PMO-RALG

NGARA DC CWIQ

Survey on Poverty, Welfare and Services In Ngara DC

SEPTEMBER 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, Ngasuma Kanyeka, Mujobu Moyo, and Teddy Neema, under the supervision of Manuel Barron. Assistance from Charles Citinka and Howard Clegg from PMO-RALG is acknowledged.

DEFINITIONS

General

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

Education

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

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

Health

Need for Health Facilities	An individual is classed as having experienced need for a health facility if he/she had suffered from a self-diagnosed illness in the four weeks preceding the survey.
Use of Health Facilities	An individual is classed as having used a health facility if he/she had consulted a health professional in the four weeks preceding the survey.
Satisfaction with Health Facilities	No problems cited with health facility used in the four weeks preceding the survey.
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 Ngara DC District CWIQ……. 1
1.2Sampling…… 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
2.1Main Population Characteristics…… 5
2.2 Main Household Characteristics…….. 9
2.3 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household…….. 5
2.4 Orphan and Foster Status……. 11
3 EDUCATION…….. 14
3.1 Overview Education Indicators…….. 17
3.1.1 Literacy…….. 17
3.1.2 Primary School Access Enrolment and Satisfaction…… 17
3.1.3 Secondary School Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction…….. 17
3.2 Dissatisfaction……. 19
3.3 Non-Attendance…….. 21
3.4 Enrolment and Drop Out Rates…….. 22
3.5 Literacy…….. 23
4 HEALTH…….. 24
4.1 Health Indicators……. 27
4.2 Reasons for Dissatisfaction…… 27
4.3 Reasons for Not Consulting When Ill…… 28
4.4 Type of Illness…….. 30
4.5 Health Provider……. 30
4.6 Child Deliveries…… 31
4.7 Child Nutrition……. 32
5 EMPLOYMENT…….. 34
5.1 Employment Status of Total Adult Population…… 37
5.1.1 Work Status…….. 37
5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads…….. 37
5.1.3 Youth Employment…… 38
5.2 Working Population……. 38
5.3 Underemployment Population…… 39
5.4 Unemployed Inactive Population…….. 42
5.5 Household Tasks……. 44
5.6 Child Labour……. 45
6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE ANDCHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES 46
6.1 Economic Situation…….. 49
6.1.1 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Community…… 49
6.1.2 Perception of Change in the economic Situation of the Household……. 50
6.2 Self- reported difficulty in Satisfying Household Needs…… 51
6.2.1 Food Needs…… 52
6.2.2 Paying School Fees…….. 54
6.2.3 Paying House Rent…… 55
6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills……. 56

6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare…….. 56
6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status…….. 57
6.3.1 Assets Ownership…….. 57
6.3.2 Occupancy Documentation …… 58
6.4 Agriculture……. 58
6.4.1 Agriculture Inputs…… 58
6.4.2 Landholding……. 60
6.4.3 Cattle Ownership…….. 60
6.5 Perception of Crime and Security in the Community…… 61
6.6 Household Income Contribution…….. 62
6.7 Other House Items…….. 62
7 HOUESHOLD AMENITIES…….. 65
7.1 Housing Materials and Typing OF housing Unit…….. 65
7.2 Water and Sanitation…… 68
7.3 Type of Fuel…….. 69
7.4 Distance to Facilities…… 71
7.5 Anti -Malaria Measures…….. 73
8 GOVERNANCE…….. 75
8.1 attendance at Meeting……. 75
8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders…… 75
8.3 Public Spending…… 77
9 CHANGES BETWEEN 2003 AND 2006…… 79
9.1 Household Characteristics……. 80
9.2 Education…….. 80
9.3 Health……..... 80
9.4 Household ASSETS AND Perception of Welfare……. 82

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.2 Predicted vs. Actual Poverty, Kagera Rural, 2000/01……... 2
Table 1.3 Cluster Location……. 3
Table 1.4 Socio-economic Group…… 4
Table 1.5 Socio-economic Group and gender of household…… 4
Table 1.6 Socio-economic Group and main economic activity……... 5
Table 2 1 Percent distribution of total population by gender and age…….. 7
Table 2.2 Dependency Ratio ……..…. 8
Table 2.3 Percent Distribution of Households by Number of Household Members……. 8
Table 2.4 Percent distribution of total population by relation to head of household……... 9
Table 2.5 Percent distribution of the total population age 12 and above by marital status……. 10
Table 2.6 Percent distribution of the total population age 5 and above by socio-economic group…… 10
Table 2.7 Percent distribution of the total population age 5 and above by highest level of education…… 11
Table 2.8 Percent distribution of heads of households by marital status……. 12
Table 2.9 Percent distribution of heads of households by socio-economic group…….. 13
Table 2.10 Percent distribution of heads of household by highest level of education …… 13
Table 2.11 Percent distribution of children under 18 years old who have lost their mother and /or father…… 14
Table 2.12 Percent distribution of children under 18 year's old living without mother and/or father…… 15
Table 3.1 Education Indicators…… 18
Table 3.2 Percentage of students currently enrolled in school with reasons for dissatisfaction……..... 21
Table 3.3 Percentage of children 7-9 years who ever attended school by reasons not currently attending…… 22
Table 3.4 Primary School enrolment and drop out rates by age and gender…… 23
Table 3.5 Secondary school enrolment and drop out rates by age and gender…… 23
Table 3.6 Adult literacy rates by age and gender (persons age 15 and above)…… 24
Table 3.7 Youth literacy rates by age and gender (persons age 15-24)……. 25
Table 4.1 Health Indicators……. 27
Table 4.2 Percentage of persons who consulted a Health provider in the 4 weeks proceeding the survey and were not satisfied, and the reasons for dissatisfaction……. 28
Table 4.3 Percentage of persons who did not consulted a Health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and the reasons for not consulting……. 29
Table 4.4 Percentage of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks proceeding the survey ,and those sick or injured the percentage by type of sickness/injury…… 31
Table 4.5 Percentage distribution of health consultation in past 4 weeks by type of health provider consulted… 31
Table 4.6 Percentage of women aged 12-49 who had a live birth in the year proceeding the survey by age of the mother and the percentage of those births where the mother received pre-natal care…… 32
Table 4.7 Percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by place of birth……. 33
Table 4.8 Percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by person who assisted in delivery of child……... 33
Table 4.9 Nutrition Status indicators and program participating rates…… 34
Table 4.10 Percent Distribution of Children Vaccination by Type of Vaccination Received…… 35
Table 4.11 Percent Distribution of Children Vaccinated by Source of Information…… 36
Table 5.1 Percentage distribution of the population by working status (age 15 and above)……... 37
Table 5.2 Principal labour force indicators (persons age 15 and above)……. 38
Table 5.3 Percentage distribution of the population by work status (age 15 -24)……..... 39
Table 5.4 Percentage distribution of the working population by type of payment in main job…….. 39
Table 5.5 Percentage distribution of the working population by employer……. 40
Table 5.6 Percentage distribution of the working population by activity…….…... 40
Table 5.7 Percentage distribution of the working population by employer, sex and activity……..… 41
Table 5.8 Percentage distribution of the working population by employer, sex and employment status…… 41

Table 5.9 Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status……. 41
Table 5.10 Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer…… 42
Table 5.11 Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by activity……. 43
Table 5.12 Percentage distribution of the unemployed population by reason…… 44
Table 5.13 Percentage distribution of the economically inactive population by reason…… 44
Table 5.14 Activities normally undertaken in the household (age 15 and over)…… 45
Table 5.15 Activities normally undertaken in the household (age 5 to 14)…….. 46
Table 5.16 Child Labour (age 5 to 14)…… 47
Table 6.1 Percentage of Household by the percentage of the economic situation of the community compared to the year before the survey…… 49
Table 6.2 Percentage distribution of Households by the percentage of the economic situation of the household To the year before the survey..... 51
Table 6.3 Percentage distribution of Households by the difficult in satisfying the food needs of the household during the year before the survey..... 52
Table 6.4 Percentage distribution of households but the difficult in paying during the year before the survey 53
Table 6.5 Percent distribution of households by the difficult in paying house rent during the year before the survey..... 54
Table 6.6 Percent distribution of households by the difficult in paying utility bills during the year before the survey..... 55
Table 6.7 Percent distribution of households by the difficult in paying for health care during the year before the Survey..... 56
Table 6.8 Percentage of households owning certain assets..... 57
Table 6.9 Percent distribution of households by occupancy status..... 58
Table 6.10 Percent distribution of household by type of occupancy documentation..... 58
Table 6.11 Percentage of household using agricultural inputs and the percentage using certain inputs..... 59
Table 6.12 Percentage distribution of households using agricultural inputs by the main source of the inputs..... 59
Table 6.13 Percent distribution of households by the area of land owned by the household..... 60
Table 6.14 Percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned by the household..... 60
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..... 56 61
Table 6.16 Percentage distribution of households by principal contributor to household income..... 62
Table 6.17 Percentage of households owning selected household items..... 63
Table 7.1 Percent distribution of households by material used for roof of the house..... 65
Table 7.2 Percent distribution of household by material used for walls of the house..... 66
Table 7.3 Percent distribution of households by material used for floors of the house..... 66
Table 7.4 Percent distribution of households by type of housing unit..... 67
Table 7.5 Percent distribution of households by main source of drinking water..... 68
Table 7.6 Percent distribution of households by main type of toilet..... 69
Table 7.7 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for cooking..... 70
Table 7.8 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for lighting..... 70
Table 7.9 Percent distribution of household by time (in minutes) to reach nearest drinking water supply and health facility..... 71
Table 7.10 Percent distribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach the nearest primary and secondary school..... 72
Table 7.11 Percent distribution of household by time (in minutes) to reach nearest food market and public transportation..... 73
Table 7.12 Percentage of households taking anti-malaria measures and percentage taking specific measures….. 74
Table 8.1 Percentage distribution of attendance of meetings(any household members within past 12 months) 75
Table 8.2 Distribution of leaders' satisfaction ratings and reasons for dissatisfaction..... 76
Table 8.3 Percentage distribution of households who received financial information in the past 12 months 77
Table 8.4 Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction..... 78
Table 9.1 Household Characteristics..... 79

Table 9.2 Education..... 80
Table 9.3 Health..... 81
Table 9.4 Household Assets and Perception of Welfare..... 82

Generic Core Welfare Indicators (2006)

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Household characteristics						
Dependency ratio	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.0
Head is male	85.4	1.7	83.8	86.9	84.1	85.8
Head is female	14.6	1.8	16.2	13.1	15.9	14.2
Head is monagamous	57.2	2.1	58.7	55.8	61.3	56.1
Head is polygamous	24.4	2.1	21.2	27.4	21.2	25.2
Head is not married	18.4	1.9	20.2	16.8	17.5	18.7
Household welfare						
Household economic situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	43.4	2.7	41.1	45.5	50.7	41.4
Better now	27.0	2.5	31.1	23.1	20.5	28.8
Neighborhood crime/security situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	11.1	2.5	11.6	10.7	12.1	10.9
Better now	39.2	5.1	35.1	43.0	39.1	39.2
Difficulty satisfying household needs						
Food	58.1	3.5	52.8	63.2	82.6	51.3
School fees	2.0	0.8	2.2	1.8	2.9	1.8
House rent	0.7	0.5	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.9
Utility bills	1.4	0.7	2.3	0.6	1.3	1.4
Health care	31.2	2.9	24.3	37.8	43.2	27.9
Agriculture						
Land owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	2.7	0.8	3.4	2.0	1.9	2.9
More now	5.5	0.7	5.3	5.7	11.7	3.7
Cattle owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	22.7	2.9	24.6	20.9	22.7	22.7
More now	11.0	2.1	10.7	11.2	9.4	11.4
Use of agricultural inputs						
Yes	76.2	3.9	72.4	79.9	74.7	76.7
Fertilizers	49.5	4.6	54.5	45.2	54.8	48.1
Improved seedlings	65.1	4.4	60.3	69.2	45.9	70.3
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	58.3	4.0	48.2	66.9	53.7	59.5
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Household infrastructure						
Secure housing tenure	1.5	0.9	2.8	0.3	0.0	1.9
Access to water	59.6	6.1	66.5	53.1	49.0	62.6
Safe water source	18.4	4.9	29.0	8.4	14.5	19.5
Safe sanitation	1.4	1.2	2.3	0.6	0.0	1.8
Improved waste disposal	26.0	5.3	26.2	25.8	21.3	27.3
Non-wood fuel used for cooking	0.5	0.5	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.7
Ownership of IT/Telecommunications Equipment						
Fixed line phone	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.3
Mobile phone	10.0	2.0	14.2	6.0	3.4	11.8
Radio set	49.4	3.7	56.3	42.9	19.7	57.7
Television set	2.0	1.1	2.7	1.2	0.0	2.5

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Employment						
Employer in the main job						
Civil service	0.8	0.3	0.7	0.9	0.0	1.1
Other public serve	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.1
Parastatal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NGO	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private sector formal	0.6	0.4	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.8
Private sector informal	33.0	1.2	31.8	34.2	25.3	35.9
Household	60.8	1.2	62.0	59.7	68.1	58.1
Activity in the main job						
Agriculture	69.2	2.7	64.4	74.0	74.8	67.2
Mining/quarrying	0.6	0.3	1.0	0.2	0.3	0.7
Manufacturing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Services	0.8	0.3	0.9	0.7	0.0	1.1
Employment Status in last 7 days						
Unemployed (age 15-24)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unemployed (age 15 and above))	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Underemployed (age 15 and above)	22.2	1.6	20.6	23.7	22.7	22.0
Male	30.0	2.3	27.3	32.5	30.7	29.7
Female	14.6	1.8	14.2	15.0	15.6	14.2
Education						
Adult literacy rate						
Total	62.0	2.4	69.2	54.9	54.4	64.8
Male	71.7	3.0	82.5	61.2	63.7	74.4
Female	52.4	2.4	56.2	48.7	46.3	54.9
Youth literacy rate (age 15-24)						
Total	82.5	2.7	86.6	77.7	77.8	84.5
Male	83.3	2.9	89.6	76.2	77.0	86.3
Female	81.5	3.4	83.4	79.3	78.9	82.6
Primary school						
Access to School	60.8	6.6	72.0	50.1	55.0	64.1
Primary Gross Enrollment	102.1	2.9	106.8	97.7	98.4	104.3
Male	100.0	4.2	107.8	93.0	101.6	99.2
Female	104.2	4.1	105.8	102.5	95.7	109.6
Primary Net Enrollment	78.4	2.2	83.9	73.2	69.8	83.4
Male	73.7	2.8	80.3	67.7	66.7	77.3
Female	83.0	3.0	87.1	78.8	72.4	89.7
Satisfaction	39.6	3.4	41.6	37.4	41.9	38.3
Primary completion rate	19.6	2.2	24.2	15.2	12.7	23.6

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Secondary school						
Access to School	14.2	5.2	20.1	7.1	6.8	18.3
Secondary Gross Enrollment	10.6	2.2	11.7	9.3	7.7	12.2
Male	10.9	2.5	14.7	6.7	8.7	12.1
Female	10.2	3.2	8.2	12.7	6.5	12.3
Secondary Net Enrollment	9.0	1.8	9.6	8.2	7.7	9.7
Male	8.9	1.9	10.8	6.7	8.7	8.9
Female	9.1	2.7	8.2	10.2	6.5	10.6
Satisfaction	48.5	9.9	56.4	36.4	70.2	40.8
Secondary completion rate	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.0	0.7
Medical services						
Health access	36.4	5.8	50.7	22.8	29.5	39.6
Need	19.7	1.1	19.9	19.6	16.2	21.3
Use	23.9	1.1	25.1	22.7	21.8	24.8
Satisfaction	71.8	2.3	75.3	68.2	57.9	77.4
Consulted traditional healer	9.8	2.1	9.0	10.6	13.0	8.5
Pre-natal care	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Anti-malaria measures used	75.3	2.3	79.2	71.5	61.3	79.1
Person has physical/mental challenge	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1
Child welfare and health						
Orphanhood (children under 18)						
Both parents dead	1.4	0.4	1.5	1.3	2.4	0.9
Father only	3.0	0.5	2.8	3.2	3.3	2.8
Mother only	1.8	0.4	2.1	1.4	0.7	2.3
Fostering (children under 18)						
Both parents absent	13.0	1.4	11.3	14.7	13.4	12.8
Father only absent	11.7	1.7	9.9	13.5	16.1	9.3
Mother only absent	4.0	1.0	5.5	2.6	2.3	5.0
Children under 5						
Delivery by health professionals	72.2	3.1	75.4	69.2	64.3	76.0
Measles immunization	66.9	2.5	69.3	64.7	63.8	68.4
Fully vaccinated	32.0	3.4	34.4	29.8	22.0	36.9
Not vaccinated	13.0	2.1	14.6	11.5	13.5	12.7
Stunted	18.5	2.1	19.5	17.5	22.0	16.8
Wasted	1.4	0.5	1.2	1.6	1.5	1.3
Underweight	10.6	1.8	10.6	10.5	13.0	9.4

** 1.96 standard deviations*

	2003	2006	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Net Enrolment Rate							
Primary School	76.9	80.2	3.3	3.5		-4.0	10.2
Secondary School	4.0	23.8	19.8	6.8	***	6.1	33.5
Rate of							
Dissatisfaction with	26.8	26.9	0.1	5.4		-9.7	12.1
Reasons for Dissatisfaction							
Books/Supplies	51.5	51.0	-0.5	13.5		-30.2	24.0
Poor Teaching	6.0	3.0	-3.0	3.3		-9.9	3.5
Lack of Teachers	48.2	62.9	14.7	11.6		-10.5	36.0
d Condition of Facilities	57.3	17.9	-39.4	10.4	**	-45.3	-3.6
Overcrowding	26.0	35.7	9.7	10.4		-11.0	30.8
Health Facility							
Consulted							
Private hospital	5.2	1.4	-3.8	1.8	**	-7.3	-0.1
Government hospital	57.8	59.7	1.9	10.5		-17.8	24.2
Traditional healer	3.4	8.0	4.6	1.9	**	0.8	8.5
Pharmacy	10.0	16.0	6.0	2.7		-1.6	9.2
Rate of							
Dissatisfaction with							
Healht Facilities	21.6	10.4	-11.2	4.2	**	-18.5	-1.7
Reasons for Dissatisfaction							
Long wait	25.4	48.7	23.3	10.2	**	2.3	43.5
of trained professionals	6.2	0.0	-6.2	2.2	**	-8.7	0.3
Cost	33.7	16.5	-17.2	12.1	*	-39.8	8.9
No drugs available	23.8	13.0	-10.8	10.8		-30.6	13.0
Unsuccessful treatment	42.3	39.0	-3.3	11.4		-25.6	20.1
Child Delivery							
Hospital or Maternity W	39.8	42.1	2.3	10.5		-18.5	23.3
Delivery Assistance							
Doctor/Nurse/Midwife	39.5	43.0	3.5	10.2		-17.1	23.9
TBA	51.6	34.1	-17.5	8.5	**	-34.4	-0.3
Self-assistance	8.9	22.7	13.8	4.5	***	5.0	23.2
Child Nutrition							
Stunted	43.3	47.8	4.5	4.7		-4.4	14.6
Severely Stunted	17.6	14.2	-3.4	3.1		-11.1	1.1
Wasted	7.8	0.9	-6.9	1.9	***	-11.3	-3.5
Severely Wasted	1.4	0.0	-1.4	0.9	***	-4.6	-1.1

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Ngara District CWIQ

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

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

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

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

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

Although beyond the purpose of this report, the results of Ngara CWIQ could also be set against those of other CWIQ surveys that have are being implemented at the time of writing in other districts in Tanzania: Bariadi DC, Bukoba DC, Bukombe DC, Bunda DC, Dodoma DC, Dodoma MC, Hanang DC, Karagwe DC, Kasulu DC, Kibondo DC, Kigoma DC, Kilosa DC, Kishapu DC, Kongwa DC, Kyela DC, Ludewa DC, Makete DC, Maswa DC, Meatu DC, Kahama DC, Mbulu DC, Morogoro DC, Mpwapwa DC, Muheza DC, Musoma DC, 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 Ngara District CWIQ was sampled to be representative at district level. Data from the 2002 Census was used to put together a list of all villages in the district. In the first stage of the sampling process villages were chosen proportional to their population size. In a second stage the sub-village (kitongoji) was chosen within the village through simple random sampling. In the selected sub-village (also referred to as cluster or enumeration area in this report), all households were listed and 15 households were randomly selected. In total 450 households in 30 clusters were visited. All households were given statistical weights reflecting the number of households that they represent.

A 10-page interview was conducted in each of the sampled households by an experienced interviewer trained by EDI. The respondent was the most informed person in the household, as identified by the members of the household. A weight

Table 1.1 Variables Used to Predict Consumption Expenditure

Basic Variables	***Household Assets***
Age of household head	Radio, radio cassette, music system
Household size	Iron
Education of household head	Roof material
	Wall material
Food Security	land
meat consumption	
	Village level variables
Household Amenities	Access to water
People per bedroom	Households where a member holds a bank account

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Table 1.2 : Predicted and Observed Poverty Rates, Kagera Rural, 2000/01

Predicted	Observed		
	Non-Poor	Poor	Total
Non-Poor	61.4	10.6	72.0
Poor	7.4	20.6	28.0
Total	68.8	31.3	100.0

Source: HBS 2000/01

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 guarantee the quality of the data.

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 Ngara in order to ensure that the model developed accurately represents this particular district.

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

the variables that have been used to calculate predicted household consumption expenditure. The actual quantitative relationship between these and consumption expenditure is presented in Table B1 in Annex 2.
Once the consumption level of a household has been predicted, it is compared to the Basic Needs Poverty Line set by National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) on the basis of the 2000/01 HBS. The Basic Needs Poverty Line is defined by what a household, using the food basket of the poorest 50 percent of the population, needs to consume to satisfy its basic food needs to attain 2,200 Kcal/day per adult equivalent. The share of non-food expenditures of the poorest 25 percent of households is then added. With this procedure, the Basic Needs Poverty Line is set at TZS 7,253 per 28 days per adult equivalent unit in 2000/01 prices. Households consuming less than this are assumed to be unable to satisfy their basic food and non-food needs[1].

The Ngara 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 7.9 percent of the cases, and vice versa in 10.9 percent of the households. This gives an overall percentage of correct predictions of 81.2 percent.

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

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 Ngara CWIQ, on the other hand, is sufficiently large to allow detailed district-level analysis. The accuracy with which households can be classified by poverty status using the CWIQ gives credence to the use of predicted poverty level as a variable throughout this report.

1.3.2 Cluster Location

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

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					
Accessible	12	5	90	18.2	74,355
Remote	120	35	240	35.7	33,210

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara 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	1.3	14.4	85.6
Self-Employed Agriculture	28.6	33.6	66.4
Self-Employed Other	3.1	17.6	82.4
Other	9.4	34.1	65.9

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

each of the variables used to construct the cluster location.

