3	94.2
Poverty Status						
Poor	64.3	68.9	63.4	59.0	65.3	91.5
Non-poor	61.5	62.3	66.9	57.3	60.0	92.7
Gender and age						
Male	32.4	40.4	43.7	18.3	46.4	91.6
15-29	57.4	52.5	57.4	32.5	44.9	88.4
30-49	13.2	35.0	33.6	5.1	59.3	98.3
50-64	9.3	21.7	34.0	5.6	35.1	92.0
65+	9.1	24.8	24.1	13.7	18.4	80.7
Female	91.8	87.6	88.1	96.6	76.7	93.2
15-29	97.8	91.7	89.9	96.9	79.2	93.1
30-49	96.3	92.1	95.9	99.1	92.2	99.5
50-64	75.0	78.1	78.9	96.0	55.3	94.0
65+	55.4	50.4	51.6	81.5	20.0	58.4

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

	Fetching water	Fetching firewood	Cleaning toilet	Cooking	Care of children	Care or elderly/sick
Total	94.0	51.3	43.2	49.8	56.6	55.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	95.6	52.0	50.4	50.3	57.1	56.2
Remote	92.2	50.5	35.2	49.2	56.0	53.7
Poverty Status						
Poor	92.9	50.3	40.7	49.8	56.8	51.1
Non-poor	94.6	51.2	44.3	49.4	55.8	57.2
Gender and age						
Male	92.6	50.5	40.3	41.2	48.7	55.3
5-9	89.6	34.7	22.3	26.5	45.1	36.3
10-14	94.9	62.8	54.1	52.6	51.5	69.9
Female	95.4	52.0	46.3	58.7	64.6	54.8
5-9	92.6	28.8	20.0	29.7	57.9	34.6
10-14	98.1	73.8	70.9	85.8	71.0	73.8
Orphan status						
Orphaned	97.3	56.0	51.6	63.7	42.9	67.1
Not-orphaned	93.7	50.9	42.6	48.7	57.6	54.1
Foster status						
Fostered	100.0	55.2	56.2	76.3	15.0	47.3
Not-fostered	93.8	51.1	42.7	48.7	58.0	55.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

breakdown. Roughly one third of children in the 5-9 cohorts were part of the working population, whereas virtually all the children in the 10-14 cohort were working at the time of the survey. The latter cohort reports a higher share working for the household and a lower share working for a private employer than the former.

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 77 and 50 percent, respectively. In turn, fostered children are more likely to be working than non-fostered children, at 87 and 50 percent, respectively. Orphaned children are more likely to undertake household duties than non-orphaned children, who are more likely to work in other activities. In contrasts, fostered children are more likely to work in agriculture than non-fostered children, at rates of 15 and 3 percent, and virtually all of them work for the household.

Table 5.16- Child labour (age 5 to 14)

		Main activity			Employer	
	Working	Agriculture	Household	Other	Private	Household
Total	51.0	2.8	90.6	6.7	7.0	93.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	52.1	2.4	90.4	7.2	7.7	92.3
Remote	49.8	3.3	90.7	6.0	6.1	93.9
Poverty Status						
Poor	55.9	2.7	88.9	8.4	8.1	91.9
Non-poor	48.2	2.9	91.5	5.7	6.4	93.6
Gender and age						
Male	50.1	3.0	91.6	5.4	5.6	94.4
5-9	29.8	0.0	87.7	12.3	12.3	87.7
10-14	97.2	5.1	94.4	0.5	0.8	99.2
Female	51.9	2.6	89.5	7.9	8.4	91.6
5-9	33.9	0.7	82.8	16.5	16.5	83.5
10-14	97.4	4.3	95.3	0.4	1.3	98.7
Orphan status						
Orphaned	76.9	2.4	95.2	2.3	2.3	97.7
Not-orphaned	49.7	2.8	90.2	7.0	7.3	92.7
Foster status						
Fostered	87.2	14.8	85.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Not-fostered	50.2	2.5	90.5	6.9	7.3	92.7

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMINITIES

This chapter presents the perceptions on welfare status and changes in Kasulu 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 the 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 27 percent of all households in the district reported a positive change in the economic situation of their community. 18 percent of the population reported observing no changes in their community's economic situation. Even though the majority reported the community's economic condition to have deteriorated (42 percent) 20 percent reported the situation to be much worse while the rest reported it to be worse.

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	19.9	21.9	18.3	25.8	1.2	12.9	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	16.5	24.1	16.6	27.9	1.7	13.3	100.0
Remote	23.9	19.3	20.4	23.3	0.6	12.5	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	25.7	26.0	18.2	11.9	0.0	18.2	100.0
Non-poor	17.8	20.7	18.1	30.4	1.6	11.3	100.0
Household size							
1-2	9.1	22.3	20.8	18.7	3.3	25.8	100.0
3-4	18.8	16.4	20.2	28.7	0.8	15.0	100.0
5-6	19.9	28.6	15.1	28.3	1.1	7.1	100.0
7+	25.2	21.0	18.3	24.1	0.9	10.6	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	45.2	9.9	30.3	14.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	28.9	27.7	18.6	6.4	0.0	18.4	100.0
1-1.99 ha	24.6	13.0	25.7	20.7	2.3	13.7	100.0
2-3.99 ha	18.5	25.7	16.3	23.7	1.9	14.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	20.4	21.9	12.6	34.6	0.0	10.5	100.0
6+ ha	9.8	25.0	17.4	35.1	0.4	12.3	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	19.2	19.7	19.2	27.0	1.3	13.6	100.0
Small only	21.2	26.3	15.5	27.3	1.6	8.1	100.0
Large only	15.5	11.5	19.2	27.5	0.0	26.3	100.0
Both	21.9	26.3	21.5	13.8	0.0	16.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	23.9	26.5	28.3	21.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - ag	19.8	21.2	17.2	26.6	1.4	13.8	100.0
Self-employed - otl	17.5	31.0	27.3	17.3	0.0	7.0	100.0
Other	24.1	11.6	14.3	31.6	0.0	18.4	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	19.8	21.6	18.3	26.9	1.1	12.2	100.0
Female	20.4	24.2	18.0	15.4	2.2	19.8	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	0.0	17.5	15.1	16.7	0.0	50.6	100.0
Monogamous	20.9	21.0	18.5	27.8	1.1	10.7	100.0
Polygamous	16.1	28.2	17.8	23.9	1.3	12.8	100.0
Loose union	29.8	0.0	22.8	47.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	23.0	17.1	18.2	17.4	2.0	22.4	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	19.0	22.5	16.7	24.9	2.3	14.6	100.0
Primary	19.6	22.5	18.9	26.9	0.9	11.2	100.0
Secondary +	24.7	15.1	19.1	20.2	0.0	21.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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	20.9	31.0	23.2	24.6	0.2	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	18.5	29.6	23.9	27.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	23.8	32.7	22.4	20.7	0.5	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	33.4	25.1	28.1	13.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	16.7	33.1	21.8	28.1	0.3	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	22.6	25.6	31.1	20.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	18.5	28.8	21.4	31.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	21.1	36.2	17.8	24.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	22.3	30.9	26.0	20.2	0.6	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	62.0	33.6	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	24.0	23.0	31.7	21.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	25.0	23.7	27.9	23.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	19.2	32.9	26.1	21.2	0.6	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	21.1	35.4	16.6	26.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	12.6	34.1	18.9	34.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	22.6	29.3	22.7	25.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
Small only	20.0	33.8	20.4	25.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	16.5	20.9	24.7	37.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	16.4	37.8	33.9	11.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	18.1	38.0	16.9	26.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	22.4	31.0	23.4	22.9	0.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	7.7	34.6	17.3	40.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	21.9	14.2	40.1	23.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	20.5	30.5	22.5	26.3	0.2	0.0	100.0
Female	25.1	35.2	30.0	9.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	33.9	17.5	15.1	33.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	21.3	29.0	24.0	25.3	0.3	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	15.6	41.2	16.6	26.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	0.0	35.3	64.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	29.1	26.8	31.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	26.3	32.6	27.7	13.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	19.3	31.4	19.7	29.3	0.3	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	14.4	22.2	35.3	28.1	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

Looking at the overall community economic situation by household characteristics, it is observed that cluster location and poverty status of the household shows some correlation with the perceived economic change. While 30 percent of the people living in accessible clusters report an improvement in their community's economic situation the share for those living in remote clusters is 24 percent. Likewise, 32 percent of non-poor households report an improvement in the economic conditions of their communities compared to 12 percent of poor households.

