PMO-RALG

SHINYANGA MC CWIQ
Survey on Poverty, Welfare and Services in Shinyanga MC

JANUARY 2007

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, Sampson Mutalemwa, 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, John Ibembe, Ngasuma Kanyeka, and Teddy Neema, under the supervision of Manuel Barron. Assistance from Charles Citinka and Howard Clegg from PMO-RALG is acknowledged.

DEFINITIONS

General

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

Education

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

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

Health

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

Employment

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

Welfare

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

2 POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLDS CHARACTERISTICS…..... 7
2.1 Introduction ……...…..... 7
2.2 Main Population Characteristics……...……..... 7
2.3 Main Household Characteristics……..…..... 9
2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household……..... 12
2.5 Orphan and Foster Status……..... 14

3 EDUCATION…….…….....…….....…..... 17
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……..... 19
3.2 Dissatisfaction…….....….....….... 21
3.3 Non-Attendance……...…...…..... 22
3.4 Enrolment and Drop Out Rates……..... 23
3.5 Literacy…….……..... 24

4 HEALTH…….…....…..... 27
4.1 Health Indicators……...…….....….... 27
4.2 Reasons for Dissatisfaction…….....…...….. 29
4.3 Reasons for Not Consulting……...…..... 30
4.4 Type of Illness……...…..... 31
4.5 Health Provider……...…….…..…..... 31
4.6 Child Deliveries…….....….. 32
4.7 Child Nutrition……..…..... 34

5 EMPLOYMENT……....…….....……..... 39
5.1 Employment Status of Total Adult Population……....…..... 39
5.1.1 Work Status…….....….....…..... 39
5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads…….....… 41
5.1.3 Youth Employment…….....…….. 41
5.2 Working Population…….....……... 42
5.3 Underemployment Population…….....…. 43
5.4 Unemployed Inactive Population……...…..... 46
5.5 Household Tasks…….…..... 47
5.6 Child labour……..…..... 49

6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES.. 51
6.1 Economic Situation…….….....….. 51
6.1.1 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Community…..... 51

6.1.2 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Household……..... 52
6.2 Self- reported Difficulties in Satisfying Household Needs……..... 54
6.2.1 Food Needs……..... 54
6.2.2 Paying School Fees……..... 55
6.2.3 Paying House Rent……..... 57
6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills……..... 57
6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare……..... 59
6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status……..... 60
6.3.1 Assets Ownership……..... 60
6.3.2 Occupancy Documentation ……..... 62
6.4 Agriculture……..... 62
6.4.1 Agriculture Inputs……..... 62
6.4.2 Landholding……..... 64
6.4.3 Cattle Ownership……..... 64
6.5 Perception of Crime and Security in the Community……..... 65
6.6 Household Income Contribution……... 67
6.7 Other House Items……..... 67

7 HOUESHOLD AMENITIES……..... 69
7.1 Housing Materials and Typing OF Housing Unit……. 69
7.2 Water and Sanitation……..... 72
7.3 Type of Fuel……..... 74
7.4 Distance to Facilities……..... 75
7.5 Anti -Malaria Measures……..... 77

8 GOVERNANCE……..... 81
8.1 attendance at Meeting……. 81
8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders……..... 82
8.3 Public Spending……..... 83

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Variables used to predict consumption expenditure..... 2
Table 1.2 Predicted vs. actual poverty rate in Shinyanga Region, and 2000/01……..... 3
Table 1.3 Cluster location……..……. 3
Table 1.4 Socio-economic group…….....…….... 4
Table 1.5 Socio-economic group and gender of households head ……..... 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……..… 12
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 less than 18 year's old living without mother and/or father..... 15
Table 3.1 Education indicators……..... 19
Table 3.2 Percent of students currently enrolled in school by reasons for dissatisfaction…. 20
Table 3.3 Percent of children 7-9 years who ever attended school by reasons not currently attending..... 21
Table 3.4 Primary School enrolment and drop out rates by age and gender..... 22
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 Percent of persons who consulted a health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and were not satisfied, and the reasons for dissatisfaction..... 28
Table 4.3 Percent of persons who did not consulted a health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and the reasons for not consulting..... 30
Table 4.4 Percent of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and those sick or injured the percent by type of sickness/injury..... 31
Table 4.5 Percent distribution of health consultation in past 4 weeks by type of health provider consulted…….…..... 32
Table 4.6 Percent of women aged 12-49 who had a live birth in the year preceding the survey by age of the mother and the percent of those births where the mother received pre-natal care..... 33
Table 4.7 Percent distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by place of birth..... 34
Table 4.8 Percent distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by person who assisted in delivery of the child..... 35
Table 4.9 Nutrition status indicators and program participating rates…….…..... 36
Table 4.10 Percent distribution of children vaccination by type of vaccination received….. 37
Table 4.11 Percent distribution of children vaccinated by source of information…….…..... 38
Table 5.1 Percent distribution of the population by working status (age 15 and above)..... 39

Table 5.2 Principal labour force indicators (persons age 15 and above)……..... 40
Table 5.3 Percent distribution of the population by work status (age 15 -24)……..... 40
Table 5.4 Percent distribution of the working population by type of payment in main job 41
Table 5.5 Percent distribution of the working population by employer…… 42
Table 5.6 Percent distribution of the working population by activity……..... 43
Table 5.7 Percent distribution of the working population by employer, sex and activity….. 44
Table 5.8 Percent distribution of the working population by employer, sex and employment status..... 44
Table 5.9 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by employment status….. 45
Table 5.10 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by employer…..... 45
Table 5.11 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by activity……..... 46
Table 5.12 Percent distribution of the unemployed population by reason……..…..... 47
Table 5.13 Percent distribution of the economically inactive population by reason…….. 47
Table 5.14 Activities normally undertaken in the households (age 15 and over)……..... 48
Table 5.15 Activities normally undertaken in the households (age 5 to 14)……..... 48
Table 5.16 Child labour (age 5 to 14)……..... 49
Table 6.1 Percent of household by the percent of the economic situation of the community compared to the year the survey..... 51
Table 6.2 Percent distribution of households by the percent of the economic situation of the household to the year before the survey..... 53
Table 6.3 Percent distribution of households by the difficult in satisfying the food needs of the household during the year before the survey..... 54
Table 6.4 Percent distribution of households but the difficulty in paying school fees during the year before the survey……..... 55
Table 6.5 Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying house rent during the year before the survey…….... 56
Table 6.6 Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying utility bills during the year before the survey……..... 58
Table 6.7 Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying for health care during the year before the survey…….... 59
Table 6.8 Percent of households owning certain assets……..... 60
Table 6.9 Percent distribution of households by occupancy status……...…. 61
Table 6.10 Percent distribution of household by type of occupancy documentation…...… 61
Table 6.11 Percent of household using agricultural inputs and the percent using certain inputs..... 62
Table 6.12 Percent distribution of households using agricultural inputs by the main source of the inputs……..... 63
Table 6.13 Percent distribution of households by the area of land owned by the household 64
Table 6.14 Percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned by the household..... 65
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..... 66
Table 6.16 Percent distribution of households by principal contributor to household income..... 67
Table 6.17 Percent of households owning selected household items……..... 68
Table 7.1 Percent distribution of households by material used for roof of the house……. 69
Table 7.2 Percent distribution of households by materials used for walls of the house..... 70
Table 7.3 Percent distribution of households by material used for floors of the house…….. 70
Table 7.4 Percent distribution of households by type of housing unit……..... 71
Table 7.5 Percent distribution of households by main source of drinking water……..... 72
Table 7.6 Percent distribution of households by main type of toilet……...… 73
Table 7.7 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for cooking…….. 74
Table 7.8 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for lighting……..... 75

Table 7.9 Percent distribution of household by time (in minutes) to reach nearest drinking water supply and health facility..... 76
Table 7.10 Percent distribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach the nearest primary and secondary school……..... 77
Table 7.11 Percent distribution of household by time (in minutes) to reach nearest food market and public transportation…..... 78
Table 7.12 Percent distribution of households taking anti-malaria measures and percent taking specific measures……..... 79
Table 8.1 Percent distribution of attendance of meetings (any household members within past 12 months) 81
Table 8.2 Distribution of leaders' satisfaction ratings and reasons for dissatisfaction……..... 82
Table 8.3 Percent distribution of households who received financial information in the past 12 months……..... 83
Table 8.4 Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction…….. 84

Generic Core Welfare Indicators (2006)