Table 1.3 shows that the poverty rates differ substantially by cluster location: households in remote villages are more likely to be poor than households in accessible villages. Whereas the poverty rate in accessible villages is 18 percent, the figure for remote villages doubles, reaching 36 percent of the population.

1.3.3 Socio-economic Group

The socio-economic group that a household belongs to depends on the employment of the household's main income provider. Throughout the report those employed in the private sectors, formally or informally, as well as Government and Parastatal employees are categorised as 'Employed'. 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 work) 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 belonging to the self-employed in agriculture category and lowest for the employees. Furthermore, households in the categories 'employee' and 'self-employed other' are more likely to be located in accessible villages, whereas the categories 'self-employed agriculture' and 'other' are associated with households located in remote villages.

The gender of the household head and the socio-economic group of the household is shown in Table 1.5. Roughly, 4 out of 5 households are headed by a male. Households belonging to the 'employee' and 'self-employed other' categories are overwhelmingly headed by males. 'Self-employed agriculture' and 'other' are the categories with highest shares of female household heads.

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 4 out of 5 household heads are dedicated. Household heads from the employee socio-economic group are mostly dedicated to mining, manufacturing, energy or construction, with a share of 99 percent. In the case of self-employed in non-agricultural activities, the predominant economic activity is services (95 percent). The 'other' socio-economic group is almost evenly divided between agriculture (49 percent) and household duties (51 percent).

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

	Male	Female	Total
Socio-economic Group			
Employees	96.3	3.7	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	79.4	20.6	100.0
Self-Employed Other	100.0	0.0	100.0
Other	66.0	34.0	100.0
Total	81.6	18.4	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Table 1.6: Socio-economic Group and Main Economic Activity

	Agriculture	Mining ManufacturingEnergy Construction	Private and Public Services	Household Duties	Other	Total
Socio-economic Group						
Employees	1.4	98.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	97.5	2.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Other	0.0	5.4	94.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	48.6	0.0	0.0	51.4	0.0	100.0
Total	81.1	11.9	6.7	0.3	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

1 Introduction

2 VILLAGE, POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

2.1.1 Introduction

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

2.2 Main Population Characteristics

Table 2.1 shows the percent distribution of the population by cluster location and poverty status, by gender and age. Overall, the district's population is young. For instance, just 4 percent of the population is over 60 years old, whereas 50 percent is under 15 years old. The remaining 46 percent is between 15 and 59 and groups. The location of the household does not seem to show strong correlation with the age of the population. However, poverty status does seem to be correlated with age.

People from non-poor households seem to be slightly older than the poor, especially women.

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

The mean dependency ratio is 1.1, meaning that one adult has to take care of more than 1 person. There seems to be no strong correlation between cluster location and the dependency ratio. However, on average poor households present a somewhat higher dependency ratio than non-poor households.

The dependency ratio increases with the number of household members, from 0.6 for households with 1 or 2 members, to 1.5 for households with 7 or more members. There are no apparently important differences in household size according to the socio-economic group of the main income provider. Households headed by males have higher a number of members aged 0 to 14, but also a higher number of members between 15 and 64, which results in no significant differences by gender of the household head.

Table 2.3 shows the percent distribution of households by number of household members. The mean household size is 5.1 individuals. Households with at most two individuals only represent 15 percent. Households with 3 to 6 members represent 64 percent of the total number of households; and households with 7 or more members represent 21 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	23.9	21.4	1.6	46.9	26.2	24.5	2.4	53.1	50.1	45.9	4.0	100.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	23.5	21.9	1.7	47.2	25.8	24.9	2.1	52.8	49.3	46.8	3.8	100.0
Remote	24.6	20.3	1.5	46.4	27.0	23.8	2.8	53.6	51.6	44.1	4.3	100.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	26.9	19.0	0.4	46.4	28.8	23.6	1.2	53.6	55.7	42.6	1.7	100.0
Non-poor	22.6	22.3	2.1	47.1	25.2	24.9	2.8	52.9	47.8	47.2	5.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

The breakdown by location shows that 37 percent of households located in accessible villages have 3 to 4 members, whereas the share for households in remote villages is 33 percent. Conversely, 19 percent of the former have 7 or more members, whereas the share for the latter is 26 percent. Both have roughly the same mean household size. Poverty status shows that poor households are significantly bigger than non-poor. Non-poor households have 4.4 members in average, while poor households have 5.8 members. Almost one third of them has 7 or more members, compared to just 18 percent of non-poor. On the other hand, 1 percent of the poor have at most 2 members, against 20 percent of the non-poor.

Regarding socio-economic groups, the employees have the highest mean household size, 6.3 members, followed by self-employed in agriculture (4.7), self-employed in non-agricultural activities (4.1) and "other" (2.2), where 70 percent

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	1.4	2.4	2.2	0.1	4.8	1.1
Cluster Location							
Accessible	0.9	1.4	2.3	2.2	0.1	4.7	1.1
Remote	1.0	1.5	2.5	2.2	0.2	4.9	1.2
Poverty Status							
Poor	1.3	1.9	3.2	2.5	0.1	5.8	1.3
Non-poor	0.8	1.3	2.1	2.2	0.2	4.4	1.1
Household size							
1-2	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.4	1.5	0.6
3-4	0.9	0.6	1.6	1.9	0.1	3.6	0.9
5-6	1.1	1.7	2.8	2.6	0.1	5.4	1.1
7+	1.5	3.3	4.7	3.3	0.2	8.1	1.5
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	1.3	2.3	3.6	2.7	0.0	6.3	1.3
Self-employed - agriculture	0.9	1.4	2.3	2.2	0.1	4.7	1.1
Self-employed - other	1.3	0.6	1.8	2.3	0.0	4.1	0.8
Other	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.9	0.7	2.2	1.4
Gender of Household Head							
Male	1.1	1.5	2.6	2.4	0.1	5.1	1.1
Female	0.4	1.0	1.3	1.6	0.3	3.3	1.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara 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	Mean household size
Total	15.0	36.0	27.9	21.0	100.0	4.8
Cluster Location						
Accessible	15.9	37.3	28.2	18.7	100.0	4.7
Remote	13.2	33.2	27.3	26.3	100.0	4.9
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.6	23.3	43.6	32.5	100.0	5.8
Non-poor	19.5	39.8	23.1	17.5	100.0	4.4
Socio-economic Group						
Employed	3.9	17.4	30.7	48.0	100.0	6.3
Self-employed - agriculture	14.8	38.1	27.7	19.4	100.0	4.7
Self-employed - other	15.7	42.1	31.8	10.4	100.0	4.1
Other	70.1	14.9	15.0	0.0	100.0	2.2
Gender of Household Head						
Male	8.4	37.2	30.7	23.7	100.0	5.1
Female	44.4	30.8	15.6	9.2	100.0	3.3

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

has at most two members.
Finally, households headed by males are larger than female headed households: the former have 5.1 members in average, whereas the latter have only 3.3 members.

2.3 Main Household Characteristics

Table 2.4 shows the percent distribution of total population by relationship to the head of household. The category "other relative" is non-negligible at all, representing 7 percent of the population. This refers to members of the extended or in-law family of the household head.

Poor households and households in remote villages have more children than their counterparts. When analysing by age-groups, it is clear that the category "other relatives" is mostly under 19 years old. This highlights the importance of the analysis of fostering and orphan status. After 30, most of the population is either head of their own household or spouse to the head of the household.

The gender split-up shows that males are roughly five times more likely to be household heads than females, with shares of 37 and 7, respectively. In turn, spouses and parents are overwhelmingly females.

Table 2.5 shows the percent distribution of the population aged 12 and above by marital status. Overall, 35 percent of the population has never been married. Roughly 40 percent is married and monogamous, and 14 percent is married and polygamous. Despite less than 1 percent being "officially" divorced, 4 percent of the population is "unofficially" separated. Informal unions constitute only 1.5 percent of the population and 5 percent is widowed.

People from poor households are more likely to have never been married, but no strong trend is detected between location and marital status.

The age breakdown shows that polygamous-married category peaks at the 40-49 group, with 30 percent of that age-group being a member of a polygamous marriage. For the population after 20 years old, married-monogamous is the most common category, except for the population aged 60 and over, where widowed is the most common category.

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

	Head	Spouse	Child	Parents	Other relative	Not related	Total
Total	21.0	16.6	55.0	0.3	6.9	0.2	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	21.4	16.8	53.8	0.2	7.6	0.3	100.0
Remote	20.3	16.1	57.5	0.6	5.5	0.1	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	17.2	14.1	62.1	0.5	6.1	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	22.6	17.5	52.1	0.3	7.3	0.3	100.0
Age							
0- 9	0.0	0.0	91.5	0.0	8.2	0.3	100.0
10-19	1.0	3.0	81.1	0.0	14.4	0.4	100.0
20-29	30.7	51.3	15.7	0.0	2.3	0.0	100.0
30-39	55.8	41.8	1.6	0.0	0.8	0.0	100.0
40-49	53.0	45.4	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-59	82.0	18.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
60 and above	77.9	12.0	0.0	8.6	1.5	0.0	100.0
Gender							
Male	36.5	0.9	55.8	0.0	6.7	0.1	100.0
Female	7.3	30.4	54.2	0.6	7.1	0.3	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Divorce does not show a trend but, as would be expected, "widowed" increases with age. "Never married" also shows correlation with age, decreasing as the population gets older.

Around 37 percent of the men have never been married, but for women the figure is lower, at 33 percent. While 9 percent of women are widowed, only 1 percent of men are in this category. Furthermore, females tend to be divorced or separated more commonly than men, who are more commonly married.

As shown in Table 2.6, around 41 percent of the population is self-employed in agriculture, with 53 percent in other activities. Individuals living in remote villages seem to be somewhat more likely to be self-employed in agriculture. Individuals from non-poor households are more likely to be employees.

The analysis of age-groups is particularly interesting. The share of employees increases with age, peaking at 17 percent for the 50-59 cohorts. A similar trend is observed for the self-employed in agriculture, but the peak (83 percent) is reached in the 40 to 49 group. The share of self-employed in other activities first increases with age, peaking at 8 percent for the group between 20 and 29 years old, and then decreases steadily. The category "other" decreases steadily with age, showing a sharp decrease between 15-19

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

	Never married	Married monogamous	Married polygamous	Informal, loose union	Divorced	Separated	Widowed	Total
Total	34.6	40.9	13.5	2.4	0.2	3.5	5.0	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	34.0	43.2	11.2	2.9	0.2	4.6	3.9	100.0
Remote	35.7	36.0	18.3	1.3	0.2	1.2	7.5	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	39.1	39.3	11.5	1.6	0.3	2.7	5.6	100.0
Non-poor	32.9	41.4	14.2	2.6	0.1	3.9	4.9	100.0
Age								
12-14	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	90.9	7.4	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	100.0
20-24	23.4	54.0	8.4	6.0	0.0	7.7	0.4	100.0
25-29	7.0	63.6	17.7	5.1	0.0	6.3	0.4	100.0
30-39	2.2	63.1	23.0	5.1	0.0	4.0	2.5	100.0
40-49	0.5	60.7	29.7	0.3	1.5	2.0	5.2	100.0
50-59	0.0	62.7	21.4	1.0	0.0	1.2	13.7	100.0
60 and above	0.0	34.8	13.4	0.0	0.0	10.6	41.2	100.0
Gender								
Male	36.5	44.7	14.6	2.6	0.1	0.7	0.7	100.0
Female	32.9	37.7	12.5	2.2	0.2	5.9	8.7	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

and 20-29, from 77 to 17 percent, then decreases steadily, and finally increases to 28 percent for the population aged 60 and above.

The gender breakdown shows that males are more likely to be employees or self-employed in non-agricultural activities than women, with shares of 6 and 4 percent against 1 and 1 percent for women, respectively. In turn, females are more likely to be in the "other" category, with a share of 56 percent against 50 percent for the males.

Table 2.7 shows the percent distribution of the total population aged 5 and above by highest level of education. Around 35 percent have no formal education, 33 percent have at most some primary, and 23 percent have completed primary. Virtually none has finished secondary education.

People from households in remote villages are more likely to have more education and less likely to have some secondary education. Similarly, it is clear that members of poor households are more concentrated in lower levels of education than members of non-poor households.

The age breakdown shows that 70 percent of the children between 5 and 9 have no formal education, but 84 percent of the children between 10 and 14 have at least some primary. Rates of no education are lower for the population between 10 and 19 and higher but roughly constant for the older groups except for the population aged 60 and over, where the share rises to 63 percent. 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: 40 against 30 percent. Finally, men are more as likely of having any education after completing primary, although the shares are fairly small: only 4 percent of all the males had any post primary education, share that is only 1 percent for females.

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

	Employed	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	2.9	41.2	2.5	53.4	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	3.6	39.7	3.3	53.4	100.0
Remote	1.4	44.4	0.9	53.3	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.1	41.9	0.3	57.7	100.0
Non-poor	4.0	40.8	3.4	51.8	100.0
Age					
5- 9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
10-14	0.3	1.3	0.3	98.1	100.0
15-19	1.7	19.8	1.1	77.4	100.0
20-29	1.9	72.3	8.6	17.2	100.0
30-39	6.1	82.2	3.8	7.9	100.0
40-49	5.4	82.9	3.4	8.3	100.0
50-59	17.3	74.6	1.6	6.5	100.0
60 and above	0.7	71.6	0.0	27.7	100.0
Gender					
Male	5.8	40.1	4.2	49.9	100.0
Female	0.5	42.1	1.1	56.3	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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

	None	Nursery school	Some primary	Completed primary	Some secondary	Completed secondary	Post secondary	Total
Total	35.3	2.2	33.0	23.0	4.3	0.0	2.2	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	34.0	2.5	31.4	23.7	6.1	0.0	2.3	100.0
Remote	38.1	1.6	36.3	21.4	0.5	0.0	2.1	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	48.0	3.9	32.8	13.9	0.3	0.0	1.1	100.0
Non-poor	30.4	1.6	33.0	26.6	5.8	0.0	2.6	100.0
Age								
5- 9	70.4	7.8	21.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	11.6	0.6	83.9	1.5	2.0	0.0	0.4	100.0
15-19	10.1	2.0	46.8	21.8	16.1	0.0	3.2	100.0
20-29	30.6	0.1	12.4	49.1	6.0	0.0	1.8	100.0
30-39	25.8	0.3	11.3	58.2	2.6	0.0	1.9	100.0
40-49	42.2	3.2	11.5	33.8	5.0	0.0	4.3	100.0
50-59	45.7	0.0	30.6	11.1	1.6	0.0	11.1	100.0
60 and above	62.7	0.0	32.7	0.7	0.6	0.0	3.2	100.0
Gender								
Male	29.8	1.4	36.5	23.7	5.2	0.0	3.5	100.0
Female	40.0	2.9	29.9	22.5	3.5	0.0	1.1	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household

Table 2.8 shows the percent distribution of household heads by marital status. Overall, 57 percent of the household heads are married and monogamous, 18 divorced, separated or widowed, 9 percent married and polygamous, 3 percent have never been married and 3 and live in an informal union.

The breakdown by cluster location shows a weak relationship between location and

marital status. Household heads in remote villages are more likely to be in a polygamous marriage and less likely to be monogamously married. Regarding poverty status, heads of non-poor households are more likely to be never married. In turn, heads of poor households are more likely to be monogamously married.

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

Overwhelmingly, most female household heads are divorced, separated or widowed (88 percent), whereas for males, this category roughly represents 3 percent for men. Most male household heads are married, monogamous or polygamous (90 percent, while the share for females is 11 percent).

Table 2.9 shows the percent distribution of household heads by socio-economic group. As expected, the great majority of the district's household heads is self-employed in agriculture, with a share of 83 percent. Self-employment in non-agricultural activities occupies 6 percent of the household heads and only 9 percent are employees.

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 90 and 80 percent, respectively. In accessible villages, household heads are more likely to be self-employed in non-agricultural activities than heads of households in remote villages, with shares of 7 and 3 percent, respectively.

Poor households are headed by individuals self-employed in agriculture more frequently than non-poor households (98 and 80 percent, respectively). On the other hand, the heads of non-poor households are employees (11 percent) or self-employed in non-agricultural activities (7 percent) more often than the heads of poor households (1 percent in each case).

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

	Never married	Married monogamous	Married polygamous	Informal, loose union	Divorced Separated Widowed	Total
Total	3.2	56.6	18.6	3.3	18.3	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	3.9	59.2	15.2	4.0	17.8	100.0
Remote	1.5	50.9	26.2	1.8	19.5	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	61.1	18.2	2.6	18.1	100.0
Non-poor	4.1	55.1	18.8	3.5	18.4	100.0
Age						
15-19	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
20-29	6.8	72.6	6.5	3.9	10.3	100.0
30-39	1.7	63.4	17.6	7.6	9.7	100.0
40-49	0.9	46.8	38.0	0.7	13.6	100.0
50-59	0.0	59.3	21.9	0.6	18.1	100.0
60 and above	0.0	34.1	12.4	0.0	53.5	100.0
Gender						
Male	3.7	69.3	20.5	4.1	2.5	100.0
Female	0.8	0.7	10.3	0.0	88.2	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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

	Employed	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	8.8	83.4	5.8	2.1	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	10.8	80.4	7.0	1.7	100.0
Remote	4.3	90.0	2.9	2.8	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.5	98.1	0.8	0.5	100.0
Non-poor	11.3	78.8	7.3	2.5	100.0
Age					
15-19	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
20-29	2.0	81.8	16.2	0.0	100.0
30-39	9.9	83.5	6.4	0.2	100.0
40-49	10.2	88.1	1.7	0.0	100.0
50-59	20.0	75.7	1.9	2.4	100.0
60 and above	0.9	87.8	0.6	10.6	100.0
Gender					
Male	10.3	81.8	7.0	0.9	100.0
Female	1.8	90.5	0.5	7.1	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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	34.4	22.0	33.6	4.9	0.0	5.1	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	34.5	21.7	31.8	6.5	0.0	5.5	100.0
Remote	34.2	22.8	37.5	1.3	0.0	4.2	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	71.0	10.2	18.1	0.0	0.0	0.6	100.0
Non-poor	23.0	25.7	38.4	6.5	0.0	6.5	100.0
Age							
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
20-29	36.0	21.0	37.6	2.7	0.0	2.7	100.0
30-39	24.5	10.8	57.8	3.9	0.0	3.0	100.0
40-49	31.3	15.9	37.3	9.5	0.0	6.1	100.0
50-59	37.1	35.4	12.7	1.9	0.0	12.9	100.0
60 and above	56.0	39.7	0.9	0.8	0.0	2.5	100.0
Gender							
Male	27.5	22.6	38.1	5.6	0.0	6.1	100.0
Female	65.0	19.3	13.5	1.8	0.0	0.4	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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 to draw solid statistical conclusions about them, so they will be excluded from the following analysis. For all age-groups, “self-employed agriculture” is the most important category, occupying around 80 percent or more of household heads. The “employee” category peaks at 20 percent for the group aged from 50 to 59. The cdss“self-employed – other” category starts at 16 percent for the 15-19 group and then decreases steadily until 1 percent for the household heads aged 60 and above. The “other” category gains importance the latter group, with a share 11 percent, as it includes the economically inactive population.

The socio-economic group of the household heads shows sharp gender differences. For instance, males are 5 times more likely to be employees than females. The same applies for the

household heads self-employed in non-agricultural activities. In turn, female household heads are 7 times more likely to work in other activities than males, and have a higher share of self-employment in agriculture (with shares of 91 and 82 percent, respectively).

Table 2.10 shows the percent distribution of the heads of household by highest level of education. Overall, only 10 percent of the household heads has any education after primary. Around 34 percent have no education, 22 percent some primary and 34 percent have complete primary.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that household heads in remote villages have higher rates of complete primary, but lower rates of "some secondary" than household heads from accessible villages.

Poverty status is strongly correlated with the education of the household heads. This should be no surprise, since education of the household head is one of the poverty predictors used to define poverty status. However, the difference is still important: while 71 percent of heads of poor households has no education, the share for non-poor is 23 percent. In the other extreme, whereas 13 percent of non-poor household heads has post secondary studies, the share for poor household heads is 1 percent.

The age breakdown shows that 65 percent of household heads aged 60 or over has no education, and 40 percent just some primary. Post secondary education goes up with age of the household head, until 59 years old. Complete primary represents around 58 percent for the groups between 30 and 39; but only 13 percent in the 50-59, where "some primary" gains importance.

The analysis by gender shows that female household heads are more likely to have no education. The share is 65 percent, against 28 percent of males. Around 14 percent of females have complete primary, against 40 percent of males.

2.5 Orphan and Foster Status

Table 2.11 shows the percent distribution of children under 18 years old who have lost at least one parent. Overall, about 3 percent of children under 18 lost both parents, while 2 percent lost only their mother only and 7 percent lost their father only. This amounts to 12 percent of all children under 18 who had lost at least one parent at the time of the survey.

A higher share of children from accessible villages has lost both parents (4 percent, against 1 percent of children in remote villages), but children from remote villages are more likely to have lost one parent, 13 against 6 percent, respectively. Similar differences are observed between children of poor and non-poor households

The age breakdown shows that orphan status is correlated with age, as would be expected. Around 26 percent of the children between 15 and 17 years lost a parent, and 23 of the children in that age lost their father. There does not seem to be a gender trend in orphan status.

The percent distribution of children under 18 years old by foster status is shown in Table 2.12. A childe is defined 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 25 percent of children under 18 were living in non-nuclear households at the time of the survey.

Table 2.11 - Orphan status of children under 18 years old

	Children who lost mother only	Children who lost father only	Children who lost both father & mother
Total	2.1	6.5	2.6
Cluster Location			
Accessible	1.0	5.4	3.5
Remote	4.1	8.5	0.8
Poverty Status			
Poor	1.8	9.4	1.8
Non-poor	2.1	5.1	3.0
Age			
0-4	0.5	1.5	0.1
5-9	1.6	4.6	2.8
10-14	4.5	11.0	4.5
15-17	2.8	17.2	6.0
Gender			
Male	2.8	7.0	1.2
Female	1.4	6.0	3.9

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Households in remote villages have higher shares of children living with their mother only, and households in accessible villages have higher shares of children living with their father only or with none of their parents. Similarly, children in poor households are more often living with their mother only, whereas children from non-poor households are more often living with their father only or with none of their parents.

There is no correlation between gender of the child and foster status. However, the analysis of age-groups shows that the share of children living in non-nuclear households increases with age, starting at 4 percent for children aged 0 to 4, going up to 41 percent for children between 15 and 17 years old.

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	9.3	7.0	8.2	24.6
Cluster Location				
Accessible	8.4	7.9	9.1	25.4
Remote	11.2	5.3	6.6	23.1
Poverty Status				
Poor	14.7	3.5	5.0	23.3
Non-poor	6.7	8.6	9.8	25.2
Age				
0-4	7.7	4.1	2.3	14.0
5-9	7.2	6.7	9.1	22.9
10-14	12.1	11.4	11.1	34.5
15-17	14.0	8.0	18.9	40.9
Gender				
Male	10.1	8.8	7.2	26.1
Female	8.6	5.5	9.2	23.3

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

2 Village, Population and Household Characteristics

3 EDUCATION

This chapter examines selected education indicators in Ngara district. 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. The adult literacy rate[1] is 61 percent. Literacy rates differ between accessible and remote villages at 64 and 53 percent respectively.