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported worsening

of their community's economic situation is significantly higher than that of households with one or two members at 46 and 31 percent respectively. Furthermore, there is a difference of 20 percentage points between households owning no land and those owning six or more hectares of land who reported deterioration in their community's economic situation at 55 and 35 percent respectively. Similarly, the percentage of households owning both small and large livestock who reported worsening conditions in their community's economic situation is significantly higher than that of households owning large livestock at 48 and 28 percent respectively.

While 51 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee reported deterioration in their community's economic situation, the share for households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category is only 36 percent. Furthermore, 47 percent of households where the household head has a loose union reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their communities compared to 17 percent of households where the household head is single. Similarly, while 28 percent of male-headed households report an improvement in their community's economic situation, the share for female-headed households is 17 percent.

It is also observed that the percentage of households where the head has no education and reported an improvement in their community's economic conditions is 7 percentage points higher than that of households where the head has secondary education or more, at 27 and 20 percent respectively.

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. A quarter (25 percent) of the households reported an improvement in their economic conditions, while 23 percent reported same conditions compared to the year preceding the survey.

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	39.7	35.8	22.6	2.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	43.9	30.4	23.3	2.4	100.0
Remote	34.7	42.2	21.7	1.4	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	21.9	35.5	38.7	3.8	100.0
Non-poor	45.3	35.7	17.5	1.4	100.0
Household size					
1-2	45.6	25.6	22.8	5.9	100.0
3-4	39.4	37.6	20.5	2.5	100.0
5-6	40.0	34.5	24.6	0.9	100.0
7+	37.3	39.3	22.6	0.8	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	31.0	44.1	24.9	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	33.3	23.5	36.6	6.7	100.0
1-1.99 ha	26.7	42.5	27.3	3.5	100.0
2-3.99 ha	33.9	39.7	24.1	2.3	100.0
4-5.99 ha	44.7	31.5	23.8	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	65.1	27.3	7.6	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	37.5	32.7	26.3	3.6	100.0
Small only	40.7	39.6	19.7	0.0	100.0
Large only	54.8	26.7	18.4	0.0	100.0
Both	40.6	46.4	13.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	55.3	35.6	9.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	38.8	36.3	23.5	1.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	46.2	29.1	24.8	0.0	100.0
Other	31.5	40.7	5.2	22.7	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	40.9	36.8	21.1	1.2	100.0
Female	28.5	26.9	35.9	8.7	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	50.9	33.9	15.1	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	41.7	38.6	18.7	1.0	100.0
Polygamous	42.4	33.2	24.4	0.0	100.0
Loose union	25.1	11.2	63.7	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	22.7	26.6	38.9	11.7	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	32.3	33.1	30.1	4.5	100.0
Primary	42.4	35.8	20.8	1.1	100.0
Secondary +	44.7	45.5	9.7	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

While 57 percent of people living in remote clusters reported deterioration of the households' economic situation, the share for accessible clusters was 49 percent. Likewise, the percentage of poor households who reported deterioration of the households' economic conditions is higher than that of non-poor households, at 58 and 50 percent respectively.

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households is slightly higher than that of households with one or two members at 53 and 49 percent respectively. Furthermore, while 62 percent of households owning no land reported much worse economic conditions of their households, the share for households owning six or more hectares of land is 13 percent. Disaggregation of the data further shows that 54 percent of households owning both large and small livestock express negative views on their households' economic conditions compared to 38 percent of households owning large livestock.

The percentage of households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities and reported an improvement in their households' economic conditions is higher than that of households where the main income earner is an employee at 40 and 27 percent respectively. Furthermore, while 34 percent of households where the head is single reported much worse economic conditions in their households, the share for 'loose union' households is virtually null. 26 percent of male-headed households reported an improvement in the household's economic conditions compared to 10 percent of female-headed households. Similarly, the percentage of households reporting an improvement in the household's economic conditions is higher for households where the head has primary or secondary education than households where the head has no education, at about 28 and 13 percent respectively.

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, 76 percent of the district's households never/seldom experienced food shortages while the remaining population experience food shortages frequently (often/always). While 44 percent of households in accessible clusters had never experienced food shortages, the share for households in remote clusters is 35 percent. Similarly, 45 percent of non-poor households had never experienced food shortages compared to 22 percent of poor households.

65 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land never experienced problems satisfying food needs compared to 31 percent of landless households. Furthermore, while 46 percent of households with one or two members never experienced food shortages, the share for households with seven or more members is 37 percent. There is also some correlation between livestock ownership and satisfying food needs. While 30 percent of households owning no livestock frequently experienced food shortages, the share for households owning both small and large livestock is 13 percent.

The socio-economic group of the household also shows some correlation with the household's ability to satisfy its food needs. While 28 percent of households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group reported frequent problems satisfying food needs, the share for households whose main income earner is an employee is only 9 percent. Furthermore, 51 percent of households where the head is single had never experienced food shortages compared to 23 percent of households where the head is widowed/divorced or separated.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households reported having food shortages more frequently than male-headed households as 45 percent of female-headed households experienced frequent food shortages compared to 22 percent of male-headed households. Likewise, while 35 percent of households where the head has no education experienced food shortages frequently, the share for

households where the head has secondary education or more is 10 percent.

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).

Poverty status and cluster location do not show strong correlation with the ability to pay school fees. However, 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 paying school fees, the share for households with seven or more members is 94 percent.

Furthermore, all households with no land and those owning 1 acre of land had never experienced problems with paying school fees compared to 96 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land. Similarly, while all households owning large livestock had never experienced problems paying school fees, the share for households owning both large and small livestock is 92 percent.

Further disaggregation of the data shows that 98 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in agricultural activities never had problems paying school fees compared to 70 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee.

Virtually all households where the head is single or has a loose union had never experienced problems paying school fees, compared to about 96 percent of 'polygamous' and 'monogamous' households. Similarly, while virtually all female-headed households had never experienced problems paying school fees, the share of male-headed households is 96 percent. Lastly, virtually all households where the household head has no education ever had problems paying school fees compared to 95 percent of households where the head has primary education.

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	96.6	1.2	1.9	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	96.4	1.9	1.2	0.5	100.0
Remote	96.9	0.4	2.8	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	97.5	0.0	2.5	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	96.3	1.6	1.7	0.4	100.0
Household size					
1-2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	98.3	0.0	0.7	1.0	100.0
5-6	96.7	1.9	1.4	0.0	100.0
7+	93.7	2.2	4.2	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	97.7	0.0	2.3	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	98.0	0.0	1.2	0.8	100.0
4-5.99 ha	92.0	5.3	2.7	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	95.8	1.2	3.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	98.5	0.3	0.7	0.5	100.0
Small only	93.9	1.8	4.3	0.0	100.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	92.2	5.0	2.8	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	70.4	14.8	14.8	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	97.7	0.9	1.1	0.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	95.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	100.0
Other	95.2	0.0	4.8	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	96.2	1.3	2.1	0.3	100.0
Female	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	96.3	1.1	2.7	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	96.8	2.3	0.9	0.0	100.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	97.6	0.0	0.0	2.4	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	99.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	97.2	0.8	1.6	0.4	100.0
Secondary +	82.8	8.8	8.4	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

6.2.3 Paying House Rent

Table 6.5 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying

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	99.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	99.5	0.5	0.0	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	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	99.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	89.0	11.0	0.0	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	0.5	0.0	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	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	100.0	0.0	0.0	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	99.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	99.6	0.4	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	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

house rent during the year before the survey. All (100 percent) households in the district reported that they never had problems paying house rent. Although a small percentage, 11 percent of households owning no land and 9 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee reported that they seldom had problems paying house rent. Other household characteristics such as cluster location, poverty status, household size, livestock ownership, gender, marital status and educational level 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

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	96.6	2.6	0.8	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	94.1	4.4	1.4	0.0	100.0
Remote	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	95.5	3.4	1.0	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	98.2	1.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	93.9	5.2	0.9	0.0	100.0
5-6	96.7	1.3	2.0	0.0	100.0
7+	98.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	89.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	91.4	8.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	98.3	0.5	1.2	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	97.2	2.1	0.7	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	95.7	4.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	97.2	1.4	1.4	0.0	100.0
Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasuku DC					
None	95.6	3.0	1.4	0.0	100.0
Small only	97.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	95.3	4.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	72.8	18.1	9.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	97.3	2.1	0.6	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	97.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	96.8	2.6	0.6	0.0	100.0
Female	95.0	2.4	2.5	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	81.7	0.0	18.3	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	96.6	3.1	0.4	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	88.8	11.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	93.1	4.6	2.3	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	95.1	3.7	1.2	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	96.8	3.2	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

the year before the survey. The outcome on household's ability to pay utility bills is almost similar to those of paying house rent. Nearly all (97 percent) households in the district did not face problems with paying utility bills in the year preceding the survey. However, it is observed that 18 percent of households where the main income earner is single and 9 percent of households where the main income earner is a employee claim having problems with paying utility bills often. Other selected household characteristics such as cluster location, poverty status, household size, land ownership, livestock ownership, gender and educational level do not show strong correlation with the ability to pay utility bills.