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Household characteristics						
Dependency ratio	0.7	0.0	0.6	0.9	0.9	0.7
Head is male	75.3	2.9	79.5	70.6	87.1	74.7
Head is female	24.7	3.0	20.5	29.4	12.9	25.3
Head is monagamous	60.5	3.1	62.8	57.9	73.5	59.8
Head is polygamous	4.7	1.1	4.3	5.2	13.5	4.3
Head is not married	34.8	3.1	32.9	37.0	12.9	35.9
Household welfare						
Household economic situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	34.6	2.7	34.8	34.4	44.4	34.1
Better now	35.1	3.5	36.8	33.2	20.6	35.8
Neighborhood crime/security situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	18.4	2.9	16.4	20.7	23.9	18.1
Better now	48.7	4.7	51.0	46.0	56.5	48.3
Difficulty satisfying household needs						
Food	44.6	4.1	29.3	62.0	79.7	42.9
School fees	8.2	1.9	9.3	6.9	20.0	7.6
House rent	4.9	1.0	6.5	3.1	5.4	4.9
Utility bills	12.5	2.0	13.5	11.4	7.2	12.8
Health care	22.8	2.7	19.1	26.9	20.3	22.9
Agriculture						
Land owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	1.1	0.5	0.6	1.7	9.0	0.7
More now	2.0	0.7	0.6	3.6	12.8	1.4
Cattle owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	8.1	2.0	2.3	14.7	7.2	8.1
More now	6.1	1.2	4.9	7.5	4.0	6.2
Use of agricultural inputs						
Yes	29.0	3.5	22.6	36.3	55.0	27.7
Fertilizers	70.4	4.2	69.2	71.4	71.2	70.4
Improved seedlings	51.1	5.9	60.3	44.6	53.2	50.9
Fingerlings	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.3
Hooks and nets	0.7	0.7	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.7
Insecticides	16.5	4.6	21.9	12.6	6.3	17.5
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Household infrastructure						
Secure housing tenure	35.9	5.2	51.9	17.7	16.4	36.9
Access to water	94.9	2.4	100.0	89.0	88.7	95.2
Safe water source	59.2	3.7	62.2	55.7	78.2	58.2
Safe sanitation	32.7	6.2	55.7	6.6	0.0	34.4
Improved waste disposal	55.9	7.8	85.0	23.0	37.2	56.9
Non-wood fuel used for cooking	3.4	0.9	5.3	1.2	0.0	3.5
Ownership of IT/Telecommunications Equipment						
Fixed line phone	6.5	1.5	10.4	2.2	0.0	6.9
Mobile phone	45.6	4.9	63.0	25.8	19.3	46.9
Radio set	75.3	3.3	85.7	63.6	27.6	77.8
Television set	25.5	4.1	40.9	8.1	6.0	26.5

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Employment						
Employer in the main job						
Civil service	3.4	1.0	5.0	1.7	0.0	3.7
Other public serve	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.4
Parastatal	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.3
NGO	1.2	0.5	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.3
Private sector formal	10.4	1.5	14.7	5.9	3.4	11.0
Private sector informal	35.2	1.8	31.2	39.5	38.9	34.9
Household	41.8	1.6	37.8	46.0	52.6	40.8
Activity in the main job						
Agriculture	13.2	3.3	3.7	23.1	22.8	12.3
Mining/quarrying	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1
Manufacturing	1.0	0.5	0.5	1.7	1.4	1.0
Services	11.4	1.9	9.5	13.3	7.2	11.7
Employment Status in last 7 days						
Unemployed (age 15-24)	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.2
Male	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.5
Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unemployed (age 15 and above))	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.5
Male	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.0	0.5
Female	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.1	0.0	0.5
Underemployed (age 15 and above)	22.0	1.6	17.7	26.6	24.9	21.8
Male	31.2	2.0	25.9	36.8	24.9	31.9
Female	13.3	1.7	10.0	16.8	24.9	12.3
Education						
Adult literacy rate						
Total	83.3	2.7	91.1	74.9	76.5	83.9
Male	89.5	2.1	95.2	83.3	79.8	90.5
Female	77.3	3.5	87.1	66.9	72.4	77.7
Youth literacy rate (age 15-24)						
Total	93.1	1.9	95.9	90.0	92.7	93.2
Male	94.8	1.8	97.6	91.9	91.1	95.4
Female	91.5	2.7	94.4	87.9	95.3	91.1
Primary school						
Access to School	90.2	3.4	95.7	86.0	88.3	90.5
Primary Gross Enrollment	111.3	2.9	108.5	113.5	120.7	110.1
Male	113.4	3.9	111.3	114.8	128.0	111.9
Female	109.1	4.7	105.9	111.9	115.6	108.0
Primary Net Enrollment	90.0	1.9	95.3	85.9	81.6	91.1
Male	88.2	2.4	97.3	82.1	76.2	89.5
Female	91.9	2.2	93.4	90.6	85.3	93.0
Satisfaction	54.3	5.5	54.1	54.4	63.8	52.9
Primary completion rate	25.6	4.3	29.3	22.7	16.4	26.8

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Secondary school						
Access to School	49.3	6.7	65.8	34.5	33.9	51.3
Secondary Gross Enrollment	37.1	4.2	50.9	24.7	24.7	38.7
Male	41.4	5.2	57.4	29.9	38.0	41.9
Female	32.2	4.4	45.1	17.4	7.2	35.1
Secondary Net Enrollment	29.7	3.5	38.9	21.4	5.4	32.8
Male	28.6	4.8	34.6	24.2	4.0	32.0
Female	30.9	4.3	42.7	17.4	7.2	33.7
Satisfaction	39.0	4.9	46.7	24.7	37.4	39.1
Secondary completion rate	6.6	2.7	12.6	1.3	3.1	7.1
Medical services						
Health access	57.8	6.2	77.4	38.6	45.2	59.0
Need	20.9	1.2	20.4	21.4	15.6	21.5
Use	24.5	0.9	24.9	24.0	17.9	25.1
Satisfaction	71.0	2.3	72.2	69.7	87.3	69.8
Consulted traditional healer	3.5	1.0	1.4	5.5	3.8	3.4
Pre-natal care	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Anti-malaria measures used	90.9	1.9	97.8	83.0	71.4	91.9
Person has physical/mental challenge	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.4
Child welfare and health						
Orphanhood (children under 18)						
Both parents dead	1.7	0.5	1.2	2.3	4.4	1.4
Father only	7.6	1.5	7.0	8.2	10.2	7.3
Mother only	4.0	0.7	5.6	2.6	3.0	4.1
Fostering (children under 18)						
Both parents absent	16.9	1.8	16.3	17.3	15.5	17.0
Father only absent	16.2	2.5	15.4	16.9	16.0	16.3
Mother only absent	5.6	1.2	6.3	5.1	1.6	6.1
Children under 5						
Delivery by health professionals	90.2	2.5	95.2	85.7	75.7	91.4
Measles immunization	70.7	2.7	71.8	69.7	49.8	72.4
Fully vaccinated	57.9	2.6	64.1	52.4	27.5	60.4
Not vaccinated	15.1	3.1	15.2	14.9	21.5	14.5
Stunted	17.9	3.3	21.3	15.4	49.1	15.4
Wasted	1.3	0.7	0.5	2.0	0.0	1.4
Underweight	8.7	2.5	11.2	6.9	17.1	8.1

** 1.96 standard deviations*

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Shinyanga MC CWIQ

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

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

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

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

Although beyond the purpose of this report, the results of Shinyanga MC CWIQ could also be set against those of other CWIQ surveys that have are being implemented at the time of writing in other districts in Tanzania: Bahi DC, Bariadi DC, Bukoba DC, Bukombe Dc, Bunda DC, Dodoma MC, Hanang DC, Karagwe DC, Kasulu DC, Kibondo DC, Kigoma DC, Kilosa DC, Kishapu DC, Korogwe DC, Kyela DC, Ludewa DC, Makete DC, Maswa DC, Meatu DC, Kahama DC, Mbulu DC, Morogoro DC, Mpwapwa DC, Muheza DC, Musoma DC, Ngara DC, Ngorongoro DC, Njombe DC, Rufiji DC, 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 Shinyanga MC CWIQ was sampled to be representative at district level. Data from the 2002 Census was used to put together a list of all mitaa[1] in the district. In the first stage of the sampling process, 30 mitaa were chosen with probabilities proportional to their population size. In a second stage a section was chosen within each selected mtaa[2] through simple random sampling. In the selected section (also referred to as cluster or enumeration area in this report), all households were listed and 15 households were randomly selected. In total 450 households in 30 clusters were visited. All households were given statistical weights reflecting the number of households that they represent

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

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

1.3 Constructed variables to disaggregate tables

The statistics in most tables in this report will be disaggregated by certain categories of individuals or households. Some of these variables have been constructed by the analysts and, in the light of their prominence in the report, deserve more explanation. This chapter discusses some of the most important of these variables: poverty status, cluster location and socio-economic group.