There is a significantly large difference in literacy rate among individuals living in poor and non-poor households. Whereas the literacy rate among non-poor households stands at 68 percent, the individuals in poor households have a literacy rate of 40 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of household shows that literacy rate is significantly higher among the employees (92 percent) than those in the remaining categories.

The gender breakdown shows an important literacy rate gap between men and women. The literacy rate among men is nearly 20 percentage points higher than that of women at 71 percent and 52 percent respectively.

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

Orphaned children have a literacy rate of 75 percent, whereas the rate for non-orphans is 8 points higher, at 83 percent. Similarly, foster children have lower literacy rate than non-foster children, at 53 and 85 percent, respectively.

3.1.2 Primary School Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction

Access

Primary school access rate is defined as the proportion of primary school-age children (7 to 13 years) reporting to live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school. Almost two-thirds (64 percent) of primary school-age children live within 30 minutes of a primary school. Primary school access is significantly higher in accessible clusters than in remote clusters. In fact, the rate of primary school access in accessible clusters is more than two times as high as that of remote clusters at 81 and 33 percent respectively.

Three quarters (75 percent) of the children aged 7 to 13 living in non-poor households live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school compared to only 42 living in poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that children leaving in households belonging to the employee or “other” category have a significantly higher access to primary schools than children living in households of self-employed socio-economic groups.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that primary school access is higher among children from female-headed households than that of children from male-headed households at 70 and 57 percent respectively.

Orphaned children have a higher access rate to primary schools than non-orphaned, at 68 and 62 percent, respectively. However, the converse is observed for fostered children: only 37 percent of fostered children have access to

primary schools, whereas the rate for non-fostered is 62 percent.

Enrolment

The two main measures of enrolment, the Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) and the Net Enrolment Rate (NER) are analysed in this section. GER is defined as the ratio of all individuals attending school, irrespective of their age, to the population of school-age children. If there is a large proportion of non-school-age individuals' attending school, the GER may exceed 100 percent. Primary school GER informs on the ratio of all individuals in primary school to the population of individuals of primary school-age (7 to 13 years) in the district.

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

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

The primary school GER was 117 percent at the time of the survey. This figure indicates that all individuals who were at primary school constitute 117 percent of all children of primary school-age in the district. The NER further shows that 80 percent of all primary school-age children were attending school. While the GER is almost the same for the clusters located in remote areas and for those in accessible areas, the NER for clusters located in the accessible areas is 7 percentage points higher than that of clusters located in remote areas.

Primary school enrolment does not vary much by poverty status. NER and GER are highest among people living in households belonging to the employee and self-employed other socio-economic groups, and lowest for the "other" socio-economic group

Furthermore, the gender breakdown shows that females have higher GER and NER than males.

Surprisingly, the breakdown by orphan status shows higher GER and NER for orphaned children. The same happens with fostered children. However, the small sample size in the in the orphan and foster categories (see chapter 2) must be kept in mind.

Table 3.1: Education indicators

		Primary				Secondary			
	Literacy rate	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction
Total	60.6	63.6	117.2	80.2	78.6	7.6	25.8	23.8	40.4
Cluster Location									
Accessible	64.0	80.5	118.0	82.6	79.4	10.9	34.9	32.9	38.1
Remote	53.0	32.8	115.8	75.8	77.0	0.0	4.9	3.2	77.9
Poverty Status									
Poor	39.9	41.6	114.5	78.0	82.7	2.8	4.9	4.9	34.9
Non-poor	67.7	75.3	118.9	81.5	76.5	9.2	32.9	30.3	40.7
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	91.5	90.2	121.1	91.7	89.6	10.9	58.4	48.9	90.9
Self-Employee - agric	56.4	58.1	117.6	78.4	77.1	7.6	19.2	18.4	14.2
Self-Employee - other	75.9	87.6	94.4	83.0	64.1	0.0	56.8	54.5	56.7
Other	24.1	100.0	83.5	38.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender									
Male	71.0	56.8	111.9	78.0	78.8	8.5	32.7	29.7	29.3
Female	51.6	69.7	121.8	82.1	78.3	6.9	20.4	19.2	54.4
Orphan status									
Orphaned	74.9	67.9	124.3	82.2	77.4	3.0	21.7	21.7	42.1
Not-orphaned	82.6	62.3	114.6	79.7	78.6	10.5	20.0	20.0	37.3
Foster status									
Fostered	53.4	36.6	133.1	90.5	38.1	2.7	2.7	2.7	100.0
Not-fostered	85.3	62.1	113.3	79.1	80.5	9.7	21.9	21.9	30.6

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara 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.

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.

More than three quarters (79 percent) of all primary school pupils were satisfied with the schools they were attending. Whereas a higher share of pupils living in poor households reported to be satisfied than those living in non-poor households, at 83 and 77 percent respectively, there is no significant difference in the satisfaction rates between pupils living in remote and accessible clusters.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the households shows that employees have a higher rate of satisfaction with their primary schools compared to the self-employed categories. Virtually all the children from the “other” socio-economic group are satisfied with their schools.

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.

Less than a tenth (8 percent) of all pupils in secondary school live within 30 minutes of travel to the nearest secondary school. The difference in access to secondary school between people living in accessible and remote clusters is noticeable at 11 and 0 percent respectively. Similarly, the access rate for individuals living in non-poor households is 3 times higher (9 percent) than that of individuals in poor households (3 percent).

The socio-economic status of the household seems to be strongly correlated with the secondary school access rate. Employees have the highest rate of access to secondary school at 11 percent, followed by the self-employed in non-agricultural activities (8 percent). The remaining categories have access rates of less than 1 percent.

The access rate for orphaned children is 3 percent, significantly lower than that for non-orphans, at 11 percent. Similarly, the difference between fostered and non-fostered children is significant, at 3 and 10 percent, respectively.

Enrolment

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

The GER and NER at secondary school are very low compared to primary school level. Overall, GER and NER were around 25 percent. There is a significant difference in the secondary school NER between households located in accessible and remote clusters at 33 and 3 percent respectively. Similarly, the secondary school GER is 30 percentage points higher in accessible clusters than that of remote clusters at 35 and 5 percent respectively. The breakdown by poverty status shows similar differences.
The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows employees and self-employed in non-agricultural activities are the categories with highest NER and GER, whereas the “other” category shows practically null enrolment rates.

Finally, there are noticeable gender differences in NER and GER. The rate is around 10 percentage points higher among males than among females. Although there seem to be no differences by orphan status, the difference between fostered and non-fostered children is significant, at 3 and 22 percent, respectively.

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	26.9	51.0	3.0	62.9	5.8	35.7	17.9	19.5	0.7
Cluster Location									
Accessible	28.7	54.2	3.0	62.7	7.1	34.0	18.6	25.8	0.0
Remote	22.5	41.1	3.1	63.7	1.6	40.6	15.9	0.0	2.8
Poverty Status									
Poor	18.7	62.7	7.6	54.4	2.0	43.0	31.1	2.1	0.0
Non-poor	30.1	48.1	1.9	65.0	6.7	33.9	14.7	23.7	0.9
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	10.2	38.4	0.0	84.9	19.7	0.0	9.3	15.6	0.0
Self-employed - agric	30.1	54.0	3.4	64.6	3.8	36.7	17.1	20.8	0.8
Self-employed - other	38.8	15.0	0.0	4.1	22.0	65.6	44.3	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender									
Male	29.0	57.5	4.7	71.9	3.0	32.1	17.6	30.3	0.0
Female	25.1	44.6	1.4	54.3	8.4	39.1	18.3	8.9	1.4
Type of school									
Primary	21.4	36.4	4.1	54.8	4.9	48.3	19.0	0.0	1.1
Government	22.4	36.4	4.1	54.8	4.9	48.3	19.0	0.0	1.1
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	59.6	73.0	1.4	91.8	9.1	16.0	17.4	67.8	0.0
Government	61.5	73.9	1.5	93.0	9.2	16.2	17.6	67.4	0.0
Private	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	17.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	28.9	95.4	0.0	19.0	0.0	0.0	9.8	0.0	0.0
Government	21.9	84.9	0.0	63.0	0.0	0.0	17.4	0.0	0.0
Private	14.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	52.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Satisfaction

More than a half (60 percent) of the total population enrolled in secondary schools is dissatisfied with their schools. Only 40 percent of this population is satisfied with the secondary schools they attend. This satisfaction rate is significantly lower than in primary schools (79 percent). The satisfaction rate is significantly higher among people living in households located in remote clusters than that of people living in accessible clusters at 78 and 38 percent respectively.

The breakdown by socio-economic groups shows that people living in households where the main income earner is an employee have a significantly higher satisfaction rate (91 percent) than people living than the rest of socio-economic groups.

Among the individuals enrolled in secondary schools, females were more satisfied with their schools than males. The satisfaction rate for females is almost twice as high as that of males at 54 and 29 percent respectively.

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.

Overall, around a quarter (27 percent) of students who were enrolled in either primary or secondary school reported dissatisfaction with the schools they were attending. Almost two-thirds of the dissatisfied individuals (63 percent) reported lack of teachers as the cause of their dissatisfaction. In addition, 51 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools because of lack of books and supplies, while 36 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools due to lack of space.

The dissatisfaction rate for people living accessible villages is about 6 percentage points higher than that of those living in remote villages. Dissatisfaction rate among non-poor households is higher than that among poor households at 30 and 19 percent respectively.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the dissatisfaction rates among households from the self-employed categories are the highest. At the same time the "other" socio-economic group reported the lowest dissatisfaction rate.

Those attending primary school report to be most dissatisfied by the lack of teachers (55 percent) followed by lack of space (48 percent) while those attending secondary schools report dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers (92 percent) followed by lack textbooks and supplies (73 percent) and high fees (68 percent).

3.2 Non-attendance

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

The district has about 11 percent of 7 to 19 year olds who were not attending school. Around 30 percent of the non-attending population did not attend because they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level. Just above one fifth (22 percent) of respondents reported that school was useless or uninteresting. While 18 percent were not attending school due to illness, 14 percent of the respondents reported non-attendance because they failed standard four, seven or form four exams. None of the respondents reported non-attendance due to pregnancy or distance to schools.

Children from poor households and

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 admis.	Dismissed
Total	10.9	29.7	0.0	9.0	10.2	17.8	0.0	3.8	21.5	14.1	0.0	2.9
Cluster Location												
Accessible	10.1	31.0	0.0	6.5	12.7	23.0	0.0	2.9	14.3	10.5	0.0	3.1
Remote	12.5	27.3	0.0	13.5	5.8	8.3	0.0	5.4	34.4	20.5	0.0	2.6
Poverty Status												
Poor	12.6	25.8	0.0	10.9	6.1	8.6	0.0	0.0	18.0	15.5	0.0	2.7
Non-poor	10.0	32.2	0.0	8.2	12.5	21.3	0.0	5.9	23.6	13.5	0.0	3.1
Socio-economic Group												
Employed	3.1	23.8	0.0	0.0	76.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - agric	12.1	28.9	0.0	9.9	7.8	18.6	0.0	2.3	22.7	14.5	0.0	3.2
Self-employed - other	12.1	57.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.9	0.0	42.2	0.0	21.4	0.0	0.0
Other	32.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender												
Male	9.6	27.4	0.0	7.7	17.2	8.3	0.0	0.0	32.0	18.6	0.0	4.8
Female	11.9	31.2	0.0	9.9	5.5	24.1	0.0	6.4	14.4	11.0	0.0	1.7
Age												
7-13	1.3	0.0	0.0	13.4	0.0	42.1	0.0	0.0	19.8	9.8	0.0	0.0
14-19	23.0	31.8	0.0	8.7	10.9	16.1	0.0	4.1	21.6	14.4	0.0	3.1

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

remote villages have higher rates of non-attendance than children from non-poor households and accessible villages. Furthermore, while 23 percent of those living in accessible clusters were not attending school due to illness, the share for children in remote clusters was 8 percent. The most prominent cause for non-attendance in remote clusters is children who reported finding school useless or uninteresting.

Nearly all the primary school-aged children attend school, as their non-attendance rate is only 1 percent. On the other hand, about three quarters (77 percent) of secondary school-aged individuals attend school. Around a third (32 percent) of secondary school-aged individuals not attending secondary school reports having completed school (standard seven, O and A-level); while 22 percent said it was useless or uninteresting.

3.3 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 0.4 percent, too low to arrive to solid statistical conclusions. Therefore, only enrolment rates will be analysed.

Overall, 80 percent of primary school-aged children were enrolled at the time of the survey. Out of those in primary school-age (7 to 13 years), 82 percent of girls and 78 percent of boys 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. Children are most likely to be in school by ages 11 or 12, where the NER is at 92 percent.

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	78.0	82.1	80.2	0.0	0.7	0.4
7	34.4	49.6	41.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	77.6	94.4	88.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	90.2	78.7	83.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
10	74.9	84.2	79.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11	94.3	88.3	91.5	0.0	2.2	1.0
12	91.3	92.1	91.9	0.0	1.8	1.2
13	92.2	86.7	89.8	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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	29.7	19.2	23.8	4.9	2.0	3.3
14	4.7	19.0	12.6	2.8	2.2	2.5
15	31.2	5.5	15.8	6.0	1.6	3.3
16	10.4	27.4	19.3	7.5	2.5	4.9
17	42.9	23.9	33.4	5.3	0.0	2.6
18	46.9	30.8	37.2	5.3	2.1	3.4
19	63.9	14.8	38.2	3.2	3.0	3.1

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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

Secondary School

Table 3.5 shows secondary net enrolment patterns by age. Secondary school enrolment rates are much lower than those at primary level. Nearly a quarter (24 percent) of secondary school-aged children was enrolled compared to 80 percent in primary school. For a person following a normal school curriculum, i.e. started standard one at age 7, he/she is expected to start form one at age 14. From this table we see that NER increases gradually with age. The biggest difference in enrolment rates is observed between age 16 and 17. Nearly one third (33 percent) of 17 years old reported to be enrolled at the time of the survey. It is also noticeable that the rate of boys enrolled in secondary school at the age of 14 was lower than that of girls enrolled in secondary school at the same age at 5 and 19 percent respectively.

Secondary school drop-out rates among secondary school-age individuals (14 to 19 years) are higher compared to those of primary school. 3 percent of children of secondary school-age students had dropped out in the year prior to the survey. In general, the highest drop-out rate is observed among 16 year olds. The highest drop-out rates among males are at ages 15 and 16 while female drop out rates are highest at ages 16 and 19.

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	71.0	51.6	60.6
15-19 years	89.7	72.6	80.1
20-29 years	66.6	58.8	61.6
30-39 years	69.8	57.0	63.7
40-49 years	60.9	32.6	46.2
50-59 years	70.6	12.4	50.7
60+ years	57.8	15.2	32.8
Accessible	72.6	56.4	64.0
15-19 years	91.2	74.1	81.9
20-29 years	68.7	67.6	68.0
30-39 years	69.3	66.4	68.0
40-49 years	62.3	28.4	43.1
50-59 years	71.8	5.2	50.3
60+ years	62.2	23.6	40.8
Remote	67.5	41.2	53.0
15-19 years	85.7	69.5	76.1
20-29 years	62.6	37.1	47.4
30-39 years	71.1	40.4	54.0
40-49 years	58.6	44.9	52.8
50-59 years	67.6	26.3	51.6
60+ years	47.1	2.1	17.7

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base for table is population age 15+

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	84.5	66.8	73.5
15-17 years	84.0	73.5	78.2
18-20 years	94.0	68.7	78.2
21-22 years	82.4	46.5	58.8
23-24 years	52.6	67.0	63.2
Accessible	88.1	72.2	78.1
15-17 years	85.2	75.0	79.8
18-20 years	96.3	73.2	81.6
21-22 years	90.3	62.4	72.7
23-24 years	53.6	72.8	69.7
Remote	77.0	54.3	63.4
15-17 years	81.2	71.0	75.1
18-20 years	88.7	56.2	69.5
21-22 years	61.6	18.4	30.7
23-24 years	51.8	42.8	47.4

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base for table is population age 15-24 years

3.5 Literacy

Literacy is defined as the ability to read and write in at least one language. Those who can read but not write were counted as illiterate. The data on literacy was solely obtained by asking the respondent if he/she was able to read and write. Besides this information, no further tests on their ability to read or write were taken. Furthermore, questions that helped determine adult literacy was only asked for individuals aged 15 or older.

Adult Literacy

Overall, 61 percent of the population aged 15 and above in the district are literate. The difference in literacy rates among men and women is about 19 percentage points at 71 and 52 percent respectively. Individuals aged between 15 and 19 have the highest literacy rate (80 percent) while only 33 percent of those who are above 60 years know how to read and write. There are significant gender differences in literacy, being larger for the older cohorts.

The literacy rate in accessible villages is about 11 percentage points higher than in remote villages. The literacy rate for the 15-19 age-groups in remote villages is 76 percent, whereas for accessible villages the rate is 82 percent. Furthermore, in accessible villages the literacy rate of men is 17 percentage points higher than that of women. In remote villages, the difference increases to 23 percentage points. On the contrary, while the literacy rate of women in accessible villages is about 15 points higher than that of women in remote villages, the difference in literacy rates between men in accessible and remote villages is 5 percentage points. Finally, there is a significant difference in literacy rates among men and women above 60 years in both cluster locations. In both cases, the literacy rates of men over 60 years is above 38 percentage points higher than that of women.

Youth Literacy

Table 3.7 shows literacy rates among the youth by age, gender and residential location. Youth literacy rate is calculated for all persons between 15 and 24 years old.

The literacy rate for this group is 74 percent, but the gender difference is important. While the literacy rate for men is 85 percent, the rate for women is almost 20 percentage points lower, at 67 percent.

Analysis by age-groups shows that 15 to 20 year olds have the highest literacy rate at 78 percent. While the youth of 18 to 20 years in accessible villages have the highest literacy rates, it is the youth of 15 to 17 years who have the highest literacy rates in remote villages. Youth literacy rate in remote villages is about 15 points higher than that of youth in accessible villages at 78 and 63 percent respectively.

3 Education

4 HEALTH

This chapter examines health indicators for the population in Ngara 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 an 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 of 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 medical services indicators. Overall, 49 percent of the households have access to medical services. Conversely, 51 percent of the households in the district do not have access to medical services.

Households in remote villages have lower access to medical services at 28 percent than households in accessible villages (59 percent). Both show similar proportions of use and satisfaction, but households in remote villages report higher need rates (31 percent) than households in accessible villages (27 percent).

Non-poor households have higher access rates than poor households, with shares of 60 and 29 percent, respectively. The breakdown by poverty status does not show sharp differences by need, use or satisfaction.

Regarding socio-economic status of the households, the employees show the highest access rate, at 89 percent, and the highest satisfaction, at 94 percent, while the self-employed in agriculture showed the lowest rates of access at 43 percent and satisfaction at 88 percent. Self-employed in non-agricultural sectors showed similar access to those in 'other' but the differences in need rates with 25 and 39 percent, respectively. Employees

Table 4.1 - Health Indicators

	Medical Services			
	Access	Need	Use	Satisfaction
Total	49.3	27.9	31.6	89.6
Cluster Location				
Accessible	59.3	26.6	31.7	89.2
Remote	28.2	30.6	31.5	90.6
Poverty Status				
Poor	28.9	27.9	29.3	85.6
Non-poor	57.6	28.0	32.6	91.1
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	90.9	22.0	31.1	94.3
Self-employee - agriculture	43.0	28.8	31.2	88.8
Self-employee - other	55.1	21.6	36.7	90.6
Other	49.6	59.5	47.3	94.2
Gender				
Male	46.6	28.2	30.5	90.5
Female	51.6	27.7	32.6	88.9
Age				
0-4	43.8	46.6	73.9	93.4
5-9	51.4	17.7	17.7	77.3
10-14	49.2	16.7	15.0	91.3
15-19	53.4	14.1	11.0	87.8
20-29	49.0	24.3	24.7	97.0
30-39	51.4	23.2	21.2	83.1
40-49	56.3	32.3	28.3	88.2
50-59	20.9	10.3	10.3	62.2
60+	48.6	45.8	35.7	81.1

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara 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.

Base of table is total population

showed the lowest rate of need, at 21 percent and the highest satisfaction rate, at 94 percent. Households where the household head was self-employed in agriculture showed slightly lower satisfaction rates, at 89 percent.

There are no gender differences in need, use or satisfaction, but females report a higher access at 52 percent while males report 47 percent.

The population aged between 50 and 59 reported the lowest access rate (21 percent), the lowest need and use rates (10 percent), and the lowest satisfaction (62 percent). Access is reported at 44 percent for children under 5, increases to 53 percent for the population aged between 15 and 19, and reduces to 49 percent for ages between 20 and 29 then starts increasing again, peaking at 56 percent for the 40-49 group. The rate of need is highest at 47 percent for children under 5 and 46 percent for the group aged 60 and above. Need decreases for the population between 5 and 19 years old, where it is around 16 percent, increasing slightly for the 20 to 29 age-group at 24 percent. The use rate is reported highest among the under 5 at 74 percent while decreasing drastically to an average of 15 percent for the 5 to 19 cohorts. Satisfaction rates are highest among the 20 to 29 age-group at 97 percent, the under 5 at 93 percent, and 10 to 14 at 91 percent. The satisfaction rate is lowest at 62 percent among the 50 to 59 age 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 10 users of healthcare facilities is dissatisfied, mostly because of long waits (49 percent) and unsuccessful treatment (39 percent). Cost as reason for dissatisfaction was reported by 17 percent of the population while, unavailability of drugs was reported by 13 percent.