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

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	39.6	33.9	24.5	1.9	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	42.6	33.7	21.2	2.5	100.0
Remote	36.0	34.2	28.6	1.3	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	30.6	29.2	38.6	1.6	100.0
Non-poor	42.8	35.4	19.8	2.1	100.0
Household size					
1-2	33.7	30.5	29.4	6.3	100.0
3-4	40.2	34.9	21.8	3.1	100.0
5-6	40.5	36.5	22.2	0.8	100.0
7+	40.8	32.4	26.8	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	32.5	44.0	23.5	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	18.6	43.2	38.2	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	32.5	39.2	26.1	2.2	100.0
2-3.99 ha	35.9	30.4	29.4	4.3	100.0
4-5.99 ha	43.5	37.6	19.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	59.6	26.1	14.3	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	39.4	33.6	24.6	2.4	100.0
Small only	39.7	32.4	26.7	1.3	100.0
Large only	43.8	35.9	16.2	4.1	100.0
Both	38.5	39.6	21.9	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	81.9	18.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	37.2	36.0	25.2	1.6	100.0
Self-employed - other	51.5	20.3	28.2	0.0	100.0
Other	32.9	30.1	19.4	17.5	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	41.7	34.0	23.2	1.1	100.0
Female	20.8	33.7	36.1	9.4	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	69.2	15.6	15.1	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	41.2	34.2	24.2	0.4	100.0
Polygamous	46.0	34.5	18.6	1.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	12.6	87.4	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	18.0	35.2	33.9	13.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	31.8	35.6	30.9	1.7	100.0
Primary	42.8	33.7	21.9	1.6	100.0
Secondary +	42.2	29.3	22.9	5.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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. 74 percent of the households reported that they never/seldom experience problems paying for healthcare in the year prior to the survey. Disaggregation of the data further shows that while 77 percent of households located in accessible clusters never/seldom experienced problems paying for healthcare; the share for households located in remote clusters is 70 percent. Similarly, 78 percent of non-poor households never/seldom had problems paying for healthcare compared to 60 percent of the poor households.

While 73 percent of households with seven or more members never/seldom had problems paying for healthcare, the share for households with one or two members is 65 percent. Similarly, 86 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land never/seldom experienced problems paying for healthcare, compared to 77 percent of households owning no land.

Furthermore, 80 percent of households owning large livestock never/seldom had problems paying for healthcare compared to 72 percent of those owning small livestock. Similarly, The majority (82 percent) of households whose main income earner is an employee never had problems paying for healthcare, compared to 33 percent of households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group. Likewise, while 69 percent of households where the household head is single never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for households where the head has a loose union is virtually null.

The percentage of male-headed households who reported that they never had problems paying for healthcare is twice as high that of female-headed households, at 42 and 21 percent respectively. On the other hand, while 32 percent of household heads with no education never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for household heads with primary education and those with secondary education or more is about 42 percent.

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, 91 percent of the district's households own their dwellings while almost all (98 percent) households own some land. 30 percent of all households

Table 6.8: Percentage of households owning certain assets

			Livestock				Motor-		Wheel
	Home	Land	Small	Large	Both	Vehicle	cycle	Bicycle	barrow
Total	91.1	97.7	29.5	5.3	9.9	0.0	0.0	54.1	0.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	91.5	98.1	28.2	6.5	8.8	0.0	0.0	59.3	0.0
Remote	90.6	97.2	31.0	3.8	11.2	0.0	0.0	47.7	0.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	90.7	96.2	27.0	0.9	8.6	0.0	0.0	33.8	0.0
Non-poor	91.2	98.1	30.1	6.7	10.4	0.0	0.0	60.6	0.0
Household size									
1-2	86.0	97.0	20.4	14.3	6.6	0.0	0.0	25.5	0.0
3-4	84.6	95.5	21.1	4.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	50.6	0.0
5-6	91.7	100.0	35.3	4.6	9.5	0.0	0.0	61.5	0.0
7+	98.4	97.9	35.8	3.1	14.6	0.0	0.0	62.8	0.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	90.9	90.9	50.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	74.7	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	91.6	98.0	29.1	5.3	10.9	0.0	0.0	53.5	0.0
Self-employed - other	91.1	96.0	34.2	3.0	7.2	0.0	0.0	65.7	0.0
Other	78.8	100.0	9.1	8.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.6	0.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	91.4	98.0	29.6	5.6	10.8	0.0	0.0	59.0	0.0
Female	88.7	95.1	28.3	2.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	9.4	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

Table 6.9: Percent distribution of households by occupancy status

Total	91.1	0.5	3.8	4.6	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	91.5	0.9	4.7	2.9	100.0
Remote	90.6	0.0	2.7	6.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	90.7	0.0	5.1	4.3	100.0
Non-poor	91.2	0.7	3.4	4.8	100.0
Household size					
1-2	86.0	0.0	10.2	3.8	100.0
3-4	84.6	1.8	5.9	7.7	100.0
5-6	91.7	0.0	2.0	6.3	100.0
7+	98.4	0.0	0.8	0.9	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	91.6	0.3	3.6	4.5	100.0
Self-employed - other	91.1	0.0	2.9	6.1	100.0
Other	78.8	0.0	12.4	8.7	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	91.4	0.6	3.2	4.9	100.0
Female	88.7	0.0	9.3	2.1	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

	Title deed	Renting contract	Payment receipt	Other document	No document	Total	Secure tenure
Total	1.7	0.5	2.5	10.4	84.9	100.0	4.7
Cluster Location							
Accessible	3.1	0.9	3.4	7.6	84.9	100.0	7.5
Remote	0.0	0.0	1.4	13.6	85.0	100.0	1.4
Poverty Status							
Poor	0.0	0.0	0.9	12.0	87.0	100.0	0.9
Non-poor	2.2	0.7	3.0	9.5	84.5	100.0	6.0
Household size							
1-2	0.8	0.0	0.0	4.4	94.8	100.0	0.8
3-4	0.9	1.8	1.8	11.7	83.8	100.0	4.5
5-6	1.4	0.0	4.1	11.0	83.5	100.0	5.5
7+	3.0	0.0	2.9	11.1	83.0	100.0	5.9
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	25.5	9.1	0.0	23.3	42.2	100.0	34.5
Self-employed - agric	0.7	0.3	2.4	10.7	85.8	100.0	3.4
Self-employed - other	4.0	0.0	5.4	5.0	85.6	100.0	9.4
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	95.7	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	1.3	0.6	2.8	10.6	84.7	100.0	4.7
Female	5.1	0.0	0.0	7.7	87.2	100.0	5.1

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

own small livestock while only 5 percent of all households own large livestock. While 54 percent of all households own a bicycle, the share for households owning a motorcycle or a vehicle is virtually null.

Table 6.9 shows the percent distribution of households by occupancy status. Cluster location, poverty status and gender do not show strong correlation with land and home ownership. However, these household characteristics show some correlation with bicycle ownership. While 59 percent of households located in accessible clusters own a bicycle, the share for households located in remote clusters is 48 percent. Likewise, the percentage of non-poor households owning a bicycle is significantly higher than that of poor households, at 61 and 34 percent respectively. It is also observed that 59 percent of male-headed households own a bicycle compared to only 9 percent of female-headed households.

Disaggregation of the data shows that 98 percent of households with seven or more members own their dwellings compared to 86 percent of households with one or two members. Furthermore, while 79 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group owns their dwellings, the share for households belonging to the other socio-economic groups is about 91 percent. On the other hand, 75 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee own a bicycle compared to 20 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the '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 6 percent of the households possess formal occupancy documentation, which include a title deed, renting contract or payment receipt. 85 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

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	18.0	80.5	18.6	0.0	0.0	19.4	0.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	19.0	93.6	7.1	0.0	0.0	14.8	0.0
Remote	16.9	62.9	34.2	0.0	0.0	25.6	0.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	13.4	56.8	23.8	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
Non-poor	19.6	85.8	17.5	0.0	0.0	16.3	0.0
Household size							
1-2	20.6	94.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.8	0.0
3-4	18.3	73.6	30.1	0.0	0.0	18.3	0.0
5-6	20.0	81.9	24.3	0.0	0.0	14.7	0.0
7+	15.0	78.7	10.8	0.0	0.0	28.2	0.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	55.0	100.0	10.4	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	15.8	76.3	20.6	0.0	0.0	21.6	0.0
Self-employed - other	27.9	93.1	17.2	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0
Other	17.3	72.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.9	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Female	18.2	80.0	19.0	0.0	0.0	21.3	0.0
Male	16.2	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

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 complemented by Table 6.12, which shows the main source of agricultural inputs.