---

[1] Literally translated, the Swahili word 'mitaa' means 'streets', but refers to the sub-divisions of the district.

[2] Singular of 'mitaa'

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

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

Once the consumption level of a

Table 1.1 Variables Used to Predict Consumption Expenditure in Shinyanga Region

Basic Variables	***Household Amenities***
Househol size	Material in the walls
Level of education of the household head	Material in the floors
Main source of income	Meat consumption
Main activity of the household head	Number of meals per day
Household Assets	
Ownership of radio	
Landholding	

Source: HBS 2000/2001 for Shinyanga Region

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 needs3.

The Shinyanga MC 2006 CWIQ uses poverty predictors to classify households as poor or non-poor, i.e. to determine whether a household's monthly consumption per adult equivalent unit is below or above the Basic Needs Poverty Line. This binary approach generates two types of mistakes associated with the prediction:

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

One way of determining the accuracy of the poverty predictors is to see how many mistakes of each type the model makes. To do this the poverty predictor model is applied to the actual consumption expenditure data. Results of thiS exercise are presented in Table 1.2. The model wrongly predicts a non-poor household to be poor in 0.9 percent of the cases, and vice versa in 6.2 percent of the households. This gives an overall percentage of correct predictions of 92.9 percent.
When the model is applied to the CWIQ 2006 data for Shinyanga MC, the share of households living in poverty is 5 percent. However, it must be kept in mind that the aim of the model is not estimating poverty rates, but determining the characteristics of the poor population. Hence, the accuracy of the model does not hinge on the closeness between the estimated and actual poverty rate, but on the percentage of correct predictions as indicated in Table 1.2.

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

Predicted	Observed		
	Non-Poor	Poor	Total
Non-Poor	89.7	6.2	96.0
Poor	0.9	3.1	4.0
Total	90.6	9.4	100.0

Source: HBS 2000/01 for Shinyanga Region

Expenditure surveys, such as the 2000/2001 Household Budget Survey, are much better suited for informing on poverty rates. However, such large scale surveys have insufficient number of observations to inform on district-level trends. The Shinyanga MC 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					
Remote	16.0	25.0	200.0	8.4	12,360
Accessible	5.0	10.0	45.0	1.7	14,025

Source: CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

Table 1.4: Socio-economic Group, Poverty Rate, and Location

	Poverty Rate	Percentage Living in	
		Remote Clusters	Accessible Clusters
Socio-Economic Group			
Employees	0.6	74.4	25.6
Self-Employed Agriculture	10.1	11.0	89.0
Self-Employed Other	5.0	62.8	37.2
Other	2.2	35.7	64.3

Source: CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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 clusters are more likely to be poor than households in accessible clusters. Whereas the poverty rate in accessible clusters is 2 percent, the rate in remote clusters is 8 percent.

1.3.3 Socio-economic Group

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

Table 1.4 shows that the poverty rate is highest for households whose main income earner is self-employed in agriculture, at a rate of 10 percent. In turn, poverty is lowest for households where the main income earner is an employee, at 1 percent. In addition, households from the former group are the most likely to be located in accessible clusters, at 89 percent, whereas the former are the most likely to be located in remote clusters, at 74 percent.

The gender composition of the socio-economic group is shown in Table 1.5. Around 3 out of 4 households are headed by a male. The share of female-headed households is lowest for the employees at 15 percent and highest for the 'other' socio-economic group at 77 percent.

Table 1.6 shows the breakdown of socio economic groups by main activity of the household heads. The main economic activity in the district is public and private services, to which 53 percent of the household heads is dedicated. Employees are mostly dedicated to mining, manufacturing, energy or construction, with a share of 88 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities are mostly dedicated to services (88 percent). Almost 40 percent of the households in the 'other' category is dedicated to household duties.

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

	Male	Female	Total
Socio-economic Group			
Employees	85.1	14.9	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	78.4	21.6	100.0
Self-Employed Other	74.3	25.7	100.0
Other	22.9	77.1	100.0
Total	75.3	24.7	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

	Agriculture	Mining Manufacturing Energy Construction	Private and Public Services	Household Duties	Other	Total
Socio-economic Group						
Employees	4.1	87.5	5.5	1.4	1.4	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	52.6	1.4	39.3	4.7	2.0	100.0
Self-Employed Other	1.5	1.9	87.8	6.5	2.3	100.0
Other	2.5	19.4	17.0	38.6	22.5	100.0
Total	13.3	24.5	52.7	6.4	3.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1 Introduction

2 POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 Introduction

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

2.2 Main Population Characteristics

Table 2.1 shows the percent distribution of the population by cluster location and poverty status, by gender and age. Overall, the district's population is young. For instance, 5 percent of the population is 60 years old or over, whereas 39 percent is under 15 years old. The remaining 56 percent is between 15 and 59 years old. Remote clusters and poor households have higher shares in the 0-14 group and lower shares in the 15-59 cohort than accessible clusters and non-poor households.

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

The mean dependency ratio is 0.7, meaning that one adult has to take care of less than 1 person. The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote clusters report a higher dependency ratio than accessible clusters. In turn, poor households show a higher dependency ratio than non-poor households.

The dependency ratio increases with the number of household members, from 0.1 for households with 1 or 2 members, to 1.0 for households with 7 or more members. The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the self-employed in agriculture have the highest dependency ratio at 1.0, whereas the employees have the lowest ratio, at 0.6.

There are no differences in dependency ratio 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 4.5 individuals. Households with at most two individuals only represent 28 percent of all households in the district. The figure for households with 7 or more members is 21 percent.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible clusters tend to be smaller than households in remote clusters, with means of 4.1 and 4.8 members, respectively. The difference by poverty status is more pronounced, with

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	20.5	27.6	2.4	50.5	18.7	28.5	2.4	49.5	39.1	56.1	4.8	100.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	18.2	29.9	1.7	49.8	18.1	30.3	1.8	50.2	36.3	60.2	3.5	100.0
Remote	22.7	25.4	3.1	51.1	19.2	26.6	3.0	48.9	41.8	52.0	6.2	100.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	21.0	27.3	3.0	51.4	23.9	23.3	1.4	48.6	44.9	50.6	4.5	100.0
Non-poor	20.4	27.6	2.3	50.4	18.1	29.0	2.5	49.6	38.5	56.6	4.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

Table 2.2: Dependency ratio

	0-4 years	5-14 years	0-14 years	15-64 years	65+ years	Total	Dependency ratio
Total	0.6	1.1	1.7	2.6	0.1	4.5	0.7
Cluster Location							
Accessible	0.6	0.9	1.5	2.6	0.1	4.1	0.6
Remote	0.7	1.3	2.0	2.6	0.2	4.8	0.9
Poverty Status							
Poor	1.2	2.7	3.9	4.5	0.3	8.6	0.9
Non-poor	0.6	1.0	1.6	2.5	0.1	4.2	0.7
Household size							
1-2	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.4	0.1	1.6	0.1
3-4	0.6	0.6	1.2	2.1	0.1	3.4	0.6
5-6	0.8	1.5	2.3	3.0	0.1	5.5	0.8
7+	1.2	2.8	4.0	4.4	0.2	8.5	1.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.5	1.0	1.6	2.6	0.0	4.2	0.6
Self-employed - agriculture	0.7	1.5	2.2	2.5	0.3	5.0	1.0
Self-employed - other	0.7	1.0	1.7	2.7	0.1	4.5	0.7
Other	0.3	0.9	1.3	1.9	0.4	3.6	0.9
Gender of Household Head							
Male	0.7	1.2	1.9	2.8	0.1	4.8	0.7
Female	0.4	0.9	1.3	2.0	0.2	3.4	0.7

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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	27.6	28.8	22.3	21.3	100.0	4.5
Cluster Location						
Accessible	29.1	32.8	21.5	16.6	100.0	4.1
Remote	26.0	24.1	23.2	26.6	100.0	4.8
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	0.0	3.9	96.1	100.0	8.6
Non-poor	29.0	30.2	23.3	17.5	100.0	4.2
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	27.0	35.0	20.2	17.8	100.0	4.2
Self-employed - agric	24.9	26.6	16.7	31.8	100.0	5.0
Self-employed - other	26.1	27.1	27.4	19.3	100.0	4.5
Other	54.9	21.1	10.7	13.2	100.0	3.6
Gender of Household Head						
Male	22.3	29.3	23.0	25.4	100.0	4.8
Female	43.9	27.0	20.2	8.8	100.0	3.4

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

poor households reporting a mean household size of 8.6 members, and non-poor households reporting 4.2 members on average.