The analysis by cluster location shows that households in remote villages are more commonly dissatisfied by an unsuccessful treatment (47 percent, against 36 percent for households in accessible villages),

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

		Reasons for dissatisfaction						
	Percent dissatisfied	Facilities not clean	Long wait	No trained professionals	Cost	No drugs available	Treatment unsuccessful	Other
Total	10.4	0.0	48.7	0.0	16.5	13.0	39.1	0.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	10.8	0.0	60.4	0.0	14.8	13.0	35.9	0.0
Remote	9.4	0.0	20.3	0.0	20.7	13.1	46.7	0.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	14.4	0.0	49.8	0.0	13.4	13.6	21.5	0.0
Non-poor	8.9	0.0	48.1	0.0	18.3	12.7	49.4	0.0
Socio-economic Group								
Employee	5.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - agric	11.2	0.0	52.8	0.0	18.3	13.1	35.6	0.0
Self-employed - other	9.4	0.0	46.3	0.0	8.4	30.4	14.9	0.0
Other	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Gender								
Male	9.5	0.0	48.7	0.0	15.4	17.3	39.7	0.0
Female	11.1	0.0	48.7	0.0	17.3	10.0	38.6	0.0
Type of provider								
Public hospital	13.2	0.0	60.8	0.0	16.6	16.1	29.1	0.0
Private hospital	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Religous hospital	1.9	0.0	64.9	0.0	35.1	0.0	35.1	0.0
Village health worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private Doctor/Dentist	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pharmacist	9.8	0.0	6.3	0.0	17.3	5.3	71.0	0.0
Trad. Healer	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	87.0	0.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.7	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base of Table is total population

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

	Percent not consulting	Reasons for not consulting				
		No need	Cost	Distance	No confidence	Other
Total	68.3	96.1	2.5	0.7	0.1	0.5
Cluster Location						
Accessible	68.3	97.4	1.6	0.1	0.0	0.5
Remote	68.5	93.4	4.3	2.0	0.3	0.5
Poverty Status						
Poor	70.6	96.3	2.6	0.7	0.1	0.2
Non-poor	67.4	96.0	2.4	0.7	0.1	0.6
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	68.9	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	68.8	95.9	2.7	0.8	0.1	0.6
Self-employed - other	63.3	94.9	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	52.7	76.8	18.0	5.2	0.0	0.0
Gender						
Male	69.5	96.5	2.1	0.7	0.1	0.5
Female	67.4	95.8	2.8	0.7	0.1	0.5
Type of sickness/injury						
Fever/malaria	5.2	3.5	86.1	14.3	0.0	0.0
Diarrhea/abdominal pains	5.2	8.7	61.5	29.8	0.0	0.0
Pain in back, limbs or joints	19.7	8.5	55.3	36.9	4.5	3.8
Coughing/breathing difficulty	7.4	0.0	71.4	9.9	7.4	11.2
Skin problems	4.2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ear, nose, throat	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Eye	21.8	16.3	55.5	28.2	0.0	0.0
Dental	32.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Accident	25.8	0.0	53.9	100.0	0.0	0.0
Other	11.6	50.2	0.0	49.8	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base of Table is total population

whereas households in accessible villages report long waits more often (60 percent, against 20 percent of the households in remote villages).

The breakdown by poverty status shows long wait as the leading cause of dissatisfaction for both poor and non-poor households at 49 and 48 percent, respectively followed by unsuccessful treatment as the second reason for dissatisfaction at 21 percent for the former and 43 percent for the latter. Cost among non-poor households was the third reason for dissatisfaction at 20 percent versus the poor households at 10 percent. Drug availability was reported as a dissatisfaction factor by 14 percent for non-poor and 11 percent for poor households.

Employees are the socio-economic group with the lowest dissatisfaction rate at 6 percent. Unsuccessful treatment was the only reported reason for dissatisfaction. The self-employed in both agriculture and non-agriculture cited long waits as the major reason for dissatisfaction at 53 percent and 46 percent respectively, while 'others' cited cost as the lead reason at 40 percent. Unsuccessful treatment was the second reason for dissatisfaction in households where the main income earner is either self-employed in agriculture (36 percent) or in the 'other' category (33 percent), while drug unavailability was the second most cited reason for the 'self-employed other' (30 percent).

The breakdown by gender shows that 48 percent of both males and females cited long wait as the first reason for dissatisfaction followed by unsuccessful treatment at 40 percent for males and 39 percent for females.

Regarding health provider, the main cause of dissatisfaction in public hospitals is the long wait at 61 percent and 65 percent in religious hospitals. For pharmacists and traditional healers, unsuccessful treatment is the leading factor at 71 and 87 percent respectively.

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

	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	27.9	58.2	22.1	12.5	17.2	2.2	1.5	2.3	1.0	0.8	1.4
Male Total	28.2	60.7	20.6	12.9	13.0	3.5	2.6	2.5	1.1	1.5	1.1
0-4	55.1	73.6	30.2	3.7	17.3	2.7	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
5-9	13.9	38.7	3.6	0.0	13.7	3.2	28.5	6.9	0.0	5.4	0.0
10-14	12.9	52.8	27.9	11.2	3.6	2.6	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.8
15-29	20.3	56.5	6.6	7.5	4.6	13.5	2.2	0.9	0.0	6.0	3.8
30-49	23.6	62.5	6.0	17.9	15.4	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.4	1.4	0.0
50-64	36.1	44.9	30.8	46.4	7.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	6.4	0.0	0.0
65+	38.8	13.1	23.1	68.5	16.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.2	0.0	5.3
Female Total	27.7	56.0	23.5	12.1	21.0	1.1	0.4	2.1	0.9	0.2	1.7
0-4	37.8	79.6	30.0	0.7	14.6	2.3	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
5-9	20.5	40.4	18.8	0.0	28.9	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	11.2
10-14	20.3	46.5	23.4	3.6	39.3	3.9	1.9	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
15-29	19.9	56.5	17.7	10.0	14.0	0.0	1.3	1.8	2.4	0.0	0.7
30-49	29.7	56.6	30.1	19.4	18.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.0	0.0
50-64	47.1	40.7	12.6	28.4	14.2	0.0	0.0	6.3	3.9	0.0	2.0
65+	66.5	28.3	18.7	50.9	33.6	1.3	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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

Base of Table is population sick (D4=1)

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	Pharmacist, chemist	Traditional healer	Other	Total
Total	59.7	1.4	13.3	1.4	0.0	16.0	8.0	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	56.8	1.2	18.4	0.3	0.0	17.0	6.2	0.1	100.0
Remote	65.8	1.6	2.6	3.6	0.0	13.7	11.9	0.8	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	70.6	0.3	0.9	3.4	0.0	11.4	12.3	1.2	100.0
Non-poor	55.8	1.7	17.8	0.6	0.0	17.6	6.4	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	61.5	0.9	20.8	1.5	0.0	15.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	59.1	1.5	11.2	1.4	0.0	16.6	9.8	0.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	62.6	0.0	29.7	1.4	0.0	5.5	0.8	0.0	100.0
Other	67.4	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	26.6	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base of Table is population who consulted a health provider (D7=1)

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, 68 percent of the population did not consult a health provider, typically because there was no need (96 percent of the cases). However the remaining, 4 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 groups of the household shows some differences. Virtually all the employees who did not consult health facilities had no need to do so, whereas in 'other' the share was 91 percent. The main reason was cost, which represents up to 18 percent from the 'other' people who did not consult.

There are no gender differences in the reasons for not consulting a health provider.

The split-up by type of illness shows that for most infirmities, fever including malaria (86 percent), diarrhoea (62 percent), eye (55 percent), and pain (55 percent), and skin problems (100 percent) and coughing (71 percent), the main cause for not consulting a health practitioner is cost. It is worth noticing the relatively low percentage of people not receiving attention (5 percent) 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 58 percent of the population. In turn, diarrhoea, abdominal pain, and coughing or breathing difficulties come in second and third place, with 22 and 17 percent of the ill population. Pain in the back limbs or joints affected 13 percent of the ill population, whereas other illnesses had minor shares.

The gender breakdown reveals that females and males make up a similar proportion of sick or injured population at 28 percent, and there are no dramatic differences by type of illness. The age breakdown shows that the share of sick/injured population starts at 55 percent for males and 38 percent for females under 5 years old, decreases drastically for the 5 to 9 age-group, to 14 percent for males and to 21 percent for females. It increases again for the 30 to 49 cohort, peaking for the population aged 65 and above at 39 percent for males, and 66 percent for females in that age-group. The share of ill population affected by malaria is highest among the under 5 at 74 percent for males and 80 percent for females. The rate of ill population affected by malaria decreases with age, but other problems emerges, mainly pain in back, limbs or joints. However, malaria and fever continues to be a prominent cause of sickness at above 40 percent for both male and females in the 65+ cohort.

4.5 Health Provider

Table 4.5 shows the percent distribution of health consultations in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, 60 percent of the consultations were made in a public hospital, 16 percent in a pharmacist or chemist, 13 percent in a religious hospital, and 8 percent to traditional healers. Private hospitals and village health workers were consulted just in 1 percent of the cases.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that 66 percent of people from remote villages and 57 percent from accessible villages visited public hospitals. People from accessible villages visited religious hospitals (18 percent) more frequently than people from remote villages (3 percent). 17 percent of people who consulted from accessible villages visited pharmacists or chemists while their counterparts in remote villages did so at a rate of 13 percent. People from remote villages visited traditional healers at 12 percent, twice the share for accessible villages.

Poor households consulted public hospitals more often than non-poor households, with shares of 71 and 56 percent, respectively. In turn, members of non-poor households tend to consult chemists and religious hospitals more often (17 and 18 percent vs. 13 and 5 percent, respectively).

Public hospitals are the most visited health facility for all socio-economic groups. Self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the highest share, at 63 percent, followed by employees (61 percent) and self-employed in agriculture at 60 percent. Private hospitals were

visited most by self-employed in non agricultural activities at 25 percent. Traditional healers are visited most by households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture at 10 percent, whereas pharmacists and Chemists were visited most by households from the 'other' category at 26 percent.

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, 17 percent of women in this age-group gave birth in the past year. No girls aged 14 or under gave birth in the district, but 6 percent of the females between 15 and 19 gave birth. The rate peaks at 32 percent for the 20-24 group, and then goes down to 20 percent for the 25 to 29 cohort increasing to 30 percent for the 30 to 39 cohort, ending at 16 percent for the group aged 40 to 49. 96 percent of pregnant women received prenatal care.

The breakdown by cluster location shows a sharp difference between accessible and remote villages. The trend shows higher birth rates for women in remote villages than for women in accessible villages until the age of 40.

The analysis by poverty status reveals that 24 percent of women from poor households had a live birth in the year preceding the survey, higher than the share for non-poor females, at 14 percent. Females from non-poor households report 8 percent of women having live births in the 15-19 cohorts whereas females from poor households reported no births in this age-group. The share of women who had live births peaks for women from poor households at 58 percent for the 30 to 39 age-group while for non-poor households the peak is at 28 percent for the 20 to 29 age-group.

The breakdown by socio-economic status of the household shows that the highest rates correspond to the self-employed, with shares of 20 percent and 14 percent for agricultural and non-agricultural, respectively, whereas 'other' shows the lowest share, of just 1 percent overall. Self-employed in non-agricultural activities show the highest rates (49 percent for women between 25 and 29 years old); and in second place self-employed in agriculture (40 percent for the 20 to 24 cohort).

Table 4.6: Percentage of women aged 12-49 who had a live birth in the year preceding the survey 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	5.7	32.2	20.6	30.2	15.8	17.3	96.2
Cluster Location								
Accessible	0.0	4.0	26.7	19.9	23.6	18.2	15.1	96.2
Remote	0.0	9.2	46.1	22.2	41.9	8.7	22.1	96.2
Poverty Status								
Poor	0.0	0.0	46.5	27.3	50.4	22.0	24.3	97.3
Non-poor	0.0	7.9	29.2	18.2	18.3	12.9	14.6	95.6
Socio-economic Group								
Employee	0.0	0.0	6.3	32.2	13.4	0.0	8.8	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.0	5.2	38.2	17.6	32.0	17.2	18.4	95.8
Self-employed - other	0.0	33.2	5.9	49.4	49.3	0.0	16.7	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	54.1	42.6	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base of Table is Females 12+

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	38.3	1.4	2.4	0.0	57.6	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	51.7	1.0	1.8	0.0	45.6	0.0	100.0
Remote	12.0	2.1	3.8	0.0	81.3	0.7	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	18.1	0.0	2.3	0.0	79.6	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	48.1	2.1	2.5	0.0	47.0	0.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	64.6	5.2	4.3	0.0	26.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	34.3	0.7	2.4	0.0	62.2	0.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	40.5	2.6	0.0	0.0	56.9	0.0	100.0
Other	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	87.5	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base of Table is total number of children under 5

Table 4.7 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey. Roughly, 58 percent of births in this period took place at home, almost 38 percent in a hospital, and 2 percent at a dispensary.

Women from accessible villages gave births in hospitals more often than at home (52 and 46 percent, respectively), while women from remote villages had more births at home (81 percent) and less in hospitals (12 percent).

The breakdown by poverty status shows that women from non-poor households had more deliveries in hospitals than women from poor households (with shares of 48 and 18 percent, respectively), whereas women from poor households had more deliveries at home (80 and 47 percent, respectively).

The split-up by socio-economic group of household shows that 65 percent of the employees gave birth in hospitals, whereas a similar rate of self-employed in agriculture gave birth at home. Women from households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category also gave birth at home at a higher rate (60 percent) than in hospitals (41 percent) a trend similar to the women of households belonging to the 'other 'socio-economic group.

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, 60 percent of deliveries were attended by a health professional, mostly midwives (38 percent of births). Traditional birth assistants (TBA) and trained TBA accounted for 21 and 13 percent of births, respectively, whereas doctors and nurses attended 5 percent of the deliveries in the district.

The analysis by cluster location shows midwives were more common in accessible villages (48 vs. 18 percent), whereas not receiving assistance was more common in remote villages (38 vs. 15 percent). 65 percent of births in accessible villages reported being attended by a health professional versus 37 percent in remote villages.

Non-poor households show a higher share of deliveries attended by a professional, 67 percent, against 32 for the poor. Poor households report higher shares of deliveries attended by T.B.A and without assistance (33 and 34 percent, respectively).

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that employees report the highest share of deliveries attended by professionals (79 percent), while the remaining groups fluctuate around 50 percent. Employees had the highest rates of births attended by a doctor or nurse, at 21 percent, and midwives, at 52 percent.

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)

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

	Doctor	Nurse Midwife	T.T.B.A.	T.B.A.	Other Self	Don't know	Total	Delivery by health prof.
Total	5.1	37.9	12.9	21.2	22.7	0.2	100.0	55.9
Cluster Location								
Accessible	6.3	48.0	10.9	19.5	15.1	0.2	100.0	65.2
Remote	2.8	17.8	16.8	24.7	37.6	0.3	100.0	37.4
Poverty Status								
Poor	1.0	21.1	10.3	33.3	34.3	0.0	100.0	32.4
Non-poor	7.1	45.9	14.1	15.5	17.1	0.4	100.0	67.1
Socio-economic Group								
Employee	21.8	52.2	5.2	10.1	10.7	0.0	100.0	79.2
Self-employed - agriculture	3.0	35.5	14.7	24.7	21.8	0.3	100.0	53.1
Self-employed - other	1.0	42.1	5.3	2.9	48.7	0.0	100.0	48.4
Other	0.0	12.5	28.4	17.3	41.8	0.0	100.0	40.9

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base of Table is total number of children under 5

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

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

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

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

Overall, 1 percent of all the children are wasted, and 48 percent are stunted. More than half the children (58 percent) participate in nutrition programs. Most children participate in weigh-ins and are vaccinated (98 percent for each category).

Cluster location and poverty status are correlated with nutrition. Poor households have higher rates of stunted children, but there are no strong differences in wasting.

Regarding socio-economic status, children from households in the self-employed agriculture category show the highest rates for stunted children, at 54 percent, whereas children from households where the main income earner is an employee have the lowest rate, at 24 percent.

The gender breakdown shows no difference in rates of wasted children, but the rate of stunted males is higher than that of stunted females (53 against 43 percent, respectively). Furthermore, girls are more likely to participate in nutrition programs than boys (69 vs. 49 percent, respectively).

Table 4.9: Nutritional status indicators and program participation rates

	Nutritional status indicators		Program participation		
	Stunted	Wasted	Nutrition	Weigh-in	Vaccinated
Total	47.8	0.9	58.7	98.1	97.7
Cluster Location					
Accessible	47.9	0.6	54.8	98.2	98.3
Remote	47.6	1.4	66.1	97.8	96.4
Poverty Status					
Poor	54.0	0.8	43.4	97.3	97.8
Non-poor	45.1	0.9	65.7	98.4	97.6
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	23.9	0.0	74.1	100.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	54.3	0.9	58.1	97.6	97.4
Self-employed - other	27.4	2.1	41.7	100.0	98.2
Other	51.3	0.0	28.4	100.0	79.6
Gender and age in completed years					
Male	52.6	0.9	49.0	97.7	96.5
0.0	57.6	0.0	50.5	93.3	92.0
1.0	58.6	1.3	51.4	98.5	98.5
2.0	51.6	2.9	49.7	98.4	96.2
3.0	49.4	0.0	51.2	100.0	99.0
4.0	49.0	0.0	37.7	98.1	97.1
Female	43.0	0.8	68.9	98.5	98.9
0.0	53.9	1.8	53.5	97.2	97.1
1.0	20.7	2.3	72.7	100.0	100.0
2.0	48.6	0.0	68.2	97.8	98.6
3.0	39.4	0.0	86.6	100.0	100.0
4.0	70.2	0.0	55.4	96.2	98.2
Orphan status					
Orphaned	62.3	0.0	41.4	100.0	100.0
Not-orphaned	47.7	0.9	58.8	98.0	97.6
Foster status					
Fostered	60.5	0.0	59.3	100.0	100.0
Not-fostered	47.6	0.9	58.6	98.0	97.6

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

The breakdown by orphan and foster status shows that orphaned and fostered children are more likely to be stunted. Orphaned children are less likely to participate in nutrition programs (41 percent) than non-orphaned children (59 percent).

Table 4.10 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by type of vaccination received[1]. Overall, 79 percent of children under 5 years old have vaccination against measles, 97 against BCG, and roughly between 90 and 95 percent received vaccinations against DPT and OPV. Finally, 81 percent of the children in the district receive vitamin A supplements.

Children from non-poor households are more likely to receive vitamin A supplements and to be vaccinated against measles. Children from accessible villages are more likely to receive vitamin A than children from remote villages.

he gender breakdown shows that for most vaccines girls have higher vaccination rates than boys.

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, but the information for children from poor households came more frequently from sources other than a health card. The main difference by socio-economic group is that 99 percent of the vaccinated children from

[1] BCG: Anti-tuberculosis; DPT: Diphtheria, Pertussis, Tetanus; OPV: Oral Polio Vaccine

the 'self-employed other' category had vaccination cards, whereas in the 'other' category the share was around 79 percent.

Finally, all children aged 1 and above had vaccination cards. Children under 1 year of age had vaccination cards in 91 and 78 percent of the cases, for females and males, respectively.

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	78.5	97.3	97.8	93.9	92.4	90.3	97.7	93.7	92.3	80.8
Cluster Location										
Accessible	78.9	96.5	98.3	94.5	94.5	95.8	98.3	94.5	94.5	82.6
Remote	77.6	98.7	96.7	92.6	88.2	79.5	96.4	92.1	88.1	77.2
Poverty Status										
Poor	74.8	94.5	96.5	92.7	90.2	85.5	96.5	92.2	90.1	78.5
Non-poor	80.2	98.5	98.4	94.4	93.4	92.5	98.2	94.4	93.4	81.8
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	89.7	94.2	97.1	94.3	94.3	96.6	97.1	94.3	94.3	70.9
Self-employed - agriculture	76.6	97.5	97.7	93.4	91.5	88.6	97.6	93.2	91.5	81.0
Self-employed - other	79.6	100.0	99.0	99.0	99.0	98.7	99.0	99.0	99.0	94.4
Other	78.6	100.0	100.0	78.6	78.6	78.6	100.0	78.6	78.6	78.6
Gender and age in completed years										
Male	75.9	96.6	97.1	93.1	91.6	86.7	97.1	92.8	91.6	83.4
0	13.5	85.9	87.3	69.2	62.6	76.0	87.3	67.9	62.6	35.7
1	84.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	91.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.8
2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.1
3	100.0	99.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.8
4	84.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	69.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.9
Female	81.2	98.0	98.4	94.7	93.2	94.0	98.2	94.7	93.1	78.0
0	25.6	95.1	92.3	86.8	80.4	93.5	91.3	86.8	79.1	45.1
1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	71.9
2	96.5	94.7	100.0	100.0	98.6	92.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.6
3	89.9	99.0	100.0	89.9	89.9	92.1	100.0	89.9	89.9	87.8
4	97.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.9

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base of table is total number of children under 5

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	97.3	2.7	100.0
Remote	95.6	4.4	100.0
Poverty Status			
Poor	94.0	6.0	100.0
Non-poor	98.0	2.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group			
Employee	95.9	4.1	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	96.8	3.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	99.0	1.0	100.0
Other	78.6	21.4	100.0
Gender and age in completed years			
Male	95.3	4.7	100.0
0.0	78.3	21.7	100.0
1.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
2.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
3.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
4.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	98.2	1.8	100.0
0.0	91.1	8.9	100.0
1.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
2.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
3.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
4.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base of table is total number of children under 5 vaccinated

5 EMPLOYMENT

This chapter examines employment indicators for the population of Ngara DC. The first part analyses the employment status of the adult[1] population. The second part 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 district's adult population 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.

[1]In this chapter adult population refers to all individuals 15 years and older

5.1.1 Work Status

Table 5.1 shows that 72 percent of the adult population is employed and 21 percent underemployed. Unemployment is virtually null. This shows that underemployment is a bigger problem in the area than unemployment. Households in remote villages and poor households show higher employment rates and lower underemployment than remote villages. For both genders, underemployment peaks for the cohort aged between 30 and 49. Around 44 percent of the males in this group are underemployed, whereas the share for females is 18 percent. Employment peaks at 83 percent for males in the 50-63 cohorts, and for females at 93 percent in the 50-64 cohorts.

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, ill people, etc. rather than people looking for work and ready for it. For the

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	72.1	20.7	92.8	0.0	7.2	7.2	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	67.1	24.8	91.9	0.0	8.1	8.1	100.0
Remote	83.3	11.7	95.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	80.6	16.0	96.6	0.0	3.4	3.4	100.0
Non-poor	69.3	22.3	91.5	0.0	8.5	8.5	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	66.3	27.9	94.2	0.0	5.8	5.8	100.0
15-29	73.1	20.3	93.4	0.0	6.6	6.6	100.0
30-49	55.1	43.9	99.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	100.0
50-64	83.3	12.4	95.7	0.0	4.3	4.3	100.0
65+	47.9	6.1	53.9	0.0	46.1	46.1	100.0
Female	77.1	14.5	91.7	0.0	8.3	8.3	100.0
15-29	74.6	16.1	90.7	0.0	9.3	9.3	100.0
30-49	80.5	17.6	98.1	0.0	1.9	1.9	100.0
50-64	93.3	2.6	95.8	0.0	4.2	4.2	100.0
65+	62.3	1.4	63.7	0.0	36.3	36.3	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara 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 wholooked for work in the same period. The inactive population, primarily students and

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

	Total population			Heads of household		
	Active population	Unemployment rate	Underemployment rate	Active population	Unemployment rate	Underemployment rate
Total	92.8	0.0	22.3	93.7	0.0	34.8
Cluster Location						
Accessible	91.9	0.0	27.0	93.4	0.0	41.0
Remote	95.0	0.0	12.3	94.4	0.0	21.1
Poverty Status						
Poor	96.6	0.0	16.6	96.7	0.0	32.7
Non-poor	91.5	0.0	24.3	92.8	0.0	35.4
Gender and age						
Male	94.2	0.0	29.6	95.7	0.0	37.1
15-29	93.4	0.0	21.7	99.1	0.0	40.7
30-49	99.0	0.0	44.3	99.2	0.0	46.2
50-64	95.7	0.0	13.0	95.6	0.0	13.4
65+	53.9	0.0	11.2	53.9	0.0	11.2
Female	91.7	0.0	15.9	84.7	0.0	23.4
15-29	90.7	0.0	17.7	100.0	0.0	44.7
30-49	98.1	0.0	18.0	96.6	0.0	44.1
50-64	95.8	0.0	2.7	92.6	0.0	4.9
65+	63.7	0.0	2.2	58.8	0.0	4.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara 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.

population over 65 the number of inactive population is higher, as would be expected, reaching 36 percent for females and 46 percent for males.