18 percent of all farmers apply agricultural inputs to their farms and the majority (81 percent) of those who use farm inputs apply fertilizers. Household location does not show strong correlation with use of agricultural inputs. However, poverty status shows some correlation. While 20 percent of non-poor households uses agricultural inputs, the share for poor households is 13 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that 21 percent of households with one to two members uses agricultural inputs compared to 15 percent of households with seven or more members. Furthermore, while 55 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee uses agricultural inputs, the share for households where the main income earner is self-employed in agricultural activities is 16 percent. Likewise, use of agricultural inputs in male-headed households is slightly higher than in female-headed households.

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	68.4	3.1	0.0	2.5	26.0	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	71.8	0.0	0.0	2.0	26.3	100.0
Remote	63.8	7.3	0.0	3.2	25.7	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	75.2	0.0	0.0	6.3	18.5	100.0
Non-poor	66.9	3.8	0.0	1.7	27.7	100.0
Household size						
1-2	37.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.2	100.0
3-4	81.8	2.3	0.0	4.7	11.2	100.0
5-6	75.7	4.3	0.0	3.9	16.1	100.0
7+	63.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	32.1	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	78.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.7	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	68.1	4.2	0.0	3.4	24.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	67.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.5	100.0
Other	52.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.4	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Female	67.6	3.4	0.0	2.7	26.2	100.0
Male	76.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

1. Base is households using agricultural inputs

While 78 percent of households where the

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	2.3	6.0	21.6	34.2	18.2	17.6	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	1.9	3.6	21.9	36.9	16.5	19.1	100.0
Remote	2.8	8.9	21.1	31.0	20.2	15.9	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	3.8	7.8	23.9	31.3	20.2	13.0	100.0
Non-poor	1.9	5.5	20.6	35.1	17.7	19.2	100.0
Household size							
1-2	3.0	6.3	24.7	37.4	15.0	13.4	100.0
3-4	4.5	9.6	23.9	40.3	10.4	11.4	100.0
5-6	0.0	5.4	22.1	33.0	19.5	19.9	100.0
7+	2.1	3.2	17.7	28.7	25.3	23.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	9.1	0.0	21.4	16.4	28.8	24.3	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	2.0	5.6	20.7	34.2	18.5	18.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	4.0	7.1	22.7	44.4	13.9	7.9	100.0
Other	0.0	17.6	40.9	23.6	13.1	4.8	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	2.0	5.4	20.6	33.2	19.5	19.3	100.0
Female	4.9	11.9	30.4	43.6	7.0	2.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

Most households that use agricultural inputs purchase them at an open market (68 percent) and in second place by preparing them themselves (26 percent). While 3 percent of the households get their inputs from cooperatives or Government, none reports donor agencies as their main source.

Data also shows that the percentage of households located in accessible clusters who purchase agricultural inputs at an open market is higher than that of households located in remote clusters at 72 and 64 percent respectively. In turn, the percentage of poor households who purchase agricultural inputs at an open market is 8 percentage points higher than that of non-poor households, at 75 and 67 percent respectively.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that households with seven or more members who purchase agricultural inputs at an open market is significantly higher than that of households with one or two members, at 63 and 38 percent respectively.

main income earner is an employee purchase their agricultural inputs at an open market, the share for households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group is 53 percent. Furthermore, 76 percent of female-headed households purchase their agricultural inputs at an open market compared to 68 percent of male-headed households.

6.4.2 Landholding

Table 6.13 shows the percent distribution of households by the area of land owned. 30 percent of households own less than two acres of land (including 2 percent of landless households). 34 percent owns between two and four acres and 36 percent owns four or more acres.

While landless households are more common among the poor, cluster location of the household does not show strong correlation with the amount of land owned.

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

	None	1	2-10	11-20	21-50	50+	Total
Total	84.8	3.6	10.5	0.8	0.1	0.1	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	84.8	4.4	10.1	0.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	85.0	2.6	11.0	0.8	0.3	0.3	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	90.4	3.7	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	83.0	3.6	12.1	1.1	0.2	0.2	100.0
Household size							
1-2	79.1	0.0	20.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	89.4	0.7	7.3	2.0	0.5	0.0	100.0
5-6	85.9	4.8	8.8	0.0	0.0	0.5	100.0
7+	82.3	6.5	10.4	0.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	83.9	3.7	11.8	0.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	89.8	2.4	2.4	2.4	1.5	1.5	100.0
Other	91.8	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	83.6	4.0	11.2	0.9	0.1	0.1	100.0
Female	95.8	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

Regarding household size, while 48 percent of households with seven or more members owns 4 or more hectares of land, the share for households with one or two members is 28 percent. On the other hand, while households where the main income earner is an employee reported the highest share of landless households (9 percent), the share for households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group is virtually null. Finally, male-headed households have larger landholdings (4 or more hectares) compared to female-headed households at 39 and 9 percent respectively.

6.4.3 Cattle Ownership

Table 6.14 shows the percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned. The majority (85 percent) of households owns no cattle at all, and only 1 percent owns more than 10 heads of cattle. Poor households are more likely to own no cattle as well as households with three or four members. In contrast, households with one or two members are more likely to have some cattle (between 2 and 10 heads) compared to households with seven or more members, at 21 and 10 percent respectively.

Furthermore, about 91 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' and 'other' categories owns no cattle compared to 84 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture. Finally, while 96 percent of female-headed households owns no cattle, the share for male-headed households is 84 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

51 percent the households reported it was improving, 33 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 54 and 47 percent respectively. Similarly, 53 percent of non-poor households reported an improvement in

the current crime and security situation compared to 46 percent of poor households.

While 5 percent of households with seven or more members reported a much worse crime and security situation, the share for households with one or two members is virtually null. On the other hand, 59 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 51 percent of landless households. While 6 percent of households owning both small and large livestock reported a much worse crime and security situation, the share for households owning large livestock is virtually null.

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	3.7	12.1	32.5	33.1	17.7	1.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	3.9	11.4	29.5	40.3	14.4	0.5	100.0
Remote	3.5	12.8	36.1	24.5	21.6	1.5	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	2.4	11.3	40.3	25.3	20.6	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	4.1	12.4	30.2	35.5	16.5	1.3	100.0
Household size							
1-2	0.0	6.1	43.1	36.8	12.2	1.8	100.0
3-4	3.1	12.2	29.7	37.0	16.3	1.7	100.0
5-6	5.0	13.5	30.5	32.7	18.2	0.0	100.0
7+	4.6	13.2	32.2	28.5	20.7	0.7	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	0.0	12.4	37.0	39.6	11.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	3.4	11.3	43.4	19.5	18.8	3.6	100.0
1-1.99 ha	2.6	7.7	38.1	31.7	18.7	1.3	100.0
2-3.99 ha	4.5	10.1	38.1	27.7	19.6	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	4.6	17.9	23.0	36.2	18.3	0.0	100.0
Female	3.2	15.3	20.3	46.0	12.6	2.7	100.0
Male							
None	2.5	11.9	34.4	32.1	18.3	0.9	100.0
Small only	6.0	14.3	26.1	37.6	15.3	0.8	100.0
Large only	0.0	9.5	42.2	28.4	20.0	0.0	100.0
Both	5.6	7.6	36.1	28.3	20.1	2.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.0	15.6	18.5	47.8	18.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	4.0	11.3	32.0	33.8	17.7	1.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	2.9	16.6	39.4	27.6	13.6	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	15.5	39.8	17.5	27.1	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	4.1	12.9	32.0	33.4	16.9	0.8	100.0
Female	0.0	4.6	37.1	31.0	24.6	2.7	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	0.0	15.1	32.3	34.2	18.3	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	4.3	12.3	32.6	32.4	18.0	0.4	100.0
Polygamous	1.6	13.8	33.2	37.5	11.9	2.1	100.0
Loose union	29.8	46.5	0.0	23.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	2.4	4.1	33.1	29.7	28.2	2.4	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	2.9	10.1	35.2	31.0	19.1	1.7	100.0
Primary	3.7	12.9	30.4	34.5	17.9	0.7	100.0
Secondary +	6.7	12.7	40.2	29.4	11.1	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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