Regarding socio-economic groups, the self-employed in agriculture have the highest mean household size at 5.0 members, while the 'other' socio-economic group has the lowest at 3.6 members.

Finally, households headed by males are larger than female headed households: the former have 4.8 members in average, whereas the latter have only 3.4 members. This difference partly owes to the fact that, as shown in Section 2.4, female household heads rarely have a spouse.

2.3 Main Household Characteristics

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

The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible clusters report higher shares of 'head' and 'spouse' and lower shares of 'child' and 'other relative' than remote clusters. In turn, the analysis by poverty status shows that the shares of 'child' and 'other relative' are higher in poor households, whereas non-poor households report higher shares of 'head' and 'spouse'.

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

The gender breakdown shows that males are more likely to be household heads than females, with shares of 34 and 11 percent, respectively. In turn, females are more likely to be spouses to the household head than males, at rates of 29 and less than 1 percent, respectively.

Table 2.5 shows the percent distribution of the population age 12 and above by marital status. Overall, 43 percent of the population has never been married. In addition, 42 percent is married and monogamous, and 3 percent is married and polygamous. Despite virtually nobody in the district being 'officially' divorced, 5 percent of the population is 'unofficially' separated. Informal unions constitute 1 percent of the population and 5 percent is widowed.

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

The age breakdown shows that the 'polygamous-married' category peaks for the 60+ group, at 8 percent. For the population after 25 years old, married-monogamous is the most common category. 'Separated' and 'widowed' show higher shares for the older cohorts. 'Never married' also shows correlation with age, decreasing rapidly as the population gets older.

Around 49 percent of the men have never been married, but for women the figure is only 37 percent. While 9 percent of women are widowed and 8 percent

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

	Head	Spouse	Child	Parents	Other relative	Not related	Total
Total	22.5	14.7	44.8	0.4	16.7	0.8	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	24.2	16.3	43.7	0.3	14.9	0.6	100.0
Remote	20.8	13.2	45.9	0.5	18.5	1.1	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	11.6	10.8	56.4	0.3	20.8	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	23.6	15.1	43.6	0.5	16.3	0.9	100.0
Age							
0- 9	0.0	0.0	74.9	0.0	25.0	0.1	100.0
10-19	0.0	2.7	73.2	0.0	23.1	0.9	100.0
20-29	25.9	26.7	28.1	0.0	17.0	2.2	100.0
30-39	45.8	41.3	8.3	0.0	3.9	0.6	100.0
40-49	68.1	27.8	1.8	0.0	2.3	0.1	100.0
50-59	66.4	31.3	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
60 and above	68.5	10.1	2.6	7.7	9.3	1.8	100.0
Gender							
Male	33.5	0.4	48.1	0.2	17.2	0.7	100.0
Female	11.2	29.3	41.5	0.7	16.3	1.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

	Never married	Married monog	Married polyg	Informal, loose union	Divorced	Separated	Widowed	Total
Total	42.6	42.4	3.3	0.8	0.1	5.3	5.4	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	44.1	43.5	3.3	0.7	0.1	4.3	4.0	100.0
Remote	41.1	41.3	3.3	0.9	0.2	6.4	6.9	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	57.7	30.6	6.1	0.0	0.0	1.7	3.9	100.0
Non-poor	41.2	43.5	3.0	0.9	0.1	5.7	5.5	100.0
Age								
12-14	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	92.8	5.3	0.6	1.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
20-24	61.3	33.8	0.5	2.2	0.0	2.3	0.0	100.0
25-29	32.1	59.0	3.6	0.9	0.3	4.1	0.0	100.0
30-39	9.0	70.7	6.9	1.2	0.0	7.4	4.9	100.0
40-49	1.7	72.0	5.0	0.0	0.6	7.7	13.0	100.0
50-59	0.0	70.5	4.8	0.0	0.0	13.1	11.6	100.0
60 and above	1.4	43.8	7.9	0.0	0.0	17.0	29.9	100.0
Gender								
Male	48.5	42.9	3.3	0.8	0.0	2.2	2.2	100.0
Female	36.8	41.9	3.2	0.8	0.2	8.4	8.6	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

separated, the shares for males are 2 and 2 percent, respectively.

Table 2.6 shows the percent distribution of the population age 5 and above by socio-economic group. Overall, 10 percent of the population works as employees, 8 percent of the population is self-employed in agriculture, 20 percent is self-employed in non-agricultural activities, and 62 percent is dedicated to other activities (unemployed, inactive, unpaid, or household workers).

Accessible clusters and non-poor households report higher shares of employees and self-employed in non-agricultural activities, while their respective counterparts report higher shares in working as self-employed in agriculture and 'other' activities.

The analysis of age-groups is particularly interesting. The share of employees peaks at 23 percent for the 40-49 cohort. The share of 'self-employed other' is higher for the population in the 30-39 and 40-49 age-groups, at around 40 percent. The share of self-employed in agriculture tends to increase with age, peaking at 34 percent for the 60+ cohort. On the contrary, the category 'other' tends to decrease with age, showing a sharp decrease between 15-19 and 20-29, from 91 to 49 percent, then decreases gradually until around 20 percent, but regains importance in the oldest cohort.

The gender breakdown shows that males report higher shares than females in every category except 'other'.

Table 2.7 shows the percent distribution of the population aged 5 and above by highest level of education. Roughly 19 percent of the population has no education, 26 percent has just some primary, and 31 percent has completed primary. 12 percent has some primary and 8 percent of the population has post secondary studies.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote clusters report a higher share of population with no education and just some primary, while accessible clusters report higher shares with some secondary and post secondary education. The breakdown by poverty status shows similar differences, with non-poor households reporting higher percentages of population in the higher educational levels.

The age breakdown shows that 55 percent of the children between 5 and 9 have no formal education, but 99 percent of the children 10-14 have some primary, complete primary, or some secondary. Rates of no education are lowest for the population in the 10-14 and 15-19 cohorts (1 and 3 percent, respectively) and higher

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	10.0	7.7	20.0	62.3	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	14.4	2.3	24.4	58.8	100.0
Remote	5.7	13.0	15.6	65.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	2.0	12.5	11.9	73.6	100.0
Non-poor	10.9	7.2	20.8	61.1	100.0
Age					
5- 9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
10-14	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
15-19	1.5	0.2	7.0	91.3	100.0
20-29	17.6	3.4	29.8	49.2	100.0
30-39	16.5	11.2	42.3	30.0	100.0
40-49	23.3	19.2	39.3	18.1	100.0
50-59	21.0	27.5	31.3	20.2	100.0
60 and above	4.5	33.9	22.7	38.9	100.0
Gender					
Male	13.0	9.9	23.8	53.3	100.0
Female	7.0	5.5	16.1	71.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

for the older groups. In the groups between 20 and 49 years old, the most common level of education is completed primary.

The gender breakdown shows that females have a higher share of uneducated population than males: 22 against 15 percent. In turn, the shares of males reporting some primary and post secondary education are higher than those of females.

2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household

Table 2.8 shows the percent distribution of household heads by marital status. Overall, 61 percent of the household heads is married and monogamous, 24 divorced, separated or widowed, 5 percent married and polygamous, 9 percent has never been married and the remaining 1 percent lives in an informal union.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible clusters report higher shares of household heads that have never been married or are in a monogamous marriage, than remote clusters. In turn, the latter report a higher share in widowed/divorced/separated.

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

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

Most female household heads are divorced, separated or widowed (79 percent), whereas for males, this category roughly represents 6 percent. In turn, most male household heads are married, monogamous or polygamous (79 and 6 percent, respectively).