5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads

Table 5.2 shows the principal labour force indicators for the adult population compared to the household heads. Activity rates are similar for total population and household heads, but underemployment is higher among the latter at 35 percent, vs. 22 percent of the former.

The gender breakdown shows that 37 percent of male household heads are underemployed, whereas the rate for all males is lower at 29 percent. In turn, the rate for female household heads is higher than the rate for all females, at 23 and 16 percent respectively.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that almost half male household heads aged between 15 and 49 are underemployed, whereas the rate for females between those ages 18 percent. The rates for older cohorts go down to 5 percent for males and 3 percent for females.

5.1.3 Youth Employment

Table 5.3 shows the distribution of the youth (ages 15 to 24) by work status. This group has slightly lower rates of activity than the overall population, at 89 percent. Moreover, underemployment is lower: only 1 of every 10 workers is underemployed, as opposed to 1 of every 5 workers for the overall population. Further, the youth from non-poor households and the youth from households in accessible villages have higher underemployment than their counterparts.

A breakdown by gender shows that underemployment is higher among the female youths than male youths, with rates of 12 and 7 percent, respectively. By dividing the cohort into two groups, it can be seen that underemployment is higher in the 20-21 group.

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

	Active population				Active		
	Employed	Under emp.	Working	Unemployed	Total	Inactive	Total
Total	79.1	10.0	89.0	0.0	89.0	11.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	74.2	11.4	85.6	0.0	85.6	14.4	100.0
Remote	89.6	6.9	96.5	0.0	96.5	3.5	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	97.3	1.3	98.6	0.0	98.6	1.4	100.0
Non-poor	73.4	12.7	86.1	0.0	86.1	13.9	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	83.9	7.3	91.2	0.0	91.2	8.8	100.0
15-16	92.2	3.0	95.2	0.0	95.2	4.8	100.0
17-19	89.8	2.3	92.1	0.0	92.1	7.9	100.0
20-21	49.0	19.4	68.3	0.0	68.3	31.7	100.0
22-23	84.1	15.9	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	76.1	11.6	87.7	0.0	87.7	12.3	100.0
15-16	87.3	0.0	87.3	0.0	87.3	12.7	100.0
17-19	66.9	13.2	80.1	0.0	80.1	19.9	100.0
20-21	73.8	22.7	96.5	0.0	96.5	3.5	100.0
22-23	77.2	10.8	88.1	0.0	88.1	11.9	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

1. Underemployed includes persons who sought to increase earnings in the seven days preceding the survey.
2. Unemployed includes persons who did not work in the four week period preceding the survey and who looked for work in the same period. The inactive population, primarily students and retired persons, is not included.

5.2 Working population

Table 5.4 shows that the vast majority of the working population is formed by self-employed (71 percent) or unpaid workers (22 percent). Moreover, employees only account for 8 percent of the working population. The self-employed population is somewhat higher in remote villages and poor households. In poor households, less than 1 percent has a position as an employee.

The gender breakdown shows that a higher share of males works as employees or is self-employed, whereas almost 26 percent of females are unpaid. The cut down by age-groups shows that the share of employees peaks for males in the 50-64 age-groups at 23 percent, the self-employed for 65+ males at 91 percent and unpaid for 50-64 females at 92 percent.

The percentage distribution of the working population by employer is analysed in Table 5.5. The table shows that the private sector (formal or informal) employs 76 percent of the working population, which combined with individuals who work for their own households represent up to 97 percent of the working population.

As would be expected, positions in State/NGO are more common in accessible villages and in non-poor

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

	Employee	Unpaid worker	Self-employed	Total
Total	7.7	21.7	70.6	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	9.2	21.8	69.0	100.0
Remote	4.3	21.5	74.2	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.5	25.7	73.8	100.0
Non-poor	10.3	20.3	69.4	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	13.1	17.0	69.9	100.0
15-29	6.4	41.7	51.9	100.0
30-49	16.2	0.3	83.4	100.0
50-64	23.4	0.0	76.6	100.0
65+	5.3	4.1	90.6	100.0
Female	2.8	25.9	71.3	100.0
15-29	3.7	38.4	57.9	100.0
30-49	2.6	13.0	84.4	100.0
50-64	0.0	7.7	92.3	100.0
65+	0.0	12.0	88.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base is working population age 15+

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

The population working in the State/NGO peaks for males aged 50-64 at 16 percent; whereas 36 percent of young females (15-29) work for the household. In contrast, most men after 30 work for either the private sector or State/NGO, whereas 42 percent of the 15-29 cohorts work for a household. Finally, the share of females working in the private sector increases gradually with age.

Table 5.6 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by main activity. The categories are agriculture; mining, manufacturing, energy and construction (MMEC); services (transport, trade, private and public services); domestic duties; and other. The most important result is that agriculture and domestic duties together account for 91 percent of the working population. 74 percent of the population is engaged in agriculture, and 17 percent in domestic duties.

The working population from remote villages and poor households is engaged in agriculture with higher frequency than their counterparts, who have higher shares in MMEC and services.

The gender breakdown shows that the most common activities for females are agriculture and household duties, accounting for 97 percent of the working population. These are the main activities for men as well, but they are less concentrated, with 17 percent in MMEC, services, and other activities.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that younger cohorts have higher shares dedicated to household duties. Nearly 9 percent of males aged 30 to 49 works in MMEC. The share of women in agriculture increases steadily with age until 64, and then reduces slightly, as household duties for this group increases.

Table 5.7 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by employment status, gender and activity. For both genders, the predominant activity for employees is services. The second most important activity for male employees is MMEC (34 percent).

Self-employed in non-agricultural activities are mostly engaged in MMEC (males) and services (females). The rest of the working population is mostly concentrated in domestic duties (89 percent for males, 75 percent for females).

Table 5.5 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employer

	State/NGO/ Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	3.3	75.8	20.9	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	4.0	74.7	21.3	100.0
Remote	1.7	78.3	20.0	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.0	75.9	24.1	100.0
Non-poor	4.5	75.8	19.8	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	6.2	77.1	16.6	100.0
15-29	1.2	57.3	41.5	100.0
30-49	7.7	92.0	0.3	100.0
50-64	16.0	83.4	0.6	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.7	74.7	24.6	100.0
15-29	0.6	63.1	36.3	100.0
30-49	1.1	85.8	13.1	100.0
50-64	0.0	94.2	5.8	100.0
65+	0.0	84.3	15.7	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base is working population age 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	73.8	3.3	5.3	17.1	0.5	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	70.7	4.1	6.9	17.7	0.6	100.0
Remote	80.4	1.6	2.0	15.7	0.3	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	80.8	0.0	0.8	18.4	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	71.2	4.5	7.0	16.6	0.7	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	68.6	6.7	8.8	14.9	1.1	100.0
15-29	49.9	6.7	5.4	36.8	1.3	100.0
30-49	82.6	9.2	7.3	0.7	0.2	100.0
50-64	73.0	1.0	22.6	0.6	2.9	100.0
65+	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	78.4	0.3	2.3	19.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	65.9	0.6	3.2	30.3	0.0	100.0
30-49	90.7	0.0	1.9	7.4	0.0	100.0
50-64	96.2	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	100.0
65+	90.8	0.0	0.0	9.2	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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	10.8	25.3	67.8	76.0
MMEC	31.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.9	16.5	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.3
Services	62.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	38.1	83.5	0.0	0.0	8.5	2.2
Domestic duties	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.5	74.7	16.2	21.5
Other	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.9	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base is working population age 15+

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

	Government/NGO		Private		Household		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	72.9	78.9	68.6	78.4
Mining & non-primary	34.6	0.0	13.9	0.0	5.2	0.3	6.7	0.3
Services	65.4	100.0	75.1	100.0	5.0	1.7	8.8	2.3
Domestic duties	0.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	15.7	19.1	14.9	19.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.1	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base is the working population age 15+

The percentage distribution of the working population by employer, gender, and activity is depicted in Table 5.8. The working population employed by the government or by a private agent (whether formal or informal) is mostly dedicated to services. Individuals whose employer is the household are mainly dedicated to agriculture, and in second place to domestic duties.

5.3 Underemployed Population

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status is shown in Table 5.9. Overall, 89 percent of the underemployed population is self-employed, 9 percent employees, and 3 percent are unpaid workers. Even though self-employed are 71 percent of the working population, they represent almost 90 percent of the underemployed.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that employees are more common among the underemployed from remote villages and self-employed are so in accessible villages. Regarding poverty status, non-poor households have a higher share of

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

	Employee	Unpaid worker	Self-employed	Total
Total	8.5	2.5	89.0	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	7.9	2.6	89.5	100.0
Remote	11.3	2.3	86.5	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	3.0	0.0	97.0	100.0
Non-poor	9.9	3.1	86.9	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	9.9	1.2	89.0	100.0
15-29	5.7	4.1	90.2	100.0
30-49	11.5	0.0	88.5	100.0
50-64	6.6	0.0	93.4	100.0
65+	47.3	0.0	52.7	100.0
Female	6.3	4.7	89.0	100.0
15-29	3.7	8.2	88.2	100.0
30-49	10.4	0.0	89.6	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base is the underemployed population age 15+

unpaid workers and employees, whereas the non-poor show a higher share of self-employed.

The gender breakdown reveals that underemployed females and males are mostly concentrated in the self-employed category, with a share of 89 percent in both cases.

Table 5.10 shows the percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer. Overall, the underemployed population mostly works for a private employer at a rate of 95 percent. Household and "State/NGO/Other" each account for 3 percent of the underemployed population.

The division between remote and accessible villages does not show wide differences. Non-poor households have higher shares in "State/NGO/Other" and "household" than poor households.

The gender breakdown does not show wide differences either, except that females have a slightly higher shares working for the household (5 percent vs. 1 percent of males). The age-group analysis shows that in both cases, the population underemployed population working for the household belongs to the 15-29 cohorts.

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by main economic activity is presented in Table 5.11. The most outstanding conclusion is that 9 out of 10 underemployed workers are dedicated to agriculture.

There are no striking differences by cluster location, but underemployed from poor households (96 percent) are more likely to be engaged in agriculture than the ones from non-poor households (88 percent).

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed women are more concentrated in agriculture (96 percent) than men (86 percent). The second most important activity for men is the mining, manufacturing, energy and construction sectors

The analysis of age-groups shows that the share of males in MMEC peaks in the 15-29 cohort at 18 percent. In the rest of activities (except agriculture) each age-group has a share of around 5 percent or less.

Table 5.10 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer

	State/NGO/Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	2.6	94.9	2.5	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	2.8	94.4	2.8	100.0
Remote	1.5	97.7	0.8	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	3.3	93.7	3.1	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	3.1	95.7	1.2	100.0
15-29	2.8	93.1	4.1	100.0
30-49	2.2	97.8	0.0	100.0
50-64	12.9	87.1	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	1.8	93.6	4.6	100.0
15-29	0.0	92.1	7.9	100.0
30-49	4.5	95.5	0.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base is working population age 15+

Table 5.11 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/ manuf/ energy/constr	Public & private services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	89.9	5.1	3.5	1.2	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	89.4	5.5	3.7	1.5	0.0	100.0
Remote	92.4	3.1	2.9	0.0	1.5	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	96.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	88.4	6.3	3.4	1.6	0.3	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	86.1	8.1	4.1	1.2	0.4	100.0
15-29	73.1	17.8	5.1	4.1	0.0	100.0
30-49	91.8	4.7	3.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	87.1	0.0	6.6	0.0	6.3	100.0
65+	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	96.1	0.0	2.6	1.3	0.0	100.0
15-29	96.4	0.0	1.3	2.3	0.0	100.0
30-49	95.5	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base is the underemployed population age 15+

Table 5.12 - Percentage distribution of the unemployed population by reason

	No work available	Seasonal inactivity	Student	HH/Family duties	Age: too old	Age: too young	Infirmity	Retired	Other	Total
Total	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Remote	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender and age										
Male	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base is the unemployed population age 15+

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

	No work available	Seasonal inactivity	Student	HH/Family duties	Age: too old	Age: too young	Infirmity	Retired	Other	Total
Total	0.0	1.8	37.4	0.9	11.4	0.0	39.5	0.0	9.1	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	0.0	0.0	42.5	0.0	5.5	0.0	43.0	0.0	9.0	100.0
Remote	0.0	8.4	18.4	4.1	33.4	0.0	26.3	0.0	9.3	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	0.0	15.9	7.0	7.8	15.9	0.0	37.1	0.0	16.3	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	0.0	41.2	0.0	10.9	0.0	39.8	0.0	8.2	100.0
Gender and age										
Male	0.0	4.9	27.8	0.0	14.8	0.0	34.8	0.0	17.8	100.0
15-29	0.0	6.1	62.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.1	0.0	15.6	100.0
30-49	0.0	29.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.2	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.9	0.0	49.1	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.6	0.0	59.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	0.0	42.9	1.4	9.5	0.0	42.2	0.0	4.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	73.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.1	0.0	0.0	47.9	0.0	34.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.4	0.0	36.8	0.0	36.8	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.1	0.0	71.9	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base is the inactive population age 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. None of the sampled individuals was unemployed.

Table 5.13 shows the main causes of economic inactivity. Overall, infirmity and being a student are the main reasons for inactivity, affecting three-quarters of the inactive population (40 and 37 percent, respectively). The category "too old" explains most of the remaining share.

Infirmity and being a student show higher shares in accessible villages than in remote ones. In turn, being too old is more important in remote than in accessible villages. In non-poor households, being a student is a reason for inactivity in 41 percent of the cases, whereas in poor households this is a reason only for 7 percent.

Infirmity and being a student are the main cause of inactivity for both genders, but the shares are higher for females. The breakdown by age-groups shows that infirmity occurs across the whole inactive population. On the other hand, students are concentrated in the 15-29 cohorts.

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 this population are taking care of the sick, elderly, and children. All the activities are undertaken by more than 50 percent of the population.
In remote villages, household activities are undertaken by equal or higher shares of the population than in accessible villages. The breakdown by poverty status shows that shares in poor households are higher than in non-poor households, for all activities.

The most important differences are shown in the gender and age breakdown. Females have much higher shares than men, except for taking care of the elderly or sick.

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

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

	Fetching water	Fetching firewood	Cleaning toilet	Cooking	Care of children	Care or elderly/sick
Total	67.6	59.5	67.2	59.6	71.3	93.2
Cluster Location						
Accessible	67.8	57.2	65.4	58.3	71.0	93.4
Remote	67.1	64.6	71.2	62.5	72.1	92.9
Poverty Status						
Poor	71.4	64.5	76.7	61.7	81.2	96.3
Non-poor	66.4	57.8	63.9	58.9	67.9	92.2
Gender and age						
Male	44.5	35.8	44.7	19.2	53.4	91.8
15-29	75.5	57.3	62.6	37.1	48.0	90.7
30-49	30.7	24.1	36.0	7.9	65.8	96.4
50-64	9.5	15.2	29.6	6.2	40.3	93.9
65+	12.2	19.7	15.7	7.4	35.0	53.4
Female	87.4	79.8	86.5	94.2	86.7	94.5
15-29	95.0	83.8	93.9	97.6	91.7	99.0
30-49	90.4	84.5	88.2	98.1	89.7	97.7
50-64	75.0	77.7	71.7	90.8	73.5	91.1
65+	30.2	29.1	39.1	53.6	48.5	48.3

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara 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	93.9	62.5	56.9	60.7	65.6	71.1
Cluster Location						
Accessible	94.2	55.6	55.3	58.7	61.8	69.4
Remote	93.2	76.1	60.0	64.5	73.2	74.4
Poverty Status						
Poor	95.1	75.1	58.0	60.6	74.8	72.8
Non-poor	93.3	56.1	56.3	60.6	61.1	70.2
Gender and age						
Male	93.3	68.2	57.7	54.5	60.4	68.7
5-9	91.2	52.9	30.2	31.2	44.1	45.7
10-14	94.9	79.6	78.4	71.9	72.7	85.9
Female	94.3	57.8	56.3	65.7	69.8	73.1
5-9	91.4	35.9	30.0	43.9	62.8	54.9
10-14	97.2	78.7	81.2	86.4	76.6	90.3
Orphan status						
Orphaned	96.2	64.3	70.6	66.8	56.3	83.5
Not-orphaned	93.3	61.8	54.4	59.5	68.1	69.0
Foster status						
Fostered	96.4	49.0	57.4	67.1	42.1	59.2
Not-fostered	93.3	63.8	55.4	58.6	66.3	70.3

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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 for children is higher than for the rest of the population. The rates of children performing most household tasks are higher in remote villages than in accessible villages. In turn, the rates tend to be higher in non-poor than in poor households.

There is no gender difference in fetching water. Males are more likely to fetch firewood, and girls are more likely to cook and take care of children, the elderly and sick. The analysis by age-groups shows that the 10-14 cohorts has higher rates than the younger children, for all household tasks.

The main descriptive statistics for child labour are presented in Table 5.16. The most important result of the table is that around half the children are economically active. They mostly work in the household, with a rate of 89 percent.

The share of working children does not vary by cluster location, but it is higher in poor households. The particular activity does not show evident correlation with remoteness, but children from poor households have higher shares in household activities and agriculture, whereas children from non-poor households have higher shares in other activities. Regarding the type of employer, the share of working children employed by a private agent is higher in accessible villages and in non-poor households.

The main difference is given by the age breakdown. As would be expected, the 10-14 cohorts have higher shares in the working population than the 5-9 cohorts. Furthermore, almost all children in the former cohort are working (96 percent for males and females). Their work mostly entails household duties.

The share of working population among orphaned children is twice as high that for not-orphaned. The rates are 83 percent for the former and 45 percent for the latter. Similarly, fostered children are more likely to work than non-fostered children, at rates of 64 and 47 percent.

Table 5.16 - Child labour (age 5 to 14)

		Main activity			Employer	
	Working	Agriculture	Household	Other	Private	Household
Total	48.9	2.6	88.6	8.7	7.9	92.1
Cluster Location						
Accessible	48.3	2.8	87.5	9.7	9.0	91.0
Remote	50.0	2.3	90.9	6.8	5.9	94.1
Poverty Status						
Poor	51.9	4.2	93.8	2.0	1.9	98.1
Non-poor	47.4	1.8	86.0	12.2	11.0	89.0
Gender and age						
Male	46.1	4.0	88.4	7.6	6.3	93.7
5-9	27.1	0.0	82.1	17.9	11.9	88.1
10-14	95.6	6.9	93.1	0.0	2.2	97.8
Female	51.3	1.5	88.8	9.6	9.2	90.8
5-9	34.1	0.5	80.3	19.1	18.2	81.8
10-14	95.9	2.4	96.7	0.9	0.9	99.1
Orphan status						
Orphaned	83.2	3.7	94.1	2.2	3.4	96.6
Not-orphaned	44.9	2.5	87.8	9.7	8.8	91.2
Foster status						
Fostered	63.9	6.3	85.0	8.7	13.3	86.7
Not-fostered	46.8	2.5	88.4	9.1	8.1	91.9

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

6 PERCEPTIONS OF WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES

This chapter presents the perceptions on welfare status and changes in Ngara district. 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 presents the perceptions of crime and security in the community. Section six presents the main income contributor to the household. A brief analysis of ownership of selected household items concludes the chapter.

6.1 Economic Situation

The analysis of this section is based solely on the perception of the interviewees. The main respondent for this part of the questionnaire was the household head. In cases where the household head

was not able to respond i.e. was travelling, sick or had little information on the household's daily practices, then the best-informed household member responded. The respondents were asked to comment on whether the situation had changed for the better/worse or remained the same compared to the year prior the survey.

6.1.1 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Community

Table 6.1 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of the economic situation of the community compared to the year before the survey. Results show that around a quarter (27 percent) of all households in the district perceive a positive change in the economic situation of their community. Only 14 percent of the population reported observing no changes in their community's economic situation. Even though the majority reported the community economic condition to be worse (56 percent), about a fifth (22 percent) reported the situation to be much worse while the rest reported it to be worse.

Looking at the overall community economic situation by household characteristics, it is observed that about half (52 percent) of the people living in accessible clusters report a worse condition in their community's economic situation compared to 64 percent of those living in remote clusters. Poverty status of the household shows correlation with the perceived economic change, as there is a difference of 13 percentage points between the poor and non-poor who reported worse conditions at 66 and 53 percent respectively.

Households that own little land report worse conditions in the community's economic situation. 61 percent of households owning no land and 67 percent of households owning less than one hectare of land report worse economic situation of their community while 49 percent of those owning six or more hectares of land share this perception. Whereas 53 percent of households owning large livestock report better economic conditions in their communities, only 21 percent of households with no livestock and 29 percent of households owning only small livestock report better economic conditions of their community.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that while 15 percent of male-headed households report same economic conditions compared to the year prior the survey, only 8 percent of female-headed households share the same perception. Likewise, a larger percentage of female-

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	22.0	33.6	13.5	26.4	0.8	3.7	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	18.0	33.9	13.0	30.0	0.5	4.6	100.0
Remote	30.9	33.0	14.6	18.5	1.3	1.6	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	25.9	39.5	11.1	21.8	1.1	0.6	100.0
Non-poor	20.8	31.9	14.1	27.9	0.6	4.7	100.0
Household size							
1-2	24.4	35.4	7.4	23.6	0.0	9.1	100.0
3-4	21.6	40.4	14.2	21.3	0.0	2.4	100.0
5-6	21.6	32.4	14.8	25.6	0.9	4.7	100.0
7+	21.4	22.4	15.0	38.3	2.3	0.7	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	25.5	35.2	11.8	3.3	0.0	24.2	100.0
< 1 ha	25.4	42.4	17.8	10.5	0.0	3.9	100.0
1-1.99 ha	27.4	41.7	14.8	12.3	1.9	1.9	100.0
2-3.99 ha	19.4	30.9	14.9	31.3	0.4	3.1	100.0
4-5.99 ha	18.7	25.7	11.6	39.3	0.8	3.9	100.0
6+ ha	21.2	27.7	1.5	47.8	1.8	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	24.5	32.9	16.6	21.2	0.2	4.6	100.0
Small only	17.4	37.0	12.8	28.1	0.8	3.7	100.0
Large only	29.8	17.2	0.0	53.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	26.1	29.1	8.4	32.4	2.5	1.5	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	14.7	23.4	19.6	40.5	1.8	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	23.2	34.3	13.5	25.8	0.3	2.8	100.0
Self-employed - other	9.9	37.9	4.6	23.5	5.9	18.2	100.0
Other	36.5	35.4	13.6	0.0	0.0	14.4	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	22.1	32.2	14.7	28.2	0.8	2.0	100.0
Female	21.4	39.8	8.2	18.7	0.6	11.3	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	18.5	52.1	9.4	20.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	24.3	33.4	11.6	29.3	0.9	0.7	100.0
Polygamous	20.4	33.6	23.9	20.8	0.8	0.4	100.0
Loose union	0.0	16.6	17.3	31.1	0.0	35.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	21.1	34.2	9.1	23.6	0.6	11.4	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	23.6	36.4	8.8	25.2	0.3	5.7	100.0
Primary	20.9	33.7	15.2	26.6	0.5	3.0	100.0
Secondary +	22.5	23.9	20.2	29.4	3.4	0.7	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

headed households report worse economic conditions in their communities than male-headed households.