	Principal contributor of income				
	Head	Spouse	Child	Other	Total
Total	89.1	8.0	1.6	1.2	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	88.8	7.1	1.9	2.2	100.0
Remote	89.6	9.2	1.3	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	86.9	11.2	0.0	1.9	100.0
Non-poor	89.8	7.1	2.1	1.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	87.5	8.8	0.0	3.7	100.0
3-4	88.9	5.1	4.4	1.6	100.0
5-6	90.3	8.7	0.0	1.0	100.0
7+	89.1	9.7	1.2	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	71.4	18.1	10.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	91.4	6.6	1.2	0.8	100.0
Self-employed - other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	19.0	58.3	8.2	14.6	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	89.0	8.9	1.3	0.8	100.0
Female	90.3	0.0	4.9	4.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

Furthermore, 56 percent of female-headed households reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 50 percent of male-headed households. Similarly, while 52 percent of households where the household head is single reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households where the head has a loose union is 24 percent. On the other hand, while 66 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee reported the current crime and security situation as improving, the share of households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities is 42 percent. Lastly, the percentage of households where the head has secondary education or more and reported deterioration of the current crime and security situation is higher than that of household heads with no education, at 20 and 13 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. For the great majority (89 percent) of households the head is the main contributor.

Cluster location of the household does not show strong correlation with the main contributor to household income. However, while 11 percent of poor households reported the spouse as the main income contributor, the share for non-poor households is 7 percent. Furthermore, all (100 percent) households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities reported the head as the main income contributor, compared to 19 of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that while 9 percent of male-headed households reported the spouse as the main income contributor, the figure for female-headed households is virtually null.

6.7 Other Household Items

Table 6.17 shows the percentage distribution of households owning selected household items. 72 percent of households own at least one mattress or bed, 55 percent owns a radio, 35 percent owns a

watch or clock and 8 percent owns an electric iron. Although no household owns a fixed line phone, 5 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 (with 5 or more members) and for households headed by males. In addition, households where the main income earner is an employee show higher rates of ownership in all 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	7.8	0.3	2.3	4.9	71.9	35.1	55.2	0.4	0.3	4.9
Cluster Location										
Accessible	10.7	0.5	2.0	8.1	74.9	37.1	61.6	0.7	0.5	6.2
Remote	4.3	0.0	2.7	1.2	68.4	32.6	47.5	0.0	0.0	3.3
Poverty Status										
Poor	2.9	0.0	0.6	0.8	66.4	16.8	32.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	9.4	0.3	2.9	6.3	73.5	40.5	62.5	0.5	0.3	6.4
Household size										
1-2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	56.9	19.5	27.6	0.0	0.0	0.8
3-4	5.6	0.9	0.7	6.1	72.2	32.9	50.6	0.9	0.9	7.2
5-6	8.5	0.0	3.0	3.6	77.7	34.3	65.8	0.0	0.0	4.2
7+	12.3	0.0	4.2	6.8	73.1	44.1	61.9	0.3	0.0	5.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	66.3	0.0	21.0	16.4	100.0	81.9	80.4	3.7	0.0	62.1
Self-employed - agriculture	5.2	0.0	1.8	4.0	68.7	31.9	53.5	0.0	0.3	2.4
Self-employed - other	15.3	2.9	2.6	10.1	90.0	51.8	74.6	2.9	0.0	9.0
Other	4.8	0.0	0.0	6.5	80.5	32.1	23.5	0.0	0.0	6.5
Gender of the head of household										
Male	8.7	0.3	2.6	5.5	73.9	37.5	59.4	0.4	0.3	5.1
Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.9	13.5	17.4	0.0	0.0	2.5

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

7 HOUSEHOLD AMENITIES

This chapter analyses the main amenities of the households in Kasulu 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, 62 percent of households have thatch as their main roof material and 36 percent have iron sheets. Very few households (1 percent) have roofs made of tiles.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote villages are more likely to use thatch than households in accessible villages at 66 and 59 percent especively. In turn, households in accessible villages tend to use iron sheets more often. Similarly, 81 percent of poor households uses thatch as their main roof material compared to 57 percent of non-poor households. On the other hand, while 42 percent of non-poor households uses iron sheets, the share for poor households is only 18 percent.

The breakdown by household size shows that 73 percent of households with up to 2 members uses thatch compared to 56 percent of households with seven or more members. In turn, larger households are more likely to use iron sheets for their roofs, as 42 percent of households with more than 5 members uses iron sheets. The split-up by socio-economic group shows that the "other" category has the highest share of households using thatch for the roof (at 85 percent), and that employees virtually do not use thatch.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households use thatch more often than male-headed households, at 72 and 61 percent respectively.

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	0.0	62.4	0.0	36.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	0.0	59.2	0.0	39.8	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	0.0	66.3	0.0	32.2	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	0.0	80.8	0.0	18.1	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	56.6	0.0	42.1	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size									
1-2	0.0	73.4	0.0	26.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	0.0	70.9	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	0.0	56.0	0.0	42.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	0.0	55.7	0.0	42.5	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	0.0	66.1	0.0	32.4	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	38.5	0.0	61.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	84.5	0.0	15.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	0.0	61.3	0.0	37.3	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	72.2	0.0	27.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

walls. Overall, 66 percent of houses are built with burnt bricks. Mud or mud bricks occupy the second place, with a share of 33 percent.

The analysis of cluster location reveals that households in accessible villages have a higher share of burnt bricks than households in remote villages. The rates are 73 and 57 percent respectively. On the other hand, while 41 percent of households in remote villages uses mud or mud bricks, the share for households in accessible villages is 26 percent.

The analysis by poverty status reveals that poor households use mud or mud bricks more often than non-poor households at 64 and 23 percent respectively. In turn, 76 percent of non-poor households uses burnt bricks as main material in the walls of the house compared to 36 percent of poor households. Similarly, 75 percent of households with 5 to 6 members uses burnt bricks as main material in the walls of the house compared to 59 percent of households with up to 4 members.

'Employee' is the category with the highest share living in houses made of burnt bricks (82 percent), whereas 'self-employed – agriculture' report the highest share living in houses made of mud or mud bricks (36 percent).

The gender breakdown shows that households headed by males use mud or mud bricks more often than female-headed households, at rates of 34 and 26 percent of males. In turn, 71 percent of female-headed households uses burnt bricks compared to 65 percent of male-headed households.

The distribution of households by type of material used in the floor is shown in Table 7.3. Overall, the floor in 96 percent of households is made of mud or dirt, and 4 percent of concrete or cement.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages, with a rate of 5 percent, have a slightly higher share of houses with concrete floor than households in remote villages, with a rate of 2 percent. In turn, households in remote villages have a higher share of houses with mud or dirt floor (98 percent, against 95 percent households in accessible villages). All (100 percent) poor households have mud or dirt compared to 95 percent of non-poor households.

The breakdown by household size shows that all households with up to 2 members have mud or dirt compared to 95 percent of households with 7 or more members. The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that employees have

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	33.1	0.0	65.6	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	26.1	0.0	72.8	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	41.3	0.0	57.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	64.0	0.0	36.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	22.7	0.0	75.5	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size								
1-2	40.9	0.0	59.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	38.7	0.0	59.3	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	23.4	0.0	74.7	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	33.0	0.0	66.1	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group								
Employee	0.0	0.0	81.9	18.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	35.9	0.0	63.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	17.6	0.0	76.3	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	30.4	0.0	69.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household								
Male	33.8	0.0	65.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	25.8	0.0	71.2	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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	96.2	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	95.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	97.7	0.0	0.0	2.3	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	95.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	95.2	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	97.1	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	94.8	0.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	40.5	0.0	0.0	59.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	98.4	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	91.1	0.0	0.0	8.9	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	95.8	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

the lowest share of mud or dirt (41 percent) and the highest share of concrete (60 percent). All households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category have houses with mud or dirt floor.

The gender breakdown shows that virtually all female-headed households use mud or dirt compared to 96 percent of male-headed households.

Table 7.4 shows the percent distribution of households by type of housing unit they occupy. Overall, 98 percent of households occupy the whole building where they live.

The breakdown by cluster location, poverty status, household size and gender do not show strong correlation with the type of housing unit households occupy. However, it is observed that 6 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee occupy two or more rooms.