Table 2.9 shows the percent distribution of household heads by socio-economic group. It is worth remembering that the socio-economic group of the household is determined by the type of employment of the main income earner of the household, who not always the household head. The great majority of the district's household heads belongs to the self-employed in non-agricultural activities, with a share of 47 percent. The employees represent 26 percent of the household heads, the self-employed in agriculture represent 22 percent, and the remaining 5 percent belongs to the 'other' socio-economic

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	18.7	2.4	25.8	31.4	11.7	1.9	8.2	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	13.1	2.8	19.6	31.4	18.8	3.2	11.1	100.0
Remote	24.2	2.0	31.8	31.4	4.8	0.5	5.3	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	28.6	2.6	33.5	25.3	8.8	0.6	0.6	100.0
Non-poor	17.6	2.4	25.0	32.1	12.0	2.0	8.9	100.0
Age								
5- 9	55.1	14.5	30.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	1.3	0.9	88.7	8.2	1.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	2.5	0.0	20.0	45.9	30.8	0.0	0.9	100.0
20-29	5.9	0.0	10.3	46.6	19.1	4.9	13.1	100.0
30-39	9.8	0.0	4.6	57.2	8.6	4.9	14.8	100.0
40-49	16.7	0.0	4.9	49.7	11.0	1.0	16.7	100.0
50-59	37.1	0.0	21.0	15.4	9.6	0.9	16.0	100.0
60 and above	52.1	0.0	26.2	7.7	2.4	0.0	11.6	100.0
Gender								
Male	15.2	2.5	27.4	30.6	11.2	2.9	10.4	100.0
Female	22.2	2.3	24.1	32.3	12.3	0.9	5.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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	9.3	60.5	4.7	1.2	24.3	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	13.6	62.8	4.3	1.0	18.2	100.0
Remote	4.4	57.9	5.2	1.5	31.1	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	73.5	13.5	0.0	12.9	100.0
Non-poor	9.8	59.8	4.3	1.3	24.8	100.0
Age						
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	34.7	51.6	2.6	3.9	7.1	100.0
30-39	5.1	72.0	4.7	1.6	16.6	100.0
40-49	2.2	63.2	6.4	0.0	28.2	100.0
50-59	0.0	59.9	4.7	0.0	35.4	100.0
60 and above	0.0	52.3	5.4	0.0	42.3	100.0
Gender						
Male	6.5	79.2	6.3	1.6	6.4	100.0
Female	17.8	3.5	0.1	0.0	78.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

group (unemployed, inactive, unpaid and household workers).

The analysis by cluster location shows that accessible clusters report higher shares of employees and self-employed in non-agricultural activities, while remote clusters show a higher share of self-employed in agriculture. In turn, non-poor households are more likely than poor households to belong to the 'employee' group, and less likely to belong to the 'self-employed agriculture' socio-economic group.

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

	Employed	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	26.2	21.7	46.8	5.3	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	36.6	4.5	55.3	3.6	100.0
Remote	14.3	41.3	37.2	7.3	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	3.5	45.7	48.4	2.4	100.0
Non-poor	27.3	20.5	46.7	5.4	100.0
Age					
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	31.5	9.1	55.2	4.2	100.0
30-39	26.3	13.4	54.1	6.2	100.0
40-49	30.4	19.8	49.8	0.0	100.0
50-59	26.9	35.4	33.7	3.9	100.0
60 and above	10.1	41.1	33.0	15.9	100.0
Gender					
Male	29.6	22.6	46.2	1.6	100.0
Female	15.7	19.0	48.7	16.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

The breakdown by age of the household head shows interesting insights. For the age-groups until 40-49, 'self-employed other' is the most important category, representing around half the household heads in those age-group. In the groups between 20 and 59 years old, the share in the 'employee' category fluctuates between 26 and 32 percent, but decreases to 10 percent for the oldest cohort. The 'other' category gains importance in the 60+ age-group, with a share 16 percent, as it includes the economically inactive population.

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

Table 2.10 shows the percent distribution of the heads of household by highest level of education. Overall, around 30 percent of the household heads has any education after primary. 16 percent of the household heads has no education, 13 percent some primary and 41 percent have completed primary.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that household heads from remote clusters report higher shares in the lower levels of education, while household heads from accessible clusters show higher shares in the higher levels of education. Poverty status is strongly correlated with the education of the household heads. This should be no surprise, since education of the household head is one of the poverty predictors used to define poverty status. However, the difference is still important: household heads from poor households are more likely to have no education than heads from non-poor households, whereas the latter show remarkably higher shares in the higher levels of education.

The age breakdown shows that 80 percent of household heads aged 37 or over has no education, and a further 32 percent just some primary. Completed primary represents between 50 and 60 percent for the groups between 20 and 49; but only 14 percent in the 50-59 cohort. The share of household heads with post secondary education does not vary widely with age, ranging from 17 percent for the youngest and the oldest cohorts to 22 percent for the 40-49 age-group.

The analysis by gender shows that female household heads are more likely to have no education than males, with rates of 38 and 9 percent, respectively. Males report a

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	16.0	13.4	40.7	8.4	2.7	18.8	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	7.8	8.4	41.3	13.6	4.7	24.2	100.0
Remote	25.3	19.0	39.9	2.6	0.5	12.7	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	44.0	14.3	41.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	14.6	13.4	40.6	8.8	2.9	19.7	100.0
Age							
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	5.7	10.8	51.8	11.6	2.9	17.3	100.0
30-39	6.3	3.6	57.4	7.4	6.7	18.6	100.0
40-49	11.5	4.6	51.2	9.5	1.5	21.8	100.0
50-59	31.2	26.9	14.0	8.3	1.4	18.2	100.0
60 and above	36.6	31.8	11.1	3.6	0.0	16.9	100.0
Gender							
Male	9.0	13.3	41.6	9.0	3.6	23.6	100.0
Female	37.5	13.9	37.9	6.6	0.0	4.1	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

higher share with complete primary than females. Furthermore, 37 percent of the male household heads has post primary studies, against 11 percent of females.

2.5 Orphan and Foster Status

Table 2.11 shows the percent distribution of children under 18 years old who have lost at least one parent. Overall, about 2 percent of children under 18 lost both parents, 4 percent lost only their mother and 8 percent lost only their father. This amounts to 14 percent of all children under 18 who lost at least one parent at the time of the survey.

The age breakdown shows that orphan status is correlated with age: as can be expected older children are more likely to be orphans than younger children. Around 28 percent of the children between 15 and 17 years lost at least one parent, and 20 of the children in that age-group lost their father. There does not seem to be a gender trend in orphan status.

The percent distribution of children under 18 years old by foster status is shown in Table 2.12. A child is defined as living in a nuclear household when both parents live in the household and as living in a non-nuclear household when at least one parent is absent from the household. Note that this makes it a variable defined at the level of the child, rather than the household (a household may be nuclear with respect to one child, but not with respect to another). The table shows that 39 percent of children under 18 were living in non-nuclear households at the time of the survey.

The breakdown by cluster location shows no strong differences. The breakdown by poverty status shows that 39 percent of children from non-poor households lives in non-nuclear households, while the share for poor households is 33 percent.

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

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

Table 2.11 - 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	4.0	7.6	1.7
Cluster Location			
Accessible	5.6	7.0	1.2
Remote	2.6	8.2	2.3
Poverty Status			
Poor	3.0	10.2	4.4
Non-poor	4.1	7.3	1.4
Age			
0-4	1.8	1.2	0.0
5-9	3.9	7.0	0.8
10-14	4.3	10.1	3.1
15-17	7.7	16.2	4.4
Gender			
Male	3.3	8.0	2.4
Female	4.8	7.2	1.1

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

2 Population and Household Characteristics

3 EDUCATION

This chapter examines selected education indicators in Shinyanga MC. 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 83 percent. Literacy rates differ between accessible and remote clusters at 91 and 75 percent respectively. Likewise, the literacy rate among non-poor households is higher than that of poor households at 84 and 77 percent respectively.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the literacy rate is higher among households where the main income earner is an employee (95 percent) than in the remaining categories.

The gender breakdown shows an important literacy rate gap between men and women. The literacy rate among men is 13 percentage points higher than that of women at 90 percent and 77 percent respectively.

Orphaned children have a literacy rate of 96 percent, whereas the rate for non-orphaned children is 2 points lower, at 94 percent. Finally, the literacy rate among non-fostered children is 13 percentage points higher than that of fostered children at 97 and 84 percent respectively.

3.1.2 Primary School Access

Primary school access rate is defined as the proportion of primary school-age children (7 to 13 years) reporting to live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school. Overall, 90 percent of primary school-age children live within 30 minutes of a primary school. Primary school access is higher in accessible clusters than in remote clusters, at 96 and 86 percent respectively.

The majority (91 percent) of the children aged 7 to 13 living in non-poor households lives within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school compared to 88 percent of those living in poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that 98 percent of children living in households belonging to the 'employee' category lives within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school compared to 84 percent of the children living in households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category.

Non-orphaned children have a higher access rate to primary schools than orphaned children, at 91 and 86 percent respectively. On the other hand, 92 percent of fostered children has access to primary schools, whereas the rate for non-fostered children is 90 percent. Finally, females have a higher access rate to primary schools than males at 92 and 89 percent respectively.

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

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

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 111 percent at the time of the survey. This figure indicates that all individuals who were at primary school constitute 111 percent of all children of primary school-age in the district. The NER further shows that 90 percent of all primary school-age children were attending school.