6.1.2 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Household

Table 6.2 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of their

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	27.3	26.4	19.3	25.6	0.9	0.5	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	24.3	24.4	20.5	29.1	1.0	0.7	100.0
Remote	34.0	30.7	16.5	17.9	0.8	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	39.9	27.8	17.3	14.5	0.5	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	23.5	26.0	19.8	29.1	1.1	0.6	100.0
Household size							
1-2	34.4	15.3	34.6	14.9	0.0	0.8	100.0
3-4	29.3	35.8	15.1	18.5	0.3	0.9	100.0
5-6	26.1	22.7	23.1	26.4	1.7	0.0	100.0
7+	20.5	22.8	10.5	44.6	1.6	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	36.1	16.5	39.0	0.0	0.0	8.4	100.0
< 1 ha	42.9	19.3	20.1	16.3	0.5	0.8	100.0
1-1.99 ha	28.4	38.7	14.7	16.3	1.9	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	26.0	26.0	20.7	27.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	18.4	19.9	16.6	44.4	0.8	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	15.6	30.2	15.7	34.0	4.6	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	38.9	22.4	22.3	14.9	0.4	1.1	100.0
Small only	20.5	28.0	16.2	34.2	1.1	0.0	100.0
Large only	3.7	21.6	11.3	63.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	14.6	36.4	21.0	25.7	2.3	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	3.2	24.2	16.8	50.2	1.8	3.9	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	30.9	27.1	19.9	21.6	0.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	10.7	26.5	1.2	55.7	5.9	0.0	100.0
Other	29.4	6.4	58.2	0.0	0.0	6.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	25.0	27.3	17.0	29.2	1.0	0.4	100.0
Female	37.3	22.1	29.4	10.0	0.6	0.7	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	18.5	5.9	42.7	32.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	26.4	30.3	13.2	28.9	1.2	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	24.1	31.6	21.4	20.2	0.8	1.8	100.0
Loose union	0.0	12.2	27.1	60.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	39.8	14.9	30.6	13.5	0.6	0.7	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	40.0	25.1	19.1	15.2	0.3	0.4	100.0
Primary	22.6	28.8	17.9	30.1	0.6	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	10.2	17.1	27.6	37.0	4.6	3.4	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

economic situation compared to the year before the survey. Only about a quarter (27 percent) reported better economic conditions, while only 19 percent reported same conditions compared to the year preceding the survey.

While 65 percent of those living in remote clusters reported economic deterioration of the household, the share for accessible clusters was 48 percent. The same pattern is observed between poor and non-poor households. Poor households express more negative views on their economic condition than non-poor households, with a difference of 18 percentage points.

The percentage of households reporting much worse economic conditions is higher for smaller households. Likewise, households owning little or no land report much worse economic conditions than households with large portions of land. Furthermore, whereas the majority (61 percent) of households who own no livestock report worse economic conditions, about the same percentage (64 percent) of households owning large livestock report better household economic conditions.

55 percent of households where the head is widowed divorced or separated report deterioration in their households' economic conditions compared to only 12 percent of households where the head has a loose union (not officially married). Likewise, female-headed households report worse conditions in their households more often than male-headed households. Finally, while 42 percent of household heads who have secondary education or more report better economic conditions of their households, this is the case for only 15 percent of those who have no education and 31 percent of those who have some primary education.

6.2 Self-reported Difficulties in Satisfying Household Needs

This section analyses the difficulties households faced in satisfying selected needs during the year prior the survey. These needs are 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, over a half (54 percent) of the district's households never/seldom experience food shortages while the remaining population experience food shortages frequently (often/always).

People living in remote clusters report difficulties satisfying food needs more often than people living in accessible clusters. While 54 percent of the people living in remote clusters experience food shortages frequently (often/always), 43 percent of those living in accessible clusters report frequent problems satisfying food needs. Similarly, 58 percent of the poor experience food shortages frequently, compared to only 42 percent of the non-poor.

Households with larger landholdings tend to report frequent problems satisfying food needs with less frequency. At the time of the survey, only 14 percent of households owning 6 or more acres reported frequent problems satisfying food needs compared to nearly two thirds (64 percent) of the landless households. Furthermore, there is also a positive correlation between livestock ownership and satisfying food needs. The percentage of people own no livestock who frequently (often/always) experience food shortage is higher than those with some livestock (small, large or both). The majority of the people owning large livestock (55 percent) have never experienced food shortages compared to only 11 percent of those owning small livestock.

The breakdown by household size shows that smaller households were more likely to face frequent problems satisfying food needs than larger households. For instance, 52 percent of households with one or two members experience food shortages compared to only 36 percent of households with seven or more members.

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	15.1	39.3	44.0	1.7	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	16.3	41.6	40.5	1.5	100.0
Remote	12.2	34.1	51.6	2.1	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	5.1	36.6	55.9	2.4	100.0
Non-poor	18.1	40.2	40.2	1.5	100.0
Household size					
1-2	19.8	27.9	47.4	4.9	100.0
3-4	14.1	36.3	47.9	1.7	100.0
5-6	7.0	48.5	43.6	0.9	100.0
7+	24.0	40.2	35.2	0.6	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	19.3	16.9	63.7	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	7.8	34.4	50.3	7.5	100.0
1-1.99 ha	6.3	45.0	46.9	1.9	100.0
2-3.99 ha	10.1	44.9	44.2	0.8	100.0
4-5.99 ha	23.9	30.0	46.1	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	51.1	34.9	14.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	11.8	27.0	58.1	3.1	100.0
Small only	11.3	47.1	41.0	0.6	100.0
Large only	54.7	34.6	6.9	3.7	100.0
Both	28.6	59.0	12.4	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	31.5	44.0	24.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	12.9	38.8	46.6	1.8	100.0
Self-employed - other	16.9	49.6	33.5	0.0	100.0
Other	28.3	10.9	48.8	12.1	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	15.0	43.2	40.8	1.1	100.0
Female	15.5	22.1	57.9	4.5	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	20.0	4.7	70.6	4.7	100.0
Monogamous	15.5	46.7	37.0	0.7	100.0
Polygamous	12.2	38.1	48.1	1.6	100.0
Loose union	15.6	37.2	47.2	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	15.5	23.9	56.0	4.6	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	6.1	34.1	56.9	2.9	100.0
Primary	20.7	40.2	37.8	1.3	100.0
Secondary +	14.8	52.0	33.3	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

The socio-economic group of the household head also shows some positive correlation with the household's ability to satisfy its food needs. The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that employees tend to be more food secure than households belonging to the other socio-economic groups, as 76 percent experienced problems satisfying food less frequently (never/seldom). At the time of the survey, 61 percent of the households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group (unemployed, inactive, involved in domestic work) reported having frequent problems satisfying food needs (often/always).

The breakdown by marital status of the household head shows that single household heads report having more food shortages than household heads of the other groups as 76 percent of them

experienced frequent food shortages. Only 33 percent of households where the household head has secondary education or more report often/always having food problems compared to 60 percent of the households whose head had no education. Likewise, female-headed households are more likely to experience food shortages than male-headed households.

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, 91 percent of households in the district reported that they never had problems paying school fees and only 5 percent of the households reported that they often/always had problems paying

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	90.9	4.1	3.3	1.7	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	87.1	5.7	4.7	2.5	100.0
Remote	99.3	0.4	0.2	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	98.0	0.0	0.6	1.4	100.0
Non-poor	88.7	5.3	4.2	1.8	100.0
Household size					
1-2	85.4	6.6	0.0	8.0	100.0
3-4	97.6	1.4	0.5	0.5	100.0
5-6	87.9	3.5	8.6	0.0	100.0
7+	87.5	7.5	3.5	1.6	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	75.8	24.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	79.8	3.6	8.3	8.3	100.0
1-1.99 ha	98.1	0.0	1.9	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	93.0	3.5	3.1	0.4	100.0
4-5.99 ha	89.3	6.2	2.2	2.3	100.0
6+ ha	95.1	2.8	2.1	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	93.9	3.0	0.0	3.1	100.0
Small only	89.7	4.0	5.9	0.5	100.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	81.9	9.3	7.6	1.2	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	92.6	5.4	2.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	91.2	3.1	3.7	2.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	81.8	17.0	1.2	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	92.4	3.1	2.6	1.9	100.0
Female	84.3	8.1	6.5	1.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	62.0	0.0	0.0	38.0	100.0
Monogamous	94.3	1.8	3.7	0.3	100.0
Polygamous	89.6	3.0	6.4	0.9	100.0
Loose union	70.4	29.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	90.8	8.2	0.0	1.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	95.4	0.0	4.0	0.5	100.0
Primary	90.5	6.2	2.7	0.6	100.0
Secondary +	78.0	5.9	4.1	12.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	99.8	0.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	99.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	99.8	0.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	99.4	0.6	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	96.2	3.8	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	99.6	0.4	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	98.2	1.8	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	99.8	0.2	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	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	99.2	0.8	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	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	98.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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).

Almost all (99 percent) the people living in remote clusters have never had problems paying school fees compared to 87 percent of those living in households located in accessible clusters. Similarly, 98 percent of the people living in poor households have never had problems paying school, while only 89 percent of those living in non-poor households share the same opinion. It is also observed that while 8 percent of households with one or two members often/always have problems paying school fees, only 1

percent of households with three or four members report the same.

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

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	97.3	2.0	0.7	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	96.3	2.7	1.0	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	96.5	2.6	0.9	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	97.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	99.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	96.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	95.9	0.9	3.2	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	97.6	2.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	94.2	1.9	3.9	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	97.1	2.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	99.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	98.8	1.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Small only	95.9	3.3	0.8	0.0	100.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	96.1	1.0	2.8	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	96.1	3.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	99.6	0.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	65.7	28.4	5.9	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	97.2	2.0	0.8	0.0	100.0
Female	98.2	1.8	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	98.2	0.6	1.2	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	70.4	29.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	96.3	3.7	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	97.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	86.4	6.8	6.8	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Household characteristics such as the amount of land owned and type of livestock owned have a positive correlation with the ability to pay school fees. Whereas 95 percent of households owning six or more acres of land never have any problems paying school fees, 76 percent of households owning no land at all claim they never had problems paying fees. Similarly, while all households owning large livestock never have problems paying school fees, this is the case for 90 percent of households owning small livestock. Likewise, while all households whose head belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group never had problems with paying school fees, the share for households whose main income earner is self-employed in non agricultural activities is 82 percent.

Male-headed households find fewer problems paying school fees compared to female-headed households. While 92 percent of male-headed households never have problems with paying school fees, 84 percent of female-headed households claim they never have problems paying fees. Furthermore, 94 percent of monogamous households have never had problems paying school fees, compared to 62 percent of households whose head is single. Households where the head has a secondary education claim to have problems paying school fees more often than households where the head has primary or no education.

6.2.3 Paying House Rent

Table 6.5 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying house rent during the year before the survey. All households in the district report that they never have problems paying house rent. Although a small percentage (4 percent) of households owning no land at all report that they seldom have problems paying house rent. Other selected household characteristics such as poverty status, cluster location, household size, livestock ownership, socio-economic group, 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 the year before the survey. The outcome on household's ability to pay
utility bills are almost similar to those of paying house rent. 97 percent of households in the district do not face problems with paying utility bills. It is observed that 28 percent of households whose main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities seldom have problems paying utility bills compared to only 4 percent of households belonging to the employee category. Furthermore, while 7 percent of households where the household head has secondary education or more claim to have problems paying utility bills often, the share for households where the household head has primary or no education is virtually null. Likewise, only 70 percent of households whose heads' marital status is loose union claim to have never had problems paying utility bills compared to 96 percent and above of households headed by individuals belonging to other marital status categories.

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. 70 percent of the households interviewed at the time of the survey stated that they never/seldom experience problems paying for health care. While 74 percent of the households located in accessible clusters never/ seldom experience problems paying for healthcare, 61 percent of households located in remote clusters report the same. 38 percent of poor households report often/always having problems paying for healthcare compared to only 20 percent of non-poor households.

Most households (86 percent) that own large acreages of land (six or more) report never/seldom difficulties paying for healthcare, while just 64 percent of households owning no land state that they never/seldom have problems paying for health care. Nearly three quarters (73 percent) of households owning large livestock never have problems paying for healthcare compared to about a quarter of households owning small or no livestock at all who claim the same. It is also observed that the majority (88 percent) of households belonging to the 'employee' socio-economic group never have problems paying for healthcare compared to 35 percent of households belonging to the self employed in non-agriculture or to the 'other' socio-economic group.

Only 27 percent of male-headed households often or always have problems paying for healthcare, while the share for female-headed households is 43 percent. Similarly, whereas 42 percent of households where the head has no education often/always have problems paying for healthcare, only 23 percent of households where the head has acquired secondary education or more report similar conditions.

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	29.4	40.7	24.8	5.1	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	31.2	42.8	20.3	5.6	100.0
Remote	25.4	36.0	34.7	3.9	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	21.4	40.6	34.2	3.9	100.0
Non-poor	31.8	40.8	21.9	5.5	100.0
Household size					
1-2	29.6	32.9	25.3	12.3	100.0
3-4	30.4	44.1	23.0	2.5	100.0
5-6	25.3	41.3	25.9	7.5	100.0
7+	33.2	39.7	25.9	1.3	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	31.2	32.7	36.1	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	15.0	44.3	26.2	14.6	100.0
1-1.99 ha	22.5	33.2	40.7	3.6	100.0
2-3.99 ha	29.6	47.7	19.9	2.8	100.0
4-5.99 ha	29.3	40.2	22.0	8.5	100.0
6+ ha	65.3	21.7	13.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	24.5	40.9	27.7	6.8	100.0
Small only	25.8	41.0	28.1	5.2	100.0
Large only	73.3	26.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	47.7	42.8	9.4	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	87.7	7.3	5.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	22.8	43.6	27.9	5.7	100.0
Self-employed - other	34.5	57.6	7.9	0.0	100.0
Other	35.1	18.2	28.7	18.1	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	30.7	42.3	21.2	5.8	100.0
Female	23.8	33.8	40.6	1.9	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	10.6	36.1	9.6	43.6	100.0
Monogamous	29.3	46.0	22.0	2.6	100.0
Polygamous	39.8	26.6	23.5	10.2	100.0
Loose union	19.4	51.4	29.2	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	24.2	37.5	36.4	1.9	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	19.3	39.0	34.2	7.6	100.0
Primary	29.8	46.4	21.5	2.3	100.0
Secondary +	62.3	14.9	10.9	12.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status

This section discusses ownership of selected assets and household occupancy status. The selected assets are 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, no further

Table 6.8: Percentage of households owning certain assets

			Livestock				Motor-		Wheel
	Home	Land	Small	Large	Both	Vehicle	cycle	Bicycle	barrow
Total	93.4	95.9	40.6	3.3	12.0	1.2	0.5	26.9	2.2
Cluster Location									
Accessible	91.0	94.9	40.5	3.8	12.9	1.7	0.8	30.4	2.7
Remote	98.6	98.3	40.9	2.1	10.1	0.0	0.0	19.1	1.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	93.9	98.9	41.2	2.1	5.7	0.0	0.0	13.1	0.0
Non-poor	93.2	95.0	40.5	3.7	14.0	1.6	0.7	31.3	2.9
Household size									
1-2	79.2	81.7	16.4	7.0	9.7	0.0	0.0	10.1	0.0
3-4	93.8	97.4	35.5	0.3	11.0	0.0	0.9	21.8	1.9
5-6	95.9	99.2	52.8	2.1	7.6	0.0	0.3	32.5	0.4
7+	99.4	99.4	50.4	7.3	21.3	5.7	0.6	40.4	6.7
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	92.9	94.3	41.1	13.7	16.1	13.7	6.2	60.4	15.0
Self-employed - agriculture	93.8	96.6	41.0	2.0	12.2	0.0	0.0	22.8	1.1
Self-employed - other	97.9	97.6	44.4	7.7	8.0	0.0	0.0	46.3	0.0
Other	65.0	71.0	11.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	95.5	98.5	42.9	3.4	13.3	1.5	0.7	31.5	2.7
Female	84.0	84.6	30.6	3.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	6.8	0.0

methods were used to verify this information.

6.3.1 Asset Ownership

Table 6.8 shows the percent distribution of households owning a selected group of assets. Overall, 93 percent of the district's households own their dwellings while 96 percent own some land. 41 percent of all households own small livestock while only 3 percent of all households own large livestock. While 27 percent of all households own a bicycle, only 1 percent owns a motorbike or car.

Table 6.9 shows the percent distribution of households by occupancy status. Proportions of households owning these assets are about the same independently of their poverty status. 99 percent of households located in remote clusters and 91 percent of households located in accessible clusters own their dwellings. Disaggregation of the data shows that 96 percent of male heads own their dwellings compared to 84 percent of female heads. At the same time 32 percent of male-headed households own bicycles compared to only 7 percent of female-headed households.

Table 6.9: Percent distribution of households by occupancy status

	Own	Rent	Free	Other	Total
Total	93.4	2.6	2.9	1.2	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	91.0	3.5	4.0	1.5	100.0
Remote	98.6	0.5	0.4	0.5	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	93.9	0.0	4.2	1.9	100.0
Non-poor	93.2	3.4	2.5	0.9	100.0
Household size					
1-2	79.2	13.1	3.8	4.0	100.0
3-4	93.8	1.3	3.7	1.2	100.0
5-6	95.9	0.6	3.5	0.0	100.0
7+	99.4	0.0	0.0	0.6	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	92.9	5.7	0.0	1.4	100.0
Self-employed - agric	93.8	2.4	3.3	0.5	100.0
Self-employed - other	97.9	2.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	65.0	0.0	6.0	29.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	95.5	0.8	2.8	0.9	100.0
Female	84.0	10.6	3.0	2.4	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base for percentage is all households

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	2.9	1.4	1.6	13.5	80.5	100.0	6.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	3.2	2.1	1.0	14.6	79.0	100.0	6.3
Remote	2.3	0.0	3.1	11.0	83.7	100.0	5.3
Poverty Status							
Poor	1.9	0.0	0.5	15.1	82.4	100.0	2.5
Non-poor	3.3	1.9	1.8	13.0	80.0	100.0	6.9
Household size							
1-2	0.5	6.5	0.0	7.5	85.5	100.0	7.0
3-4	0.9	0.9	1.5	11.5	85.1	100.0	3.3
5-6	3.2	0.0	2.1	15.2	79.6	100.0	5.2
7+	7.8	0.6	2.6	18.9	70.0	100.0	11.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	15.5	5.3	3.7	39.3	36.3	100.0	24.5
Self-employed - agric	1.3	1.2	1.3	11.2	85.0	100.0	3.8
Self-employed - other	8.0	0.0	4.3	6.9	80.7	100.0	12.4
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.3	82.7	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	3.4	0.6	2.0	14.8	79.3	100.0	6.0
Female	1.0	5.3	0.0	8.0	85.8	100.0	6.3

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base for percentage is all households

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	22.9	93.2	12.2	0.0	0.0	10.4	0.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	27.7	93.2	13.4	0.0	0.0	12.0	0.0
Remote	12.1	93.6	6.4	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	17.3	97.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	24.6	92.3	14.4	0.0	0.0	12.6	0.0
Household size							
1-2	16.6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3-4	19.7	89.0	9.4	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0
5-6	22.8	97.7	13.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7+	32.9	91.0	18.7	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	45.5	91.5	8.5	0.0	0.0	30.0	0.0
Self-employed - agric	21.4	96.2	10.8	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0
Self-employed - other	18.7	50.9	49.1	0.0	0.0	38.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	23.8	94.7	11.0	0.0	0.0	12.2	0.0
Female	18.8	84.7	19.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base for percentage for cols 2-7 is all households using agricultural inputs

6.3.1 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 tittle deed, renting contract or payment receipt. 81 percent of households in this district have no documentation at all.

6.3 Agriculture

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

Agricultural Inputs

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

About a quarter (23 percent) of all farmers applies agricultural inputs to their farms and the majority of those who use farm inputs apply fertilizers. The percentage of households located in accessible clusters using agricultural inputs is more than twice that of households located in remote clusters, at 28 and 12 percent respectively. Similarly, the percentage of non-poor households using agricultural inputs is 8 percentage points higher than that of poor households. As the number of household member's increases, the usage of agricultural inputs also increases. Likewise, use of agricultural inputs in male-headed households is higher than in female-headed households at 24 and 19 percent respectively. Furthermore, the percentage of households from the employee group using agricultural inputs is significantly higher than that of the other socio-economic groups.

Most households that use agricultural inputs obtain them by preparing them

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

	Open market	Government	Donor agency	Cooperatives	Other	Total
Total	22.3	1.6	0.0	0.0	76.1	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	25.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	73.0	100.0
Remote	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	92.9	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	96.9	100.0
Non-poor	25.3	1.8	0.0	0.0	72.8	100.0
Household size						
1-2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
3-4	18.6	4.8	0.0	0.0	76.6	100.0
5-6	24.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.1	100.0
7+	32.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.5	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	55.6	8.5	0.0	0.0	35.9	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	87.5	100.0
Self-employed - other	49.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.9	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	24.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.2	100.0
Female	9.5	9.8	0.0	0.0	80.7	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base for percentage is all households

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	4.1	14.6	17.5	40.9	14.2	8.8	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	5.1	17.1	18.8	38.9	11.9	8.2	100.0
Remote	1.7	8.9	14.5	45.4	19.2	10.3	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	1.1	10.5	22.9	45.7	14.9	4.9	100.0
Non-poor	5.0	15.9	15.8	39.3	13.9	10.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	18.3	24.0	18.5	24.9	3.6	10.7	100.0
3-4	2.6	15.9	20.1	46.7	11.0	3.7	100.0
5-6	0.8	15.4	17.5	44.9	13.5	7.9	100.0
7+	0.6	4.4	12.2	37.3	28.0	17.5	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	5.7	22.1	6.2	30.4	4.9	30.7	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	3.4	13.8	18.4	41.6	15.4	7.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	2.4	9.4	20.6	54.6	13.0	0.0	100.0
Other	29.0	28.0	17.0	19.5	6.4	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	1.5	10.8	18.1	44.9	15.5	9.2	100.0
Female	15.4	31.0	14.7	23.5	8.3	7.1	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base for percentage is all households

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	84.7	2.1	11.1	1.2	1.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	83.3	2.6	11.2	1.5	1.5	0.0	100.0
Remote	87.8	0.9	10.8	0.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	92.3	0.6	5.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	82.3	2.5	12.9	0.9	1.3	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	83.3	0.0	13.7	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	88.7	5.0	5.8	0.0	0.5	0.0	100.0
5-6	90.3	0.0	8.7	0.6	0.4	0.0	100.0
7+	71.4	1.3	21.2	2.7	3.4	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	70.2	0.0	19.9	3.2	6.7	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	85.8	2.5	10.1	1.1	0.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	84.3	0.0	15.7	0.0	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	83.3	2.5	12.0	0.9	1.3	0.0	100.0
Female	90.5	0.0	7.1	2.4	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base for percentage is all households

themselves (76 percent) and in second place purchasing them at an open market (22 percent). 2 percent of the households get their inputs from government while none report donor agencies or cooperatives 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 significantly higher than that of households located in remote clusters at 25 and 7 percent respectively.