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

	Single room	Flat	Two or more rooms	Whole building	Other	Total
Total	0.4	0.0	1.4	98.2	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	0.7	0.0	0.9	98.4	0.0	100.0
Remote	0.0	0.0	2.1	97.9	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	0.0	1.0	99.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.5	0.0	1.6	97.9	0.0	100.0
Household size						
1-2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	1.0	0.0	1.7	97.3	0.0	100.0
5-6	0.4	0.0	2.0	97.6	0.0	100.0
7+	0.0	0.0	1.3	98.7	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	0.0	0.0	5.7	94.3	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.3	0.0	1.2	98.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	1.2	0.0	2.7	96.1	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	0.4	0.0	1.3	98.3	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	0.0	2.4	97.6	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

7.2 Water and Sanitation

The percentage distribution of households by source of drinking water is shown in Table 7.5. Overall, 64 percent of households have a safe source of water, whereas 13 percent of them gets it from an unprotected well. 10 percent of all households get drinking water from a river, lake or pond. Safe sources of drinking water are treated pipes, bore holes, hand pumps, and protected wells

The analysis of cluster location shows that 67 percent of households in accessible villages have a safe source of drinking water, whereas the share of households in remote villages is 60 percent. On the other hand, 14 percent of households in remote villages gets drinking water from a river, lake or pond, against 6 percent of households in accessible villages. Poverty status of the household reveals that 67 percent of non-poor households use safe sources of water, against 54 percent of poor households. In turn, 22 percent of poor households gets their drinking water from river, lake or pond, against 5 percent of non-poor households.

When analysing by household size, it is noticed that 70 percent of households with 5 or 6 members and 61 percent of households with 7 or more members have a safe source of drinking water compared to 56 percent of households with up to 2 members. The shares of households with unprotected wells are 19 percent for smaller households with up to 2 members and 4 percent for households with 5 or 6 members.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that 'employee, is the category with the highest rate of access to safe sources of drinking water (83 percent), followed by the 'other' category (82 percent), while 'self employed-agriculture' is the category with the lowest access to safe water (62 percent). On the other hand, 13 percent of the households where the main income earner belongs to either of the self-employed categories gets drinking water from unprotected well compared to 5 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee.

The split-up by gender of the household head shows that while 67 percent of female-headed households have access to safe sources of drinking water, the share for male-headed households is 63 percent.

Table 7.6 shows the percentage distribution of households by main type of toilet. Overall, 83 percent of households have safe sanitation, whereas up to 83 percent use a covered pit latrine.

The cluster breakdown shows that 85 percent of households in remote villages have safe sanitation, while the share for households in accessible is 82 percent. Similarly, 85 percent of non-poor households have safe sanitation compared to 77 percent of poor households.

Households with up to 2 members have the lowest percentage of safe sanitation, at 76 percent, while households with 7 or

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	32.6	13.8	14.7	16.3	12.9	0.0	9.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	63.6
Cluster Location											
Accessible	31.7	15.6	14.7	20.6	11.0	0.0	6.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	67.0
Remote	33.6	11.6	14.8	11.1	15.2	0.0	13.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	59.5
Poverty Status											
Poor	13.0	6.6	19.0	22.5	16.9	0.0	22.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	54.4
Non-poor	39.1	16.2	13.5	14.1	11.7	0.0	5.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	66.7
Household size											
1-2	25.6	14.6	16.2	14.5	18.9	0.0	10.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	56.3
3-4	37.0	13.3	12.7	14.5	16.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	64.2
5-6	36.4	16.7	16.3	17.5	3.9	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	70.3
7+	28.4	11.5	14.6	17.6	15.0	0.0	12.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	60.6
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	11.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	83.3
Self-employed - agric	30.7	14.3	16.4	15.1	13.2	0.0	10.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	62.1
Self-employed - other	35.7	16.9	5.0	24.0	13.3	0.0	5.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	64.7
Other	28.6	5.2	11.6	41.3	11.1	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	81.5
Gender of the head of household											
Male	31.8	14.3	14.6	16.9	12.5	0.0	9.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	63.3
Female	39.4	9.0	16.1	11.2	16.1	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	66.6

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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	4.2	0.3	0.2	0.0	82.9	12.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	83.4
Cluster Location										
Accessible	4.1	0.5	0.4	0.0	80.8	14.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	81.7
Remote	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	85.3	10.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	85.3
Poverty Status										
Poor	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.3	11.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	77.3
Non-poor	2.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	84.5	12.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	85.2
Household size										
1-2	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.9	14.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	75.9
3-4	5.6	0.9	0.0	0.0	79.8	13.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	80.7
5-6	1.7	0.0	0.9	0.0	81.8	15.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	82.7
7+	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	89.3	7.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	89.3
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	91.3	8.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	91.3
Self-employed - agriculture	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	82.9	12.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	82.9
Self-employed - other	2.6	2.9	2.7	0.0	79.4	12.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	85.0
Other	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.2	7.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	83.2
Gender of the head of household										
Male	3.6	0.3	0.3	0.0	83.0	12.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	83.6
Female	9.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	81.3	9.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	81.3

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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	97.6	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	100.0	0.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	95.6	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	100.0	0.0
Remote	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	99.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	100.0	0.0
Non-poor	97.1	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Household size										
1-2	96.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	100.0	0.0
3-4	96.9	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
5-6	97.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
7+	98.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	74.5	25.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	87.7	12.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	92.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	98.2	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	100.0	0.0
Female	92.4	7.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

more members have the highest percentage of safe sanitation at 89 percent. It stands out that up to 17 percent of households with 5 to 6 members have no toilet.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that employees have the highest rate of safe sanitation, at 91 percent while the 'other' and 'self-employed –

agriculture' categories have the lowest rate of safe sanitation at 83 percent.
The analysis by gender of the household head 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 9 and 4 percent, respectively.

7.3 Type of Fuel

Table 7.7 shows the distribution of households by fuel used for cooking. Overall, 98 percent of households use firewood. Virtually all households in remote villages use firewood compared to 96 percent of households in accessible clusters. The breakdown by poverty status and the household size reveals no strong correlation with the type of fuel used for cooking.

The breakdown by gender shows that while 98 percent of male-headed households use firewood, the share for female-headed households is 92 percent. On the other hand, 8 percent of female-headed households use charcoal compared to 2 percent of male-headed households. The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that virtually all households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture use firewood compared to 75 percent of the households where the main income earner is an employee. In turn, 25 percent of 'employee' households use charcoal.
Table 7.8 shows the distribution of households according to the fuel used for lightning. Overall, 96 percent of the households in the district uses kerosene or paraffin and 2 percent uses firewood. Gas, electricity, solar panels, batteries, and candles are virtually not used for lighting in the district.
The analysis of cluster location shows that about 96 percent of households in both remote and accessible villages uses kerosene/paraffin. A similar trend is observed in the split-up by poverty status.

The breakdown by household size reveals that 98 percent of households with 7 or more members uses kerosene/paraffin compared to 91 percent of households with up to 2 members.

The analysis by socio-economic group of the household shows that households belonging to the 'other' category have the lowest rate of use of kerosene/paraffin at 85 percent compared to about 97 percent of the remaining categories. In turn, 15 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category use firewood.

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	96.3	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.2	2.4	0.7	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	95.8	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.3	1.2	100.0
Remote	96.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	2.5	0.2	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	96.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	2.0	0.3	100.0
Non-poor	96.1	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.9	100.0
Household size									
1-2	91.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0	100.0
3-4	94.8	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.8	100.0
5-6	98.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.1	100.0
7+	98.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.6	0.3	0.6	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	96.3	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	96.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	2.2	0.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	97.1	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	84.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.1	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	97.2	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.2	1.6	0.6	100.0
Female	87.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.8	2.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

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	79.0	15.9	3.7	1.3	100.0	27.1	35.0	23.4	14.6	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	79.0	17.9	3.1	0.0	100.0	27.5	40.7	26.5	5.3	100.0
Remote	79.1	13.5	4.5	2.8	100.0	26.5	28.0	19.6	25.8	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	66.5	23.8	5.6	4.1	100.0	20.6	34.9	26.1	18.4	100.0
Non-poor	83.3	13.2	3.2	0.4	100.0	29.0	35.2	22.3	13.5	100.0
Household size										
1-2	70.9	17.9	9.0	2.2	100.0	29.8	34.9	15.0	20.2	100.0
3-4	79.9	18.7	1.4	0.0	100.0	26.6	33.5	28.6	11.2	100.0
5-6	83.4	11.4	4.1	1.1	100.0	33.8	30.2	21.3	14.7	100.0
7+	78.1	16.4	3.3	2.2	100.0	20.7	40.2	23.9	15.2	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	82.3	17.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	22.5	16.4	23.9	37.2	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	79.6	15.5	3.7	1.2	100.0	27.5	35.1	24.0	13.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	77.9	17.8	2.7	1.6	100.0	26.2	38.4	19.5	15.9	100.0
Other	64.8	19.8	11.1	4.3	100.0	20.7	39.3	17.5	22.5	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	79.6	15.7	3.6	1.1	100.0	27.8	33.5	24.2	14.5	100.0
Female	74.3	17.5	5.4	2.9	100.0	20.6	47.8	16.2	15.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

Finally, male-headed households are more likely to use kerosene/paraffin than female-headed households at 97 and 88 percent respectively. On the other hand, 10 percent of female-headed households use firewood compared to only 2 percent of 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, 95 percent of households are located under 30 minutes of a drinking water supply. In addition, 62 percent of the households are located under 30 minutes of a health facility.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that 97 percent of households in accessible villages have access to a drinking water source and 69 percent to a health facility, whereas the shares for households in remote villages are 93 and 55 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 households with 3 to 4 members have the highest rate of access to sources of drinking water, at 99 percent and households with 1 or 2 members have the highest rate of access to health facilities (65 percent).