While the GER for households located in remote clusters is 114 percent, the rate for households located in accessible clusters is 109 percent. On the other hand, NER for households located in accessible clusters is higher than that of households in remote clusters at 95 and 86 percent respectively. Furthermore, while GER for poor households is 121 percent, the rate for non-poor households is 110 percent. In turn, NER for non-poor households is higher than that of poor households at 91 and 82 percent respectively.

GER is highest among people living in households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category at 123 and NER is highest among people living in households belonging to the 'employee' category at 96 percent. On the other hand, GER and NER are lowest among households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category at 81 percent.

Furthermore, while GER for males is 113 percent, the rate for females is 109 percent. In contrast, females have a higher NER than males at 92 and 88 percent respectively.

The breakdown by orphan status shows that GER for non-orphaned children is higher than that of orphaned children at 112 and 107 percent respectively. In contrast, orphaned children have a higher NER than non-orphaned at 94 and 90 percent respectively. On the other hand, foster status does not show strong correlation with GER. In contrast, non-fostered children have a higher NER than fostered children at 90 and 87 percent respectively. It is worth remembering the small sample size in the orphaned and fostered category (see chapter 2), as well as that foster and orphan status are strongly correlated with age: orphaned and fostered children have higher mean ages than non-orphaned and non-fostered children.

Satisfaction

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

54 percent of all primary school pupils were satisfied with school. Cluster location does not show strong correlation with primary school satisfaction rates. In contrast, while 64 percent of pupils living in poor households reported to be satisfied with school, the share for pupils living in non-poor households is 53 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that households belonging to the 'other' category have the highest rate of satisfaction with their primary schools at 72 percent, while pupils living in households belonging to the 'employee' category have the lowest satisfaction rate at 45 percent.

Furthermore, 55 percent of non-orphaned children reported to be satisfied with primary school compared to 52 percent of orphaned children. On the other hand, while 66 percent of fostered children reported to be satisfied with primary school, the share for non-fostered children is 54 percent. Finally, females have a

Table 3.1: Education indicators

		Primary				Secondary			
	Adult Literacy rate	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction
Total	83.3	90.2	111.3	90.0	54.3	32.2	37.1	29.7	39.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	91.1	95.7	108.5	95.3	54.1	47.5	50.9	38.9	46.7
Remote	74.9	86.0	113.5	85.9	54.4	18.5	24.7	21.4	24.7
Poverty Status									
Poor	76.5	88.3	120.7	81.6	63.8	27.7	24.7	5.4	37.4
Non-poor	83.9	90.5	110.1	91.1	52.9	32.8	38.7	32.8	39.1
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	95.3	98.2	106.7	96.3	44.6	49.0	61.5	54.3	36.4
Self-employed - agriculture	68.6	84.0	123.3	84.6	49.0	32.3	18.6	17.4	20.7
Self-employed - other	85.8	89.1	110.7	91.3	62.0	26.5	35.2	24.0	44.4
Other	60.5	93.3	81.0	81.0	72.0	3.0	29.5	29.5	61.9
Gender									
Male	89.5	88.6	113.4	88.2	53.1	33.8	41.4	28.6	35.5
Female	77.3	92.0	109.1	91.9	55.6	30.4	32.2	30.9	44.0
Orphan status									
Orphaned	95.8	85.5	106.6	93.5	52.0	39.8	34.0	34.0	30.8
Not-orphaned	93.7	91.0	111.5	89.5	55.1	25.3	29.4	29.4	42.5
Foster status									
Fostered	84.4	92.0	109.8	86.9	66.1	24.7	7.8	7.8	20.5
Not-fostered	96.7	89.5	110.8	89.8	53.9	28.8	33.7	33.7	40.5

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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.

higher satisfaction rate than males at 56 and 53 percent respectively.

3.1.3 Secondary School

Access

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

Only 32 percent of all pupils in secondary school live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school. While 48 percent of pupils living in accessible clusters live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, the share for pupils living in remote clusters is 19 percent. Similarly, 33 percent of pupils living in non-poor households live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, whereas the share for pupils living in poor households is 28 percent.

The socio-economic status of the household seems to be strongly correlated with the rate of access to secondary school. While pupils living in households belonging to the 'employee' category have the highest rate of access to secondary school at 49 percent, followed by those who belong to the 'self-employed agriculture' category (32 percent), the share for the 'other' category is 3 percent.

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	45.9	34.2	20.9	42.8	1.6	11.2	35.9	13.8	3.2
Cluster Location									
Accessible	44.3	32.5	22.4	37.3	1.0	7.3	35.8	18.2	1.5
Remote	47.6	35.9	19.4	48.1	2.2	14.9	36.1	9.7	4.8
Poverty Status									
Poor	43.4	27.4	13.7	45.0	7.8	5.1	47.4	8.9	0.0
Non-poor	46.2	35.0	21.7	42.6	0.9	11.9	34.6	14.4	3.6
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	54.0	33.4	23.8	30.5	2.4	6.9	44.3	23.1	3.2
Self-employed - agriculture	50.1	39.4	12.8	59.6	1.0	16.2	34.2	1.3	7.8
Self-employed - other	39.8	32.1	24.1	42.2	1.3	12.3	31.6	12.7	0.0
Other	26.4	20.3	20.3	39.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	39.8	0.0
Gender									
Male	48.1	37.5	23.8	41.5	2.3	13.2	37.1	13.1	1.9
Female	43.2	29.8	16.9	44.6	0.7	8.5	34.4	14.8	4.9
Type of school									
Primary	45.7	36.9	23.0	41.8	2.1	14.5	33.6	5.4	3.0
Government	46.4	38.3	23.8	43.5	2.2	15.0	34.9	1.5	3.1
Private	17.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	100.0	0.0
Other	77.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Secondary	61.0	34.2	21.0	52.0	0.0	7.1	45.1	26.3	0.0
Government	59.6	45.1	13.2	72.0	0.0	8.7	57.5	0.0	0.0
Private	72.2	20.7	29.2	27.7	0.0	0.0	32.0	54.2	0.0
Other	44.4	36.9	23.1	55.7	0.0	22.7	41.6	32.6	0.0
Other	31.6	20.7	10.1	30.2	2.2	2.4	30.2	32.8	10.4
Government	33.7	10.4	16.4	23.0	3.6	3.9	21.7	40.4	16.9
Private	35.7	43.6	0.0	45.9	0.0	0.0	51.3	10.2	0.0
Other	13.2	0.0	0.0	17.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	82.7	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

While 34 percent of males live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, the share for females is 30 percent. On the other hand, the access rate for orphaned children is 40 percent, higher than that for non-orphaned children, at 25 percent. Likewise, while 29 percent of non-fostered children live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, the share for fostered children is 25 percent.

Enrolment

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

The GER and NER at secondary school are very low compared to primary school level. Overall, GER was 37 percent and NER was 30 percent. The secondary school GER for households located in accessible clusters is 26 percentage points higher than that of households located in remote clusters at 51 and 25 percent respectively. Likewise, Secondary school NER is higher in accessible clusters than remote clusters at 39 and 21 percent respectively. Furthermore, both secondary GER and NER are higher in non-poor households than in poor households, with a difference of 14 and 28 percentage points respectively.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that employees are the category with highest GER and NER

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

			Reasons not currently attending									
	Percent not attending	Completed school	Distance	Cost	Work	Illness	Pregnancy	Got married	Useless/ uninteresting	Failed exam	Awaits admission	Dismissed
Total	23.2	31.3	0.0	12.8	11.8	1.6	1.1	6.2	12.8	26.6	36.2	0.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	25.2	31.7	0.0	9.3	14.5	0.9	0.0	6.4	8.2	22.7	47.0	0.0
Remote	21.4	30.8	0.0	16.4	9.0	2.3	2.2	6.1	17.6	30.5	25.3	0.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	28.4	37.9	0.0	8.0	1.5	4.6	0.0	3.2	24.0	27.3	25.7	0.0
Non-poor	22.5	30.3	0.0	13.5	13.4	1.1	1.3	6.7	11.1	26.4	37.8	0.0
Socio-economic Group												
Employee	14.6	29.4	0.0	23.1	1.9	1.4	0.0	6.1	11.5	24.2	37.9	0.0
Self-employed - agric	18.6	18.0	0.0	5.9	6.4	5.4	0.0	2.0	28.5	16.7	35.4	0.0
Self-employed - other	30.8	34.2	0.0	13.5	17.2	0.4	1.9	8.3	7.0	31.7	38.5	0.0
Other	21.7	60.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.2	13.1	5.2	0.0
Gender												
Male	22.7	30.1	0.0	10.6	9.1	1.2	0.0	0.0	12.8	18.5	41.4	0.0
Female	23.7	32.6	0.0	15.2	14.7	2.0	2.3	12.9	12.9	35.1	30.6	0.0
Age												
7-13	3.0	37.8	0.0	0.0	2.8	9.0	0.0	0.0	20.2	0.0	67.9	0.0
14-19	46.4	30.8	0.0	13.7	12.4	1.0	1.2	6.7	12.3	28.5	33.9	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

at 62 and 54 percent respectively, whereas the 'self-employed agriculture' category have the lowest GER and NER at 19 and 17 percent respectively. Furthermore, while GER for males is 41 percent, the share for females is 32 percent. In turn, females have a higher NER than males at 31 and 29 percent respectively.