Likewise, the percentage of non-poor households who purchase their agricultural inputs at an open market is about 8 times as high as that of poor households at 25 and 3 percent respectively.

6.3.1 Landholding

Table 6.13 shows the distribution of households by the area of land owned. Around 37 percent of all households own less than two acres of land (including 4 percent of landless households), 41 percent owns between 2 and 4 acres, and 23 percent own 4 or more acres.

Landless households are more common in accessible villages, and households owning large portions of land are more common in remote villages. Likewise, the percentage of landless households among non-poor households is higher than that of poor households.

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

Households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group report the highest share of landless households (29 percent) and the self employed in non-agriculture report the lowest share (2 percent).

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

6.3.2 Cattle ownership

Table 6.14 shows the percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned. 85 percent of households own no cattle at all, and only 2 percent of households own more than 10 heads of cattle. Households in remote villages are more likely to own no cattle as well as poor households. The breakdown by household size shows that households with seven or more members are more likely to have some cattle (between 2 and 10 heads) compared to those with one to two members at 21 and 14 percent respectively.

Employees are the socio-economic group with highest shares of households owning more than two heads whereas all the households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group own no cattle at all. Finally, male-headed households, on average, own more cattle than female-headed households.

6.4 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.

About half (52 percent) the households reported it was better, 26 percent said it was the same while 22 percent perceived it as worse. The percentage of households located in remote clusters who perceived the crime and security level as better is slightly higher than that of households located in accessible clusters at 55 and 50 percent respectively. However, the percentage of poor households who the current crime and security situation was worse than that of the previous year is slightly higher than that of non-poor households at 27 and 21 percent respectively.

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	6.8	15.1	26.3	42.5	8.8	0.5	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	5.3	16.2	27.8	41.6	8.3	0.7	100.0
Remote	10.2	12.7	22.8	44.5	9.8	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	13.2	13.5	32.1	34.1	7.1	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	4.9	15.5	24.5	45.2	9.3	0.6	100.0
Household size							
1-2	6.0	16.9	14.1	49.7	12.6	0.8	100.0
3-4	7.6	15.0	30.9	36.9	8.7	0.9	100.0
5-6	6.4	16.7	29.9	39.3	7.7	0.0	100.0
7+	6.8	12.2	22.3	51.2	7.5	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	3.8	3.8	11.8	67.7	12.7	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	6.1	23.3	25.7	36.3	7.7	0.8	100.0
1-1.99 ha	10.4	16.1	23.9	41.5	8.1	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	6.1	12.7	32.8	37.9	9.5	0.8	100.0
4-5.99 ha	6.7	11.5	27.0	52.6	2.2	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	6.0	21.9	7.0	48.2	16.9	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	8.2	21.4	24.2	34.3	10.9	1.1	100.0
Small only	5.3	9.1	29.6	49.1	6.9	0.0	100.0
Large only	0.0	51.0	13.5	30.7	4.8	0.0	100.0
Both	9.0	2.8	26.4	53.4	8.5	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	5.4	31.4	29.5	21.7	11.9	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	7.3	14.0	24.9	44.6	8.8	0.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	2.1	5.6	46.7	45.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	7.5	18.1	11.3	36.4	20.7	6.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	6.7	17.2	27.2	39.6	8.9	0.4	100.0
Female	7.4	6.3	22.3	55.3	8.0	0.7	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	5.9	38.0	23.5	19.1	13.5	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	7.3	15.8	29.4	38.6	8.9	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	5.3	17.1	22.8	45.0	9.8	0.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	8.5	8.5	82.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	8.3	8.5	23.8	48.7	8.1	2.5	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	10.7	11.9	32.4	35.3	8.3	1.3	100.0
Primary	4.9	14.9	21.0	50.3	8.9	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	4.1	27.5	34.7	23.8	9.9	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Base for percentage is all households

The percentage of households without land who perceived the crime and security situation as better is significantly higher than that of large landholders (households owning six or more hectares of land) at 81 and 65 percent respectively. Furthermore, while 63 percent of female-headed households perceive the crime and security situation as better, this is the case for only 49 percent of the male-headed households. Likewise, the percentage of households whose head had primary education and reported a better crime and security situation is higher than that of those with secondary education or no education at all.

6.5 Household Income Contributions

Table 6.16 shows the percentage 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 (87 percent) of households the head is the main contributor.

While in 21 percent of households with 7 or more members the main income contributor is the spouse, the share for households with 1 or 2 members is just 8 percent.Furthermore, households, which belong to the 'other' socio-economic group (unemployed, inactive, involved in domestic work), show more dependency on the spouse, children or other people for income contributions than the remaining socio-economic groups.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that up to 10 percent of female-headed households the main income contributor is the children or other people, whereas in male-headed households the head is always the main contributor.

6.6 Other Household Items

Table 6.17 shows the percentage distribution of households owning selected household items. 65 percent of households own at least one mattress or bed, 47 percent own a radio, 32 percent own a watch or clock and 9 percent own an electric iron. Although no household owns a fixed line phone, 9 percent own a mobile phone.

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

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

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

	Principal contributor of income				
	Head	Spouse	Child	Other	Total
Total	87.2	10.5	1.4	0.9	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	86.2	11.6	1.2	0.9	100.0
Remote	89.2	8.1	1.7	1.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	88.5	9.9	1.6	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	86.7	10.8	1.3	1.2	100.0
Household size					
1-2	87.2	7.8	1.0	4.0	100.0
3-4	93.9	3.8	1.4	0.9	100.0
5-6	87.4	12.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	75.2	21.4	3.4	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	86.2	12.3	1.4	0.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	98.4	0.0	1.6	0.0	100.0
Other	40.3	15.0	7.2	37.5	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	87.2	12.2	0.2	0.4	100.0
Female	86.8	3.3	6.6	3.3	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Table 6.17: Percentage of households owning selected household items

	Iron	Refrigerato	Sewing machine	Modern stove	Mattress or bed	Watch or clock	Radio	Televison	Fixed line phone	Mobile phone
Total	8.3	1.2	2.0	4.2	65.3	31.8	46.8	1.8	0.0	9.4
Cluster Location										
Accessible	9.7	1.7	2.8	5.9	74.6	33.5	53.1	2.6	0.0	12.5
Remote	5.2	0.0	0.2	0.5	44.7	28.0	32.8	0.0	0.0	2.7
Poverty Status										
Poor	1.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	50.2	13.4	16.1	0.0	0.0	0.5
Non-poor	10.5	1.6	2.5	5.5	70.1	37.5	56.4	2.3	0.0	12.2
Household size										
1-2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.8	33.4	28.3	0.0	0.0	3.1
3-4	6.2	0.0	0.4	2.6	71.5	22.7	38.9	0.0	0.0	3.0
5-6	5.9	0.0	1.6	3.8	63.4	35.3	48.5	0.4	0.0	14.4
7+	21.2	5.7	6.9	10.7	62.7	41.5	71.5	7.9	0.0	18.4
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	45.0	13.7	14.5	31.8	91.3	68.7	90.4	15.1	0.0	45.9
Self-employed - agriculture	4.0	0.0	0.9	1.3	62.2	26.5	42.0	0.6	0.0	3.9
Self-employed - other	17.7	0.0	0.0	5.9	79.2	63.2	63.4	0.0	0.0	38.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.5	0.0	11.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	9.3	1.5	2.2	4.8	67.9	34.1	53.3	2.2	0.0	10.9
Female	3.9	0.0	1.5	1.8	53.8	21.8	18.5	0.0	0.0	2.9

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

7 HOUSEHOLD AMENITIES

This chapter analyses the main amenities of the household. 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 household gets source of drinking water, schools, and food market. 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, 50 percent of households have iron sheets as their main roof material and 48 percent have thatch.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote villages are more likely to use thatch than households in accessible villages. In turn, households in accessible villages tend to use iron sheets more often. Similarly, poor households tend to use thatch more often, and non-poor households, iron sheets.

The breakdown by household size shows smaller households tend to use thatch, and that bigger households are more likely to use iron sheets for their roofs. The split-up by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed in agriculture is the category with highest share of households using thatch for the roof (at 53 percent), and that employees are the group with the lowest use of thatch (12 percent).

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households use iron sheets more often than male-headed households, at rates of 56 and 49 percent, respectively.

Table 7.2 shows the distribution of households by type of material used in the walls. Overall, 95 percent of houses are built with mud or mud bricks. Burnt bricks occupy the second place, with a share of 4 percent.

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	0.6	47.6	0.0	50.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.4	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	0.9	37.3	0.0	59.8	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.8	100.0
Remote	0.0	70.8	0.0	28.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	0.0	71.6	0.0	23.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	100.0
Non-poor	0.8	40.2	0.0	58.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.4	100.0
Household size									
1-2	3.0	50.7	0.0	46.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	0.5	58.6	0.0	39.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	100.0
5-6	0.0	39.7	0.0	56.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	100.0
7+	0.0	37.2	0.0	62.1	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	0.0	12.0	0.0	88.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	0.2	52.8	0.0	45.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.7	100.0
Self-employed - other	7.7	32.5	0.0	59.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	33.2	0.0	66.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	0.8	48.3	0.0	49.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.7	100.0
Female	0.0	44.5	0.0	55.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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

	Mud/ mud bricks	Stone	Burnt bricks	Cement/ sandcrete	Wood/ bamboo	Iron sheets	Cardboard	Total
Total	95.2	0.4	4.0	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	93.7	0.3	5.5	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	100.0
Remote	98.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	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	100.0
Non-poor	93.8	0.5	5.1	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.0	100.0
Household size								
1-2	90.5	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	98.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	98.3	0.0	0.6	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
7+	89.9	1.6	7.9	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group								
Employee	77.8	1.7	19.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	96.6	0.2	2.7	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household								
Male	96.1	0.2	3.1	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.0	100.0
Female	90.9	1.1	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

The analysis of cluster location reveals that households in remote villages have a higher share of mud and mud bricks than households in accessible villages. The rates are 99 and 94 percent, respectively. Likewise, poor households use mud or mud bricks more often than non-poor households (100 and 94 percent, respectively).

'Self-employed other' and 'other' are the categories with highest shares living in houses made of mud or mud bricks (100 percent), whereas employees have the highest share living in houses made of burnt bricks (19 percent).

The gender breakdown shows that households headed by females use burnt

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	90.1	0.0	0.0	9.6	0.3	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	86.7	0.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	97.8	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.8	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	99.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	87.3	0.0	0.0	12.6	0.1	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	85.5	0.0	0.0	14.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	96.2	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	93.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	0.9	0.0	100.0
7+	79.2	0.0	0.0	20.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	60.3	0.0	0.0	39.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	92.8	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.3	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	94.1	0.0	0.0	5.9	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	91.2	0.0	0.0	8.5	0.3	0.0	100.0
Female	85.4	0.0	0.0	14.6	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

bricks more often than male-headed households, at rates of 8 and 3 percent of males.

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

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages, with a rate of 13 percent, have more houses with concrete floor than households in remote villages, with a rate of 1 percent.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households have a higher share of houses with mud or dirt floor (99 percent, against 87 percent of the non-poor households). Up to 13 percent of non-poor households have concrete flooring.

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that employees have the lowest share of mud or dirt and the highest share of concrete. There are no major differences between the remaining groups.

Finally, households headed by males have a higher share of mud or dirt floor than female-headed households. In turn, 15 percent of female-headed households have concrete or cement flooring, against 9 percent of male-headed households.

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

	Single room	Flat	Two or more rooms	Whole building	Other	Total
Total	1.6	0.0	2.2	96.1	0.1	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	2.1	0.0	2.9	95.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	0.4	0.0	0.8	98.4	0.4	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.5	0.0	0.0	99.5	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	1.9	0.0	2.9	95.0	0.2	100.0
Household size						
1-2	7.3	0.0	5.2	86.6	0.9	100.0
3-4	0.9	0.0	4.0	95.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	0.5	0.0	0.0	99.5	0.0	100.0
7+	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	3.9	0.0	0.0	96.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	1.2	0.0	1.6	97.1	0.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	0.0	8.1	91.9	0.0	100.0
Other	12.1	0.0	21.5	66.5	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	0.6	0.0	2.2	97.2	0.0	100.0
Female	6.0	0.0	2.4	90.9	0.7	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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	6.6	4.2	41.1	11.7	30.2	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.9	100.0	59.4
Cluster Location											
Accessible	8.9	1.5	47.0	13.5	25.3	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.7	100.0	69.5
Remote	1.3	10.2	28.0	7.7	41.2	0.0	10.5	0.0	1.2	100.0	37.0
Poverty Status											
Poor	1.8	2.7	22.5	10.3	54.3	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.3	100.0	34.5
Non-poor	8.0	4.7	46.9	12.2	22.9	0.0	4.2	0.0	1.0	100.0	67.2
Household size											
1-2	8.8	4.2	46.7	12.2	22.9	0.0	4.3	0.0	1.0	100.0	67.7
3-4	6.7	3.4	33.0	14.9	36.1	0.0	4.5	0.0	1.4	100.0	54.6
5-6	6.8	4.0	38.7	9.5	35.4	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.3	100.0	55.1
7+	4.2	6.0	54.3	8.9	18.5	0.0	7.5	0.0	0.7	100.0	67.4
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	19.4	6.5	45.4	5.5	23.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	70.3
Self-employed - agric	3.8	3.6	40.5	12.6	33.1	0.0	5.8	0.0	0.5	100.0	56.9
Self-employed - other	28.8	5.9	48.1	2.1	5.3	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.9	100.0	79.0
Other	0.0	13.6	27.9	31.4	12.7	0.0	7.2	0.0	7.2	100.0	59.3
Gender of the head of household											
Male	5.5	4.6	41.8	11.5	29.7	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.8	100.0	58.8
Female	11.1	2.3	38.1	12.7	32.7	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.2	100.0	61.8

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara 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	4.5	0.0	0.3	0.0	68.6	26.5	0.2	0.0	100.0	68.9
Cluster Location										
Accessible	4.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	69.8	25.1	0.3	0.0	100.0	70.3
Remote	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.8	29.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	65.8
Poverty Status										
Poor	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.4	37.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	55.4
Non-poor	3.6	0.0	0.4	0.0	72.5	23.2	0.2	0.0	100.0	23.9
Household size										
1-2	13.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	74.0	12.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	74.0
3-4	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.6	30.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	30.3
5-6	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.5	25.2	0.7	0.0	100.0	69.5
7+	1.8	0.0	1.5	0.0	65.1	31.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	33.2
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	73.5	25.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	74.9
Self-employed - agriculture	5.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	67.9	26.6	0.2	0.0	100.0	68.2
Self-employed - other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.8	24.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	75.8
Other	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.1	32.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	53.1
Gender of the head of household										
Male	2.8	0.0	0.4	0.0	68.6	27.9	0.2	0.0	100.0	69.0
Female	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.3	20.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	68.3

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara 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	93.2	6.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	90.2	9.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	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	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Non-poor	91.1	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Household size										
1-2	93.5	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
3-4	95.3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
5-6	94.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
7+	88.5	11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	61.9	38.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - agric	97.9	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	71.2	28.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	93.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Female	92.9	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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

Households from accessible clusters are slightly less likely to occupy the whole building than households from remote clusters. The breakdown by poverty status shows a similar result, with non-poor

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	81.1	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.0	2.2	15.0	1.1	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	89.0	0.0	0.7	0.2	0.0	3.2	6.6	0.4	100.0
Remote	63.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.7	2.8	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	70.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.4	1.0	100.0
Non-poor	84.3	0.0	0.6	0.2	0.0	2.9	11.0	1.1	100.0
Household size									
1-2	67.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	24.0	1.8	100.0
3-4	86.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.4	0.3	100.0
5-6	79.5	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	4.3	14.9	0.9	100.0
7+	83.8	0.0	1.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	11.7	2.2	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	98.6	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	78.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	2.6	16.9	1.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	98.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	100.0
Other	58.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.3	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	84.4	0.0	0.6	0.2	0.0	1.5	12.0	1.4	100.0
Female	66.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	28.3	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

households having a lower share occupying the whole building.
The breakdown by household size shows that small households, those with up to 2 members, have 7 percent living in a single room; while 95 percent or more of the households with 3 or more members occupy the whole building.

The analysis of socio-economic groups shows that the 'other' category has the lowest share of households occupying the whole building, at 66 percent. 22 percent of them occupy two or more rooms and 12 percent occupy one room.
Finally, female-headed households are less likely than male-headed households to occupy the whole building.

7.2 Water and Sanitation

The percentage distribution of households by source of drinking water is shown in Table 7.5. Overall, 59 percent of households have a safe source of water, whereas 30 percent of them get it from an unprotected well. Safe sources of drinking water are treated pipes, bore holes, hand pumps, and protected wells.
The analysis of cluster location shows that 70 percent of households in accessible villages have a safe source of drinking water, whereas the share of households in remote villages is just 37 percent. The shares of households with unprotected wells are 25 percent for accessible and 41 percent for households in remote villages. Poverty status of the household shows important differences in access to safe water. 67 percent of non-poor households use safe sources of water, against 35 percent of poor households. In turn, 54 percent of poor households get their drinking water from unprotected wells, against 23 percent of non-poor households.

When analysing by household size, no strong trends emerge. The split-up by gender of the household head does not show striking differences either, but the breakdown by socio-economic group of the household does. 'Self-employed other' are the category with the highest rate of access to safe sources of drinking water, followed by the employees.

Table 7.6 shows the percentage distribution of households by main type of toilet. Only 27 percent of households have safe sanitation, whereas up to 69 percent use a covered pit latrine.

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	54.1	28.1	13.6	4.2	100.0	27.9	22.0	21.3	28.9	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	58.3	26.0	12.7	3.1	100.0	33.0	26.4	21.8	18.8	100.0
Remote	44.9	32.9	15.5	6.7	100.0	16.3	12.1	20.0	51.5	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	33.1	37.2	23.9	5.8	100.0	10.2	18.7	21.8	49.3	100.0
Non-poor	60.7	25.4	10.2	3.7	100.0	33.3	23.0	21.2	22.5	100.0
Household size										
1-2	52.8	24.6	19.4	3.2	100.0	42.2	17.7	12.8	27.3	100.0
3-4	56.8	25.6	13.0	4.6	100.0	23.3	24.8	22.0	29.9	100.0
5-6	46.9	32.6	17.5	3.1	100.0	21.6	23.8	26.1	28.5	100.0
7+	60.2	29.0	5.2	5.6	100.0	33.7	17.7	19.7	28.9	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	74.2	19.2	4.9	1.7	100.0	65.0	21.8	0.0	13.1	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	50.5	29.9	15.0	4.6	100.0	23.9	21.1	22.9	32.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	74.1	20.1	5.7	0.0	100.0	18.2	42.4	33.7	5.8	100.0
Other	59.1	18.1	14.4	8.5	100.0	57.1	0.0	13.1	29.8	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	53.8	28.9	13.4	4.0	100.0	28.3	22.6	22.0	27.1	100.0
Female	55.6	24.9	14.3	5.2	100.0	26.0	19.2	18.1	36.7	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

The cluster breakdown shows that 26 percent of households in accessible villages have safe sanitation, while in households in remote villages the share is 30 percent. The analysis by poverty status shows that 73 percent of non-poor households use covered pit latrines, driving the share with safe sanitation down to 24 percent, 13 percentage points below poor households.

Households with 1 or 2 members have the lowest percentage of safe sanitation, at 12 percent. The rates for other groups fluctuate between 26 and 33 percent. Uncovered pit latrines gain importance in households with more than 2 members. It stands out that up to 14 percent of households with up to 2 members have no toilet.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that 'other' has the highest rate of safe sanitation, at 33 percent. The rates for other socio-economic groups fluctuate around roughly 25 percent.

The analysis by gender of the household heads reveals that male-headed households are more likely to have safe sanitation than female-headed households. Furthermore, female-headed households are more likely to have no toilet than male-headed households, with rates of 12 and 3 percent, respectively.

7.3 Type of Fuel

Table 7.7 shows the distribution of households by fuel used for cooking. Overall, 93 percent of households use firewood. Virtually all households in remote villages use firewood, while almost 10 percent of households in accessible villages use charcoal. The breakdown by poverty status reveals similar differences between poor and non-poor households.

The breakdown by household size shows that the largest households (with 7 members or more) tend to use charcoal more often than the rest, at 12 percent. There is no difference between the other households, with around 95 percent using firewood.

There are no differences by gender of the household head. However, the split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that 38 percent of the employees and 28 percent of the self-employed in non agricultural activities use charcoal for cooking, whereas the other two categories use firewood in almost every case.

Table 7.8 shows the distribution of households according to the fuel used for lightning. Overall, 81 percent of the households in the district use kerosene or paraffin, 15 percent firewood and just 1

percent uses electricity. Gas, solar panels, batteries, and candles are virtually not used for lighting in the district.

The analysis of cluster location shows that all households using electricity are located in accessible villages, but still represent only 1 percent of households in accessible villages in the district. Virtually no household in remote villages uses electricity. A similar trend is observed in the split-up by poverty status. All the households that use electricity are non-poor, but only represent 1 percent of non-poor households. No poor household uses electricity.

The breakdown by household size reveals that in households with up to 2 members, firewood is more likely to be used as source of lighting, with a share of 24 percent.

The analysis by socio-economic group of the household shows employees and self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the highest rates of use of kerosene/paraffin, with rates of nearly 100 percent. On the other hand, 'other' has the highest rate of use of firewood, at 41 percent

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

7.4 Distances to Facilities

Table 7.9 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest drinking water supply and health facility. Although each table gives more detailed information, the analysis of this section will be focused on the 30 minute threshold that was used to define access to a facility. It must be kept in mind that distance to public transportation is one of the variables used to define a cluster as accessible or remote, so it must come as no surprise that distance to public transportation and cluster location are strongly correlated. However, the rest of the variables, despite not being used to define cluster location, also show strong correlations.