Households where the main income earner is an employee have the highest rate of access to drinking water (100 percent). Households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the highest rate of access to health faculties at 64 percent, whereas households belonging to the 'employee' category have the lowest access to health facilities at 39 percent.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that male-headed households have a higher access rate to drinking water supply than female-headed households at 96 and 92 percent

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	39.1	40.9	17.4	2.7	100.0	8.5	17.2	23.0	51.3	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	33.6	43.5	21.7	1.2	100.0	11.0	22.2	26.8	40.0	100.0
Remote	45.6	37.7	12.2	4.4	100.0	5.4	11.1	18.5	65.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	38.0	40.2	18.2	3.6	100.0	10.1	16.8	16.2	56.9	100.0
Non-poor	39.3	41.4	16.9	2.4	100.0	8.0	17.1	25.4	49.6	100.0
Household size										
1-2	40.7	35.5	17.2	6.7	100.0	1.8	10.1	26.1	61.9	100.0
3-4	35.1	41.0	22.9	1.1	100.0	8.5	17.5	22.7	51.4	100.0
5-6	45.3	36.9	14.5	3.3	100.0	8.9	19.2	25.2	46.7	100.0
7+	36.8	46.2	15.0	1.9	100.0	10.9	18.1	20.2	50.8	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	47.8	40.3	8.3	3.7	100.0	3.7	27.5	14.8	54.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	38.4	40.7	18.6	2.2	100.0	9.2	15.4	22.3	53.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	37.7	44.3	12.8	5.2	100.0	1.9	32.2	23.6	42.3	100.0
Other	51.8	36.5	5.2	6.5	100.0	12.4	12.1	46.5	29.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	39.3	42.1	16.1	2.5	100.0	8.3	17.7	22.9	51.2	100.0
Female	37.1	29.6	29.2	4.2	100.0	10.4	12.5	24.0	53.1	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

respectively. On the other hand, female-headed households have a higher access rate to health facilities than male-headed households at 69 and 62 percent respectively.

Table 7.10 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest primary and secondary school. Overall, 80 percent of households are located within 30 minutes of a primary school; however, only 26 percent of households live within 30 minutes of a secondary school. Moreover, 51 percent of households are 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 84 percent of households in remote villages have access to primary school, against 78 percent in accessible villages. For secondary school, the rates go down to 16 and 33 percent, respectively. On the other hand, poverty status of the household does not appear to be correlated with access to school, either primary or secondary.

The analysis of household size shows that households with 7 or more members have higher rates of access to both primary and secondary school than households with up to 2 members.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households in the category 'other' have the highest rate of access to primary and that households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the highest rate of access to secondary schools, at 88 and 34 percent, respectively. Households in the category 'self-employed agriculture' have the lowest access rate to primary schools at 79 percent.

Households headed by males have higher access rates to primary school than female-headed households, at 81 percent, against 67 percent for females. There is a slight difference in the access to secondary school at 26 and 23 percent, respectively.

Table 7.11 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest food market and public transportation. Overall, 88 percent of households have access to a food market, and 72 percent to public transportation.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 90 percent of households in accessible

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	50.7	36.6	9.9	2.9	100.0	48.2	23.6	11.1	17.1	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	54.9	35.2	8.4	1.5	100.0	55.9	29.3	13.5	1.3	100.0
Remote	45.6	38.3	11.6	4.5	100.0	39.0	16.8	8.1	36.1	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	37.8	45.3	11.6	5.4	100.0	36.2	20.9	9.7	33.1	100.0
Non-poor	54.8	34.1	9.0	2.1	100.0	52.1	24.6	11.2	12.0	100.0
Household size										
1-2	57.6	27.5	9.7	5.2	100.0	53.8	19.0	13.9	13.3	100.0
3-4	51.4	34.7	11.7	2.2	100.0	51.2	19.5	16.6	12.7	100.0
5-6	44.6	43.7	8.2	3.5	100.0	47.9	27.6	6.5	18.0	100.0
7+	52.1	36.3	9.7	2.0	100.0	43.6	25.9	8.7	21.8	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	52.9	38.0	9.1	0.0	100.0	40.8	34.4	16.4	8.4	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	50.2	37.7	9.5	2.7	100.0	47.6	23.6	10.9	17.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	56.2	27.4	12.2	4.2	100.0	60.3	18.9	8.4	12.4	100.0
Other	45.8	33.6	14.2	6.5	100.0	38.6	26.3	17.5	17.6	100.0
Gender of head of household										
Male	52.1	36.0	9.9	2.1	100.0	50.1	22.5	9.7	17.7	100.0
Female	38.1	42.5	9.5	9.9	100.0	31.3	33.7	23.4	11.6	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

villages live within 30 minutes of a food market, against 84 of households in remote villages. The shares for public transportation are 85 for accessible and 56 percent for households in remote villages. Non-poor households have higher rates of access to food markets, with a rate of 89 percent, against 83 of non-poor. Similarly, while 77 percent of non-poor has access to public transportation the share for poor households is 57 percent.

The breakdown by size of the household shows that 88 percent of households with 7 or more members lives within 30 minutes of a food market compared to 86 percent of households with 7 or more members. In contrast, households with 1 or 2 members have a higher rate of access to public transportation than households with 7 or more members.

Employees have the highest rate of access to food markets, with 91 percent whereas households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the highest access rate to public transportation at 79 percent.

Male-headed households have a higher access rate to both facilities at 88 and 73 percent against 81 and 65 percent of females.

7.5 Anti-Malaria Measures

The percentage of households taking anti-malaria measures and the specific measures they take are shown in Table 7.12. Overall, 54 percent of households take measures against malaria. The most commonly taken measures are use of insecticide treated nets (39 percent of households), bed nets (33 percent) and maintenance of good sanitation (24 percent).

The analysis of cluster location shows that 57 percent of households in remote villages take measures against malaria, compared to 50 percent of households in accessible villages. Use of bed nets is reported more frequently by households in remote villages (36 percent) than in accessible villages (31 percent). On the other hand, while 42 percent of households in accessible villages uses insecticide treated nets, the share for households in remote villages is 36 percent.

Furthermore, 60 percent of non-poor households takes measures against malaria compared to 36 percent of poor households. The rates for maintenance of good sanitation are lower, though non-poor households tend to maintain good

sanitation than poor households at 25 and 21 percent respectively.

The share of households taking measures tends to increase with the size of the household but there are no clear trends by measure taken. The analysis of socio-economic status shows that virtually all households in the 'employee' category take measures, 55 percent of 'self-employed other', 53 percent of 'self-employed agriculture', and only 23 percent of 'other'. Finally, 57 percent of households headed by males takes measures against malaria compared to 29 percent of households headed by females. Male-headed households use insecticide treated nets more frequently than female-headed households at 41 and 9 percent respectively. In turn, a higher share of the latter maintains good sanitation.