Finally, the GER and NER rates among orphaned children are higher than among non-orphaned children at 34 and 29 percent respectively. On the other hand, while the GER and NER for non-fostered children is 34 percent, the share for fostered children is 8 percent.

Satisfaction

39 percent of the secondary school students is satisfied with school. 61 percent of this population reports to be dissatisfied with the secondary schools they attend. This satisfaction rate is lower than in primary schools (54 percent). The satisfaction rate is higher among students from accessible clusters than that of students from remote clusters, at 47 and 25 percent respectively. Likewise, while 39 percent of pupils living in non-poor households was satisfied with their school, the share for those living in poor households is 37 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that 62 percent of pupils living in households belonging to the 'other' category is satisfied with secondary school, whereas the share for those living in households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category is 21 percent.

44 percent of female pupils was satisfied with school compared to 36 percent of males. Among the individuals enrolled in secondary schools, non-orphaned children were more satisfied with their schools than orphaned children. 43 percent of non-orphaned children was satisfied with their schools compared to 31 percent of orphaned children. Similarly, 41 percent of non-fostered children reported to be satisfied with their secondary schools compared to 21 percent of fostered children.

3.2 Dissatisfaction

One of the aims of the survey is to inform on perceptions of quality of services received among individuals for whom these are provided. To obtain this information, primary and secondary school students who were not satisfied with school at the time of the survey were asked to provide reasons for their

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	88.2	91.9	90.0	2.3	3.0	2.7
7	58.3	82.2	66.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	76.0	93.4	84.7	8.7	0.0	4.3
9	100.0	91.8	96.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
10	94.0	99.0	97.3	1.9	0.0	0.7
11	99.0	94.3	96.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
12	97.5	91.5	94.7	2.5	7.1	4.6
13	94.7	88.2	91.4	5.3	11.8	8.6

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

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, 46 percent of the students who were enrolled in either primary or secondary school reported dissatisfaction with school. 43 percent of students reported lack of teachers as the cause of their dissatisfaction. In addition, 36 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools due to bad condition of facilities, whereas 34 percent reported lack of books and supplies. While 21 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools due to poor teaching, 14 percent reported high fees and 11 percent reported lack of space

The dissatisfaction rate for people living in remote clusters is 4 percentage points higher than that of those living in accessible clusters, at 48 and 44 percent respectively. Likewise, the rate of dissatisfaction for people living in non-poor households is slightly higher than that of people living in poor households at 46 and 43 percent respectively. Further breakdown of the data shows that the dissatisfaction rate due to lack of teachers among poor households is higher than that among non-poor households at 45 and 43 percent respectively. Likewise, while 48 percent of people living in remote clusters reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers, the share for those living in accessible clusters is 37 percent. It is also observed that 15 percent of people living in remote clusters reported dissatisfaction due to lack of space compared to 7 percent of people living in accessible clusters.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the dissatisfaction rate among households belonging to the 'employee' category is the highest (54 percent). At the same time the 'other' category reported the lowest dissatisfaction rate (26 percent). It is also observed that 60 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers compared to 31 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category.

The gender breakdown shows that the dissatisfaction rate among males is higher than that among females at 48 and 43 percent respectively.

Those attending primary school reported to be most dissatisfied due to lack of teachers (42 percent) followed by lack of books and supplies (37 percent) while those attending secondary schools reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers (52 percent) followed by bad condition of facilities (45 percent).

3.3 Non-attendance

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

The district has about 23 percent of 7 to 19 year olds who were not attending school. Around 36 percent of the non-attending population did not attend because they were awaiting admission. 31 percent reported that they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level and 27 percent said they had failed standard four, seven or form four exams. 13 percent of respondents reported that they were not attending school either due to cost or school was useless or uninteresting. While 12 percent were not attending due to wok, 6 percent were not attending because they had gotten married.

25 percent of children from households located in accessible clusters does not attend school compared to 21 percent of children from households located in

remote clusters. Likewise, while 28 percent of children from poor households does not attend school, the share for those from non-poor households is 23 percent. Further breakdown of the data shows that while 47 percent of children living in households located in accessible clusters were not attending school because they were awaiting admission, the share for those living in households located in remote clusters is 25 percent. Similarly, 38 percent of children living in non-poor households were not attending school because they were awaiting admission compared to 26 percent of those living in poor households. Likewise, while 38 percent of children living in poor households were not attending school because they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level, the share for children living in non-poor households was 30 percent. It is also noticeable that while 7 percent of children living in non-poor households were not attending school due to marriage, the share for those living in poor households was 3 percent.

Furthermore, 31 percent of children from households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed other' category does not attend school compared to 15 percent of those from households belonging to the 'employee' category. Further breakdown of the data shows that while 61 percent of children from households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category was not attending because they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level , the share for those from households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category is 18 percent.

Gender does not show strong correlation with non-attendance rates. However, further breakdown of the data shows that while 41 percent of boys was not attending because they were awaiting admission, the share for girls is 31 percent. It is also observed that while 13 percent of females were not attending school due to marriage, the share for males was virtually null.

Almost all primary school-aged children attend school, as their non-attendance rate is 3 percent. On the other hand, the share for secondary school-age children is 46 percent. 29 percent of secondary school-aged individuals not attending secondary school reported having failed exams. While 68 percent of primary school-aged children not attending school reported that they were awaiting admission, the share for secondary school-aged children is 34 percent.

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	28.6	30.9	29.7	26.5	16.1	21.6
14	11.5	13.4	12.3	29.8	18.5	24.9
15	30.8	38.9	34.9	22.7	19.5	21.1
16	26.5	32.2	29.6	43.5	22.1	32.0
17	39.1	49.1	44.0	38.3	18.4	28.3
18	28.1	18.9	24.6	14.0	5.6	10.8
19	33.5	15.6	25.9	12.0	3.7	8.5

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

3.4 Enrolment and Drop-out Rates

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

Primary School

Table 3.4 shows primary school net enrolment and drop-out rates. The drop-out rates at primary level are generally very low. Disaggregation of the data shows that at the time of the survey, the primary school drop-out rate was only 3 percent. Therefore, only enrolment rates will be analysed.

Overall, 90 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), 92 percent of girls and 88 percent of boys were enrolled. The required age at which children should start standard one is 7 years. However, data on primary school enrolment show that at the time of the survey 66 percent of all seven year olds were enrolled. Children are most likely to be in school by the ages of 10 and 11, where the NER is about 97 percent.

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	89.5	77.3	83.3
15-19 years	94.4	95.2	94.8
20-29 years	94.0	88.3	91.0
30-39 years	92.1	84.6	88.1
40-49 years	87.1	70.6	79.6
50-59 years	79.4	43.5	60.7
60+ years	69.7	20.8	45.1
Accessible	95.2	87.1	91.1
15-19 years	100.0	97.6	98.7
20-29 years	94.1	91.6	92.8
30-39 years	95.8	93.7	94.8
40-49 years	99.2	75.8	88.1
50-59 years	84.8	67.4	77.0
60+ years	90.1	41.5	65.1
Remote	83.3	66.9	74.9
15-19 years	90.0	92.1	90.8
20-29 years	94.0	83.4	88.3
30-39 years	85.3	76.2	79.6
40-49 years	77.0	65.9	72.1
50-59 years	74.7	30.6	49.6
60+ years	59.0	8.9	34.3

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is population age 15+

Secondary School

Table 3.5 shows secondary net enrolment patterns by age. Secondary school enrolment rates are much lower than those at primary level. Only 30 percent of secondary school-aged children was enrolled compared to 90 percent in primary school. For a person following a normal school curriculum, i.e. started standard one at age 7, he/she is expected to start form one at age 14. The table shows that the widest difference in enrolment rates is observed between the ages of 14 and 15. Furthermore, 44 percent of 17 year olds reported to be enrolled at the time of the survey. It is also noticeable that the rate of girls enrolled in secondary school at the age of 14 is higher than that of boys, at 13 and 12 percent respectively.

Secondary school drop-out rates among secondary school-age individuals (14 to 19 years) are higher compared to those of primary school. 22 percent of children of secondary school-age had dropped out in the year prior to the survey. In general, the highest drop-out rate is observed among 16 year olds (at 32 percent). The highest drop-out rate among males and females is at the age 16.

3.5 Literacy

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

Adult Literacy

Overall, 83 percent of the population aged 15 and above in the district are literate. The difference in literacy rates among males and females is about 13 percentage points at 90 and 77 percent respectively. Individuals aged between 15 and 19 have the highest literacy rate (95 percent) while 45 percent of those who are above 60 years know how to read and write. There are remarkable gender differences in literacy. Furthermore, the gap is larger for the older cohorts.

The literacy rate in accessible clusters is 16 percentage points higher than in remote clusters. The literacy rate for the 15-19 age-group in accessible clusters is 99 percent, whereas for remote clusters the rate is 91 percent. Furthermore, in accessible clusters the literacy rate of men is 8 percentage points higher than that of women. In remote clusters, the difference increases to 16 percentage points. On the contrary, while the literacy rate of women in accessible clusters is about 20 percentage points higher than that of women in remote clusters, the difference in literacy rates between men in accessible and remote clusters is 12 percentage points. Finally, there is a significant difference in literacy rates among men and women above 60 years in both cluster locations. In both cases, the literacy rates of men over 60 years are above 48 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 93

percent, but the gender difference is important. While the literacy rate for men is 95 percent, the rate for women is 3 percentage points lower, at 92 percent.

Analysis by age-groups shows that 18 to 20 year olds have the highest literacy rate at 95 percent. Youth of 15 to 17 years have the highest literacy rate in accessible clusters at 100 percent, while in remote clusters the literacy rate is highest among the youth of 18 to 20 years at 93 percent. However, youth literacy rate in accessible clusters is higher than that of youth in remote clusters at 96 and 90 percent respectively.

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	94.8	91.5	93.1
15-17 years	93.2	96.5	94.9
18-20 years	97.0	92.8	95.2
21-22 years	95.1	86.1	90.6
23-24 years	93.6	86.4	89.2
Accessible	97.6	94.4	95.9
15-17 years	100.0	99.3	99.6
18-20 years	100.0	95.2	97.7
21-22 years	94.7	100.0	96.7
23-24 years	93.1	84.4	87.4
Remote	91.9	87.9	90.0
15-17 years	86.9	92.9	89.8
18-20 years	94.8	90.2	93.0
21-22 years	95.9	76.4	83.0
23-24 years	94.1	91.0	92.5

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is population aged 15-24

3 Education

4 HEALTH

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

4.1 Health Indicators

Throughout this report, a household is said to have access to medical services if it is located within 30 minutes 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 use is defined as the proportion of individuals who had

Table 4.1 - Health Indicators

	Medical Services			
	Access	Need	Use	Satisfaction
Total	57.8	20.9	24.5	71.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	77.4	20.4	24.9	72.2
Remote	38.6	21.4	24.0	69.7
Poverty Status				
Poor	45.2	15.6	17.9	87.3
Non-poor	59.0	21.5	25.1	69.8
Socio-economic group				
Employee	68.9	19.3	25.4	74.8
Self-employed - agriculture	43.4	23.0	23.3	71.4
Self-employed - other	61.2	20.2	24.5	69.7
Other	37.2	26.6	25.7	59.3
Gender				
Male	56.4	17.9	22.1	71.9
Female	59.2	24.0	26.9	70.2
Age				
0-4	60.7	26.8	57.1	67.6
5-9	51.4	17.7	18.2	77.1
10-14	53.4	15.4	14.6	87.4
15-19	58.4	16.7	15.4	83.1
20-29	64.9	14.3	14.0	81.1
30-39	60.0	15.9	15.3	64.8
40-49	54.6	30.5	30.8	66.7
50-59	55.5	22.7	29.8	33.5
60+	52.8	37.9	33.3	60.5

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

consulted a healthcare provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey regardless of their health status. Finally, the rate of satisfaction with health services is represented by the proportion of people who had consulted a health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and cited no problems with the service received.

Table 4.1 shows indicators regarding medical services by cluster location, poverty status, socio-economic status, gender and age. Overall, 58 percent of the households has access to medical services. Conversely, 42 percent of the households in the district lacks of access to medical services.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible clusters have a higher rate of access to medical services at 77 percent than households in remote clusters at 39 percent.

The breakdown by poverty status that shows non-poor households has a higher share of access at 59 percent compared to 45 percent reported by poor households. Non-poor households reported higher rates of need and use than poor households (22 and 25 percent vs. 16 and 18 percent). Poor households reported a higher rate of satisfaction than non-poor households, at 87 and 70 percent, respectively.

The split-up by socio-economic status reveals the employees reported the highest access rate at 69 percent followed by the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 61 percent. The lowest need rate was reported by the employees at 19 percent while the highest need rate was reported by the 'other' socio-economic group at 27 percent. The highest use rate was reported by the 'other' socio-economic group at 26 percent while the lowest was reported by the self-employed in agriculture at 23 percent. Conversely, the 'other' socio-economic group reported the lowest satisfaction rate at 59 percent while the employees reported the highest satisfaction rate at 75 percent.

The gender breakdown shows no strong

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

		Reasons for dissatisfaction						
	Percent dissatisfied	Facilities not clean	Long wait	No trained professionals	Cost	No drugs available	Treatment unsuccessful	Other
Total	29.0	9.3	46.5	6.6	30.3	20.2	17.2	5.2
Cluster Location								
Accessible	27.8	14.9	53.3	6.7	29.3	27.0	11.4	1.4
Remote	30.3	4.2	40.2	6.6	31.3	13.9	22.6	8.7
Poverty Status								
Poor	12.7	0.0	52.4	0.0	24.0	23.6	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	30.2	9.6	46.3	6.9	30.5	20.1	17.7	5.4
Socio-economic group								
Employee	25.2	31.0	46.7	21.7	20.1	34.0	2.3	4.2
Self-employed - agriculture	28.6	1.7	41.6	8.0	31.9	18.6	25.2	4.9
Self-employed - other	30.3	4.2	54.7	0.0	27.8	17.3	15.3	6.5
Other	40.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	80.6	0.0	55.7	0.0
Gender								
Male	28.1	12.8	40.3	8.6	32.3	22.4	16.3	7.8
Female	29.8	6.6	51.4	5.1	28.7	18.5	17.9	3.2
Type of provider								
Public hospital	44.6	13.0	63.0	8.3	17.0	27.2	9.6	5.9
Private hospital	12.2	13.2	32.6	0.0	43.5	32.6	1.4	4.1
Religous hospital	43.3	0.0	26.1	0.0	52.4	4.0	26.4	0.0
Village health worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private Doctor/Dentist	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Pharmacist	14.2	0.0	0.0	6.9	64.3	0.0	42.5	6.9
Trad. Healer	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	63.6	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

differences in access or satisfaction; however females reported higher use rates at 27 percent, 5 points higher than males.

Access does not vary widely by age-groups. The rate of need starts at 27 percent for the 0-4 age-group, then decreases to around 15 percent for the cohorts between 5and 39 years old, and then tends to increase for the older cohorts. The rate of use follows a similar pattern. The rate of satisfaction starts at 68 percent for the youngest cohort, increases peaking at 87 percent for the 10-14 cohort, and then decreases steadily until 61 percent for the 60+ cohort.

4.2 Reasons for Dissatisfaction

Table 4.2 shows the percentage distribution of the population who consulted a healthcare provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and were not satisfied. Overall, 3 in 10 users of healthcare facilities is dissatisfied, mostly because of long waits at (47 percent), cost (30 percent), drug unavailability (20 percent), unsuccessful treatment (17 percent) and unclean facilities (9 percent).

The analysis by cluster location shows no wide differences in the dissatisfaction rate. 'Long wait' was reported as the lead reason for dissatisfaction by both households in accessible and households in remote clusters (53 percent and 40 percent). Cost is second most cited reason for dissatisfaction in accessible clusters at 31 percent and remote clusters at 29 percent. Drug unavailability was reported as a reason for dissatisfaction at a higher rate by households in accessible clusters at 27 percent compared to households in remote clusters at 14 percent. Dissatisfaction due to unsuccessful treatment was reported at 23 percent by households from remote clusters compared to 11 percent reported by households in accessible clusters. Households from remote clusters reported unclean facilities as a reason for dissatisfaction at a lower rate of 4 percent compared to households in accessible clusters at 15 percent.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households reported a higher dissatisfaction rate than poor households. Both poor and non-poor households reported long waits as the main reason for dissatisfaction, with rates of 52 percent and 46 percent for poor and non-poor households, respectively. Cost