Overall, 82 percent of households are located under 30 minutes of a drinking water supply. In addition, 50 percent of the households are located under 30 minutes of a health facility.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that 84 percent of households in accessible villages have access to a drinking water source and 60 percent to a health facility, whereas the shares for households in remote villages are 78 and 28 percent. Similar differences are observed by

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	33.6	32.2	20.7	13.5	100.0	4.8	6.9	20.2	68.1	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	39.2	38.5	17.0	5.4	100.0	6.9	9.7	24.4	59.0	100.0
Remote	21.1	18.3	29.1	31.5	100.0	0.0	0.8	10.8	88.4	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	17.0	28.4	34.5	20.2	100.0	2.6	5.7	12.9	78.7	100.0
Non-poor	38.7	33.5	16.6	11.2	100.0	5.5	7.3	22.5	64.8	100.0
Household size										
1-2	50.2	30.6	9.0	10.2	100.0	5.8	14.6	15.6	64.0	100.0
3-4	28.9	33.4	26.6	11.1	100.0	3.3	8.0	20.8	67.8	100.0
5-6	22.7	38.5	24.5	14.3	100.0	1.8	2.6	24.3	71.2	100.0
7+	44.0	23.1	14.1	18.7	100.0	10.5	5.2	16.8	67.5	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	40.1	46.3	5.4	8.2	100.0	8.5	6.0	36.2	49.4	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	33.0	28.3	23.6	15.1	100.0	4.5	7.0	17.1	71.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	25.8	64.6	7.4	2.2	100.0	2.2	9.0	44.4	44.4	100.0
Other	50.0	42.8	7.2	0.0	100.0	8.5	0.0	8.9	82.6	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	32.0	32.5	21.5	14.0	100.0	5.0	6.3	21.4	67.3	100.0
Female	40.4	31.1	17.6	10.9	100.0	3.8	9.5	14.7	72.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

poverty status, with non-poor households having higher access rates than poor households.

The breakdown by household size shows that the largest households (7 or more members) have the highest rates of access to sources of drinking water, and that households with 1 or 2 members have the highest rate of access to health facilities.

Households where the main income earner is an employee or self-employed in non-agricultural activities have higher rates of access to drinking water. Employees also have the highest rates of access to drinking water sources, whereas households in the 'self-employed agriculture' category have the lowest.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no strong differences in access to water sources, but households headed by males have higher access rates to health facilities, with 51 percent living less than 30 min of health facilities, 6 percent points above female-headed households.

Table 7.10 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest primary and secondary school. Overall, 66 percent of households are located within 30 minutes of a primary school, but just 12 percent of households live within 30 min of a secondary school. Moreover, 68 percent of households are located 60 min or more away from the nearest secondary school. Access to school was also analysed in chapter 3 but with a different focus. In chapter 3, access to school was analysed at child level, i.e. the access rate of each child. In this section the focus is the distance of the house to the nearest school.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 78 percent of households in accessible villages have access to primary school, against 39 of remote. For secondary school, the rates go down to 17 and 1 percent, respectively.

72 percent of non-poor households are located within 30 minutes from a primary school, 27 percentage points above non-poor households. Similarly, non-poor households have higher rates of access to secondary school than poor households, with shares of 13 and 8 percent, respectively.

The size of the household does not appear to be correlated with access to school, either primary or secondary. However, households with up to 2 members have the highest rates of access to both primary and secondary school.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households in the category 'other' have the highest rates of access to primary and that employees have the highest rates of access to secondary schools, at 93 and 14 percent, respectively. Households in the category 'self-employed agriculture' have the lowest access rates to primary schools at 61 percent.

Households headed by females have higher access rates to primary school than male-headed households, at 72 percent, against 65 percent of males. There is no strong difference in the access to secondary school.

Table 7.11 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest food market and public transportation. Overall, 58 percent of households have access to a food market, and 68 percent to public transportation.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 72 percent of households in accessible villages live within 30 minutes of a food market and, against 24 of households in remote villages. The shares for public transportation are 86 for accessible and 28 percent for households in remote villages.
Poverty status is also strongly correlated with distance to food markets and public transportation. Poor households have lower rates of access to food markets, with a rate of 36 percent, against 64 of non-poor. There is a similar difference regarding access to public transportation. While 75 percent of non-poor have access to public transportation, only 46 percent of poor have so.

The breakdown by size of the household shows that households with 1 or 2 members have the highest rates of access to these facilities, and that households with 7 or more members have the lowest access rates.

Employees have the highest rates of access to food markets and public transportation, with rates of 83 and 93 percent. Self-employed in non-agricultural activities are in second place, with rates of 73 and 81 percent, respectively, to each

facility. The self-employed in agriculture come in third place with rates of 54 and 65 percent, whereas the 'other' category has the lowest rates at 34 and 60 percent, respectively.

There does not appear to be a difference according to the gender of the household head in access to public transportation, but there is a strong difference in access to food markets. Male-headed households have an access rate of 59 percent and female-headed households have a rate of 52 percent.

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, 57 percent of households take measures against malaria. The most commonly taken are herbs (31 percent of households), anti-malaria drugs (24 percent), and bed nets (23 percent).

The analysis of cluster location shows that 43 percent of households in remote villages take measures against malaria, compared to 64 percent of households in accessible villages. Anti-malaria drugs, bed-nets and herbs are more widespread among accessible villages (at roughly 25 percent each), whereas herbs is reported more frequently by households in remote villages (44 percent). Similar differences are observed by poverty status.

The share of households taking measures increases with the size of the household but there are no clear trends by measure taken. The analysis of socio-economic status shows that 78 percent of households in the category 'employee' takes measures, 66 percent of 'self-employed other', 55 percent of 'self-employed agriculture', and only 46 percent of 'other'. Finally, households headed by males are more likely to take measures against malaria than households headed by females. Male-headed households use bed-nets and insecticide treated nets and herbs more frequently than female-headed households. In turn, higher shares of the latter use anti-malaria drugs.

Table 7.11: Percent dstribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach nearest market and public transportation

	Food market					Public transportation				
	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total
Total	29.6	27.9	16.3	26.3	100.0	49.4	18.7	7.6	24.4	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	38.2	34.2	13.0	14.6	100.0	63.7	22.3	5.3	8.7	100.0
Remote	10.4	13.9	23.5	52.3	100.0	17.5	10.6	12.6	59.3	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	8.0	28.4	20.4	43.1	100.0	20.4	25.4	5.1	49.1	100.0
Non-poor	36.3	27.8	15.0	21.0	100.0	58.4	16.6	8.3	16.6	100.0
Household size										
1-2	41.5	24.2	10.9	23.4	100.0	60.5	14.1	7.4	18.1	100.0
3-4	23.8	32.4	15.9	28.0	100.0	42.9	23.7	7.6	25.8	100.0
5-6	22.4	37.6	14.6	25.5	100.0	47.7	20.7	7.5	24.1	100.0
7+	40.5	9.9	23.0	26.6	100.0	54.8	10.6	7.8	26.8	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	70.1	12.6	5.0	12.3	100.0	82.1	10.8	1.5	5.6	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	24.2	30.2	17.1	28.6	100.0	44.2	20.6	8.5	26.8	100.0
Self-employed - other	46.4	26.4	17.2	10.1	100.0	76.6	4.5	1.6	17.3	100.0
Other	29.0	5.2	26.2	39.6	100.0	46.1	14.3	12.7	26.9	100.0
Gender of head of household										
Male	30.8	27.8	16.1	25.3	100.0	47.7	20.2	8.2	24.0	100.0
Female	24.0	28.1	17.1	30.8	100.0	57.1	12.0	4.9	26.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

7 Household amenities

8 GOVERNANCE

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

8.1 Attendance at Meetings

Table 8.1 summarises responses to the following question 'Did you or anyone in your household attend a meeting at [...] level in the past 12 months'. This question was repeated 4 times with the dots replaced by kitongoji, village, ward and district. The responses show that just above three-quarters (79 percent) of the households had at least one member attending a kitongoji or village meeting in the past 12 months. About half (52 percent) of the households reported attending meetings at the ward level while only 15 percent of the households reported having at least one member attend a district level meeting.

Looking at the attendance rates by cluster location, it is observed that households located in remote areas have higher attendance rates at kitongoji and village levels than households located in accessible clusters. On the other hand, there are no differences in attendance rates between the poor and non-poor. Data dissaggregation by socio-economic group show that in general, households where main income earner is self-employed in agriculture have the highest attendance rates while households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group have the lowest attendance rates. Overall, attendance rates to meetings tend to decrease as the governance level increases. In particular, kitongoji and village-level meetings have the highest attendance rates, followed by ward-level meetings. District-level meetings have the lowest 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 their work and for those who responded 'no' or 'don't know' the reason for this response was asked. The results are displayed in Table 8.2. 80 percent of households have reported satisfaction with their kitongoji, village, ward and district leaders while 69 percent report satisfaction with their district councillor. It is good to note that there are no households, which responded 'Don't know' at kitongoji and village levels.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that a higher share of households located in accessible clusters report being satisfied

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	79	79	52	15
Cluster Location				
Accessible	75	77	51	13
Remote	87	84	53	21
Poverty Status				
Poor	86	80	53	13
Non-poor	77	79	51	16
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	69	83	47	12
Self-employed - agriculture	82	81	54	16
Self-employed - other	58	64	40	2
Other	53	53	28	21
No. of Obs.	448	448	448	448

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

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

	Kitongoji Leaders	Village Leaders	Ward Leaders	District Leaders	District Councillor
Total					
Satisfied	86	85	81	80	69
Not Satisfied	14	14	15	11	22
Don't Know	0	0	4	9	9
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location					
Accessible	89	89	84	85	66
Remote	79	77	75	69	76
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status					
Poor	80	77	73	75	73
Non-poor	88	88	84	81	68
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group					
Employee	92	92	92	88	53
Self-employed - agriculture	86	84	80	79	70
Self-employed - other	81	88	88	85	71
Other	88	88	74	71	88
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)					
Political differences	0	0	0	0	1
Embezzlement/corruption	26	23	20	8	6
They do not listen to people	23	24	24	3	12
Favouritism	22	32	18	8	8
Lazy/inexperienced	8	5	6	2	1
Personal Reasons	3	2	2	1	1
I see no results	22	25	14	13	22
They never visit us	21	19	46	65	45
No. of Obs.	448	448	448	448	448

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

Note: While the question for kitongoji, village, ward and district leaders was framed as: do you think the leaders atthis level are polite and helpful', the question for the district councillor was framed as 'are you satisfied with the work of your district councillor

with their leaders than households located in remote clusters. In addition, the non-poor population show higher satisfaction rates than the poor population. Analysis of the data by socio-economic category shows that the employees report the highest satisfaction rates with their leaders compared to households belonging to other socio-economic groups, except for district councillor. The employees are the least satisfied group with their district councillor.

Finally, respondent who reported dissatisfaction or said they did not know at a certain level of government were asked why this was so. The last part of table 9.2 summarizes this information. It is important to note that the percentages here include ‘don’t know’ and ‘no’ responses. Reasons for dissatisfaction vary along different government levels. The main reasons for dissatisfaction at kitongoji and village levels are corruption, not listening to people and favouritism, each of them with a share between 22 and 32 percent. The most prominent reason for dissatisfaction at ward and district level is ‘they never visit us’. It is important to note that while there are no respondents who reported dissatisfaction due to political differences, there is a very small percentage of household, which are dissatisfied due to laziness/inexperienced and personal reasons.

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	4	8	5	4
Cluster Location				
Accessible	4	9	5	4
Remote	5	8	4	4
Poverty Status				
Poor	3	7	3	3
Non-poor	4	9	5	4
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	0	0	0	0
Self-employed - agriculture	5	10	5	5
Self-employed - other	5	8	5	1
Other	0	4	0	0
Source				
Letter	8	2	2	0
Notice board	0	5	5	0
Meeting	86	87	82	75
Rumours/hear-say	5	8	9	13
Radio/newspapers	0	0	3	12
No. of Obs.	448	448	448	448

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

8.3 Public Spending

This section discusses the results of questions on the extent to which financial information reached the sample of respondent, as well as their satisfaction with public spending. Table 8.3 shows the distribution of the percentage of respondents that reported having received financial information from four different levels of government. Overall, the percentage of households receiving information on finances in this district is very low. The largest share of financial information distribution to households is 8 percent at village level. Information on kitongoji, ward and district finances fluctuates around 5 percent of households. There are no differences by cluster location or poverty status.

The split-up by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed groups receive more financial information than other socio-economic groups. Above three-quarters of the households receive financial information through meetings for all levels of government. The other sources have much lower shares.

Furthermore, respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with the 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. About half of the households reported that they did not know while the rest reported satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The rates of satisfaction with spending are quite similar across different levels of government, ranging from 28 to 31 percent. However, the rates of dissatisfaction decrease as the share of people who answer 'I don't know' increases, A higher share of households located in remote villages reports to be satisfied with public spending at all levels compared to households located in accessible clusters. At the same time, there is no difference in satisfaction rates among the poor and non-poor. The breakdown by socio-economic category shows that employees are less satisfied with public spending than households belonging to other socio-economic categories. Households that reported dissatisfaction or said they did not know were asked to give reasons as to why this was so. 80 to 89 percent of the respondents said that leaders at the respective levels do not

provide them with any information on public spending. Dissatisfaction due to people not seeing results ranks second and embezzlement/corruption ranks third.

Table 8.4: Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction

	Kitongoji Spending	Village Spending	Ward Spending	District Spending
Total				
Satisfied	29	31	29	28
Not Satisfied	19	20	16	11
Don' Know	53	50	55	61
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location				
Accessible	24	27	26	26
Remote	40	39	36	33
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status				
Poor	29	29	28	25
Non-poor	29	31	29	29
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group				
Employee	19	24	17	21
Self-employed - agriculture	29	31	29	28
Self-employed - other	39	38	38	36
Other	21	28	28	21
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)				
I see no results	14	13	10	8
Embezzlement/corruption	7	10	11	6
Favouritism	3	4	3	1
This is what I hear	1	1	1	0
They give no information	80	81	86	89
No. of Obs.	448	448	448	448

Source: CWIQ 2006 Ngara DC

9 CHANGES BETWEEN 2003 AND 2006

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

Being estimates, the changes should not be read as points, but from the corresponding confidence intervals. For instance, Table 9.2 shows that the Net Enrolment Rate (NER) for secondary school increased by 20 percent, and that the confidence interval of the change runs from 6.1 to 33.5 percent. This should be read: 'the secondary school NER increased between 6.1 and 33.5, with 95 percent of confidence'. If the confidence interval includes zero, it is said that the change is not significant, because there is a chance that the change is zero. For the sake of space, the tables only show the 95 percent confidence intervals. However, some researchers or policy makers may prefer 90 or 99 percent confidence intervals. Although they are not presented in the tables, stars indicate the significance level of each change. *, **, and *** represent significance at the 90, 95 and 99 percent of confidence. The text only discusses changes at the 95 percent of confidence.

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

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

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

Table 9.1: Household Characteristics

	2003	2006	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Household Size							
1-2	14	15	1.0	2.55		-4.4	5.8
3-4	29	36	7.0	4.06	*	-1.1	15.1
5-6	26	28	2.0	3.61		-5.3	9.1
7+	30	21	-9.0	4.62	**	-18.9	-0.3
Mean Household Size	5.3	4.8	-0.5	0.24	**	-1.0	-0.1
Female-headed Households	17	18	1.0	1.97		-2.7	5.1

Source: Ngara DC CWIQ for 2003 and 2006

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

9.1 Household characteristics

Household size has remained fairly stable, as would be expected from two surveys with a relatively short time gap. There is a significant reduction in the share of households with 7 members or more. This change led to a reduction of mean household size from 5.3 to 4.8 members per household. In addition, the share of households headed by females has not changed at the 95 percent of confidence.

9.2 Education

Neither literacy nor Net Enrolment Rate (NER) for primary school changed between the surveys. However, there is a significant increase in secondary school NER, though it still lags far behind that primary school NER. The rate of satisfaction has remained steady in primary school and increased in secondary school.

Dissatisfaction with school remained steady. The only reason that shows a significant change is 'bad conditions of facilities'. The other reasons (lack of books, poor teaching, lack of teachers and overcrowding) do not show statistically significant reductions between the two surveys.

9.3 Health

The rates of need, use and satisfaction increased between 2003 and 2006. The only reason for dissatisfaction that shows an increase is the long waits. The changes in the other reasons are not statistically significant at the 95 percent of confidence, since their confidence intervals include 0.

The share of people who did not consult health facilities reduced significantly. There is an important reduction in the share of people who cited costs as the cause for not consulting. In both cases, most people did not consult because they didn't consider it necessary.

Government hospitals are the facility with the highest rate of use in both surveys. There is a significant decrease in the use of private hospitals and a compensating increase in the share of patients consulting traditional healers.

There is an increase in the percentage of women aged 40 and above that had a live birth in the year preceding the survey. According to both surveys, virtually all pregnant women received pre-natal care.

Table 9.2: Education

	2003	2006	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Literacy	64	61	-3	4.94		-13.0	6.7
Primary School							
Net Enrolment Rate	77	80	3	3.53		-4.0	10.2
Satisfaction	72	79	6	6.50		-8.1	17.9
Secondary School							
Net Enrolment Rate	4	24	20	6.82	***	6.1	33.5
Satisfaction	87	40	-47	14.82	***	-77.6	-15.6
Dissatisfaction Rate	27	27	0	5.45		-9.7	12.1
Reasons for Dissatisfaction							
Books/Supplies	52	51	-1	13.54		-30.2	24.0
Poor Teaching	6	3	-3	3.34		-9.9	3.5
Lack of Teachers	48	63	15	11.58		-10.5	36.0
Bad Condition of Facilities	57	18	-39	10.40	**	-45.3	-3.6
Overcrowding	26	36	10	10.42		-11.0	30.8

Source: Ngara DC CWIQ for 2003 and 2006

In addition, the share of women giving Both surveys enquire about the live births in the five years preceding the survey. The share of women who reported having been assisted by a TBA is lower in 2003, whereas the share of women who reported not having received any assistance increased. The share of women who reported having been assisted by a doctor, nurse, or midwife remained statistically unchanged at the 95 percent of confidence. birth in hospitals has remained statistically unchanged at roughly 40 percent of the deliveries.

The last panel of the table shows child nutrition indicators, previously defined in section 4. The rates of stunting and severe stunting, long-term indicators of child malnutrition, appear to be constant. The rates of wasting and severe wasting, short-term indicators, have decreased considerably between the two surveys.

Table 9.3: Health

	2003	2006	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Medical Services							
Need	15	28	13	1.97	***	9.4	17.2
Use	15	32	17	17.17		-16.6	50.8
Satisfaction	78	90	11	4.20	**	1.7	18.5
Reasons for Dissatisfaction							
Long wait	25	49	23	10.23	**	2.3	43.5
Shortage of trained professionals	6	0	-6	2.22	**	-8.7	0.3
Cost	34	17	-17	12.09	*	-39.8	8.9
No drugs available	24	13	-11	10.84		-30.6	13.0
Unsuccessful treatment	42	39	-3	11.37		-25.6	20.1
Not Consulting	86	68	-18	2.56	***	-22.2	-12.0
Reasons for Not Consulting							
No need	93	96	3	2.36		-1.2	8.3
Cost	8	3	-6	2.62	**	-11.2	-0.7
Distance	5	1	-4	2.01	*	-8.0	0.1
Facility Used							
Private hospital	5	1	-4	1.81	**	-7.3	-0.1
Government hospital	58	60	2	10.51		-17.8	24.2
Traditional healer	3	8	5	1.92	**	0.8	8.5
Pharmacy	10	16	6	2.72		-1.6	9.2
Women who Had Live-Births			0				
15-19	7	6	-2	3.46		-5.6	8.2
20-24	30	32	2	5.58	*	-1.8	20.5
25-29	23	21	-3	8.78		-18.3	16.9
30-39	32	30	-2	6.49	*	-1.8	24.2
40+	7	16	9	5.63	**	0.5	23.0
Prenatal care	100	96	-4	1.58	*	-0.1	0.0
Facilities Used in Child Deliveries							
Hospital or maternity ward	40	42	2	10.46		-18.5	23.3
Delivery Assistance							
Doctor/Nurse/Midwife	40	43	4	10.25		-17.1	23.9
TBA	52	34	-18	8.51	**	-34.4	-0.3
Other/Self	9	23	14	4.54	***	5.0	23.2
Child Nutrition							
Stunted	43	48	5	4.74		-4.4	14.6
Severely Stunted	18	14	-3	3.06		-11.1	1.1
Wasted	8	1	-7	1.94	***	-11.3	-3.5
Severely Wasted	1	0	-1	0.86	***	-4.6	-1.1

Source: Ngara DC CWIQ for 2003 and 2006

9.4 Household Assets and Perceptions of Welfare

Table 9.4 analyses changes in household assets and on welfare perceptions. There is a reduction in the share of households owning less land than the year preceding the survey. The change was compensated by the increase in the share of households for which land ownership did not change. In both surveys, the distribution of household by acreage of landholding is also constant. Regarding livestock ownership, there were no changes for any type of livestock holding.

The share of households that reported having difficulties satisfying food needs shows wide variations. The share of households that report having no problems satisfying food needs reduced between 3 and 24 percent. The figure for 'seldom' increased between 16 and 32 percentage points. There is no change in the percentage of households reporting problems with food needs 'sometimes'. Finally, the share of households who report having these problems 'always' decreased between 14 and 26 percentage points. This is consistent with the important reductions in the shares of households reporting deterioration of the economic situation of the household and the community.

Table 9.4: Household Assets and Perception of Welfare

	2003	2006	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Landholding							
No holding	7	4	-3	3.04		-9.1	3.1
Less	10	5	-5	2.19	**	-9.3	-0.5
Same	76	86	10	3.87	**	2.0	17.5
More	7	9	2	2.04		-1.9	6.3
Difficulty satisfying food needs							
Never	29	15	-14	5.45	**	-24.4	-2.6
Seldom	15	39	24	4.04	***	16.2	32.4
Sometimes	35	44	9	0.06		-2.6	20.6
Always	22	2	-20	2.87	***	-25.6	-14.1
Livestock							
No livestock	48	44	-4	4.56		-13.5	4.8
Small only	38	41	3	4.66		-6.7	12.0
Large only	3	3	0	1.77		-3.7	3.4
Small and large	10	12	2	2.59		-3.4	7.0
Landholding (in acres)							
Mean	3	2.6	-0.5	0.30		-1.1	0.1
0	7	4	-3	3.04		-9.1	3.1
0-0.99	8	15	7	3.41	*	-0.3	13.4
1-1.99	20	18	-3	4.20		-11.1	5.7
2-3.99	35	41	6	5.29		-4.6	16.6
4-5.99	20	14	-6	3.19		-8.5	4.3
6+	9	9	0	3.05		-10.8	1.4
Economic Situation Has Deteriorated							
Community	76	56	-20	-20.93	***	0.1	-33.2
Household	70	54	-16	5.65	***	-27.4	-4.8

Source: Ngara DC CWIQ for 2003 and 2006