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	53.9	33.0	5.1	7.2	0.9	39.2	0.4	24.3	0.0	0.9	0.0
Cluster Location											
Accessible	57.0	30.6	5.8	6.5	1.6	41.5	0.7	25.6	0.0	1.6	0.0
Remote	50.1	36.4	4.0	8.2	0.0	36.2	0.0	22.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Poverty Status											
Poor	35.6	32.9	6.3	7.4	0.0	36.5	0.0	20.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	59.5	33.4	4.9	6.7	0.5	40.2	0.5	25.2	0.0	1.1	0.0
Household size											
1-2	31.2	36.7	0.0	3.5	0.0	37.8	0.0	22.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
3-4	55.2	21.9	5.5	10.5	1.6	43.9	1.4	22.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
5-6	59.1	40.4	4.6	5.5	0.0	28.3	0.0	28.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
7+	57.8	35.3	6.3	6.7	1.2	44.8	0.0	22.2	0.0	2.7	0.0
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	100.0	40.5	22.9	0.0	0.0	31.2	0.0	13.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - agric	53.4	31.5	4.1	7.5	1.1	38.5	0.5	27.3	0.0	1.1	0.0
Self-employed - other	55.0	41.8	4.4	9.9	0.0	46.9	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	23.0	39.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household											
Male	56.6	32.8	5.4	6.5	0.9	41.0	0.0	23.7	0.0	1.0	0.0
Female	29.0	36.3	0.0	19.2	0.0	8.8	7.7	35.7	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIC 2006 Bukoba 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. The results show that 77 percent of households had at least one member attending at least one kitongoji meeting in the past 12 months. Attendance at village meetings was slightly higher at 79 percent. Ward and district level meetings did not attain attendance of the majority of households at 29 and 11 percent respectively.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages report higher attendance rates than households in remote villages. The breakdown by poverty status shows that while there is no difference in attendance at kitongoji and village meetings, non-poor households seem to have better attendance rates at ward and district level meetings. Analysis of the results by socio-economic group shows that the 'other' socio-economic category (a small group of households consisting mainly of households where the main income earner is neither an employee nor self-employed) consistently report lower attendance rates than the other socio-economic groups. The employees tend to report the highest attendance rates.

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

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	77.1	79.4	29.3	11.4
Cluster Location				
Accessible	78.0	81.6	38.4	14.5
Remote	76.1	76.7	18.3	7.6
Poverty Status				
Poor	77.6	78.1	22.1	7.6
Non-poor	76.8	79.6	31.8	12.7
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	81.3	79.0	46.7	39.1
Self-employed - agriculture	78.2	81.4	28.7	10.5
Self-employed - other	72.8	68.4	35.5	15.0
Other	59.2	57.0	11.7	0.0
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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	92.7	86.7	83.2	76.9	77.3
Not Satisfied	7.0	12.2	7.8	7.0	15.6
Don't Know	0.3	1.1	9.1	16.1	7.1
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location					
Accessible	93.1	87.1	85.0	77.8	80.4
Remote	92.3	86.2	81.0	75.9	73.7
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status					
Poor	92.8	89.3	85.6	76.5	74.8
Non-poor	92.7	85.7	82.3	76.9	78.3
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group					
Employee	90.9	83.6	81.9	72.8	56.1
Self-employed - agriculture	93.3	87.7	84.1	77.6	78.1
Self-employed - other	88.0	75.5	73.3	70.5	78.8
Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC	92.7	92.7	87.9	78.9	72.4
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)					
Political differences	6.5	8.5	2.8	3.1	4.1
Embezzlement/corruption	22.3	33.2	10.0	2.0	10.1
They do not listen to people	23.9	26.7	10.8	0.0	10.5
Favouritism	37.3	32.1	10.2	6.3	5.4
Lazy/inexperienced	21.4	12.7	5.5	1.2	3.4
Personal Reasons	2.9	4.8	1.2	0.9	0.0
I see no results	22.4	17.0	21.4	15.7	33.1
They never visit us	12.9	16.6	36.8	58.4	26.0
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu 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?'

their work and for those who responded ‘no’ or ‘don’t know’ the reason for this response was asked.

The results, displayed in Table 8.2, show a clear trend of satisfaction with leaders going up as the level of government goes down. While, respectively, 93 percent and 87 percent of respondents say they are satisfied with kitongoji and village leaders, only 77 percent say the same of district leaders. This does not, however, mean that respondents specifically reported dissatisfaction with leaders at higher levels of government. In fact, the percentage of people claiming to be dissatisfied with leaders does not differ much between kitongoji, village, ward and district leaders. Rather, the number of people responding ‘I don’t know’ increases for higher levels of government. Around 16 percent of respondents were not satisfied with the work of their district councillor, while 77 percent was satisfied and 7 percent answered ‘I don’t know’.

The breakdown by accessibility of the cluster and the poverty status of the household shows that respondents living in accessible villages report higher satisfaction rates with ward leaders and district councillors, with no strong differences in the remaining levels. Poor households, in turn, report higher satisfaction rates with village and ward leaders, and lower rates of satisfaction with district councillors.

Disaggregating the rates by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed in non-agricultural activities have lower satisfaction rates than the other socio-economic groups. On the other

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

The reasons for dissatisfaction are very different across the different levels of government. While at kitongoji level only 13 percent of dissatisfied respondents complained that leaders never visit them, this figure goes up to 58 percent for district leaders. In turn, favouritism, by contrast, is the most commonly cited response at kitongoji level at 37 percent, while it is less important at district level at 6 percent. The most common reason for dissatisfaction with district councillors is the failure to see result of their work (33 percent), followed by not visiting the people (26 percent). While there low percentages complain on the embezzlement and corruption of the district leaders, district councillor or ward leaders, this complaint is more common for village and kitongoji leaders.

8.3. Public Spending

This section discusses the results of questions on the extent to which financial information reached the respondents, as well as their satisfaction with public spending. Table 8.3 shows the distribution of respondents that reported having received financial information from four different levels of government. Information on village finances seems to reach the largest share of households at 10 percent. Information on kitongoji, ward and district finances reaches 5, 3 and 3 percent of the household's respectively. There are no strong differences in the share of households receiving financial information at different levels of government by cluster location or poverty status.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed groups report the highest shares receiving information at all levels, except at district finances. At the latter level, the employees report the highest share of households receiving financial information at 23 percent. The 'other' group (households where the main income earner is unemployed, inactive or a domestic worker) reports null rates at all levels. The employees, in turn, report null rates at kitongoji and village level.

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	5.2	9.8	2.6	3.3
Cluster Location				
Accessible	4.8	9.6	2.9	2.5
Remote	5.6	10.1	2.3	4.3
Poverty Status				
Poor	3.1	6.7	2.5	3.8
Non-poor	5.6	10.9	2.7	3.2
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	0.0	0.0	5.7	23.1
Self-employed - agriculture	5.2	10.2	2.7	3.1
Self-employed - other	9.1	13.0	2.4	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Source				
Letter	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC	1.4	0.0	0.0	14.4
Meeting	82.5	91.3	71.7	37.4
Rumours/hear-say	12.0	11.5	21.5	10.9
Radio/newspapers	0.0	0.0	9.7	29.6
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC

For those that received financial information, the source of this information was probed for. The results show that at all levels of government the most important method of acquiring information was attendance to meetings. Information received through rumours or hear-say scores second place at all levels except at district level, ranging from 12 percent at village level to 22 percent at ward level.

Respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with spending at different levels of government and were requested to respond with either 'yes', 'no' or 'don't know'. Table 8.4 shows the results. Satisfaction with spending is higher for lower levels of government.
Between 42 and 46 percent of respondents were satisfied with spending at all levels of government. The percent of respondents reported 'I don't know' was higher than that of respondents reported

'dissatisfaction' at all levels of government.

Respondents from poor households and from remote villages reported lower satisfaction rates with public spending at all levels except kitongoji. The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the employed group displays the highest satisfaction rates, except for kitongoji spending, where the self-employed agricultural group shows slightly higher rates.

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

Table 8.4: Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction

	Kitongoji Spending	Village Spending	Ward Spending	District Spending
Total				
Satisfied	45.6	43.9	41.9	41.5
Not Satisfied	16.2	23.4	16.1	11.4
Don' Know	38.3	32.7	42.0	47.1
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location				
Accessible	45.3	48.2	43.7	43.4
Remote	45.8	38.8	39.7	39.2
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status				
Poor	43.7	40.8	35.9	36.6
Non-poor	46.1	45.2	44.1	43.4
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group				
Employee	47.1	51.9	46.5	63.8
Self-employed - agriculture	47.3	44.5	42.1	41.6
Self-employed - other	33.8	40.9	41.8	36.6
Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC	30.6	30.2	33.3	33.3
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)				
I see no results	16.5	23.0	16.3	17.0
Embezzlement/corruption	10.7	20.2	13.9	8.5
Favouritism	3.5	8.8	4.1	2.6
This is what I hear	1.2	2.7	0.7	0.7
They give no information	61.4	60.4	72.9	76.6
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kasulu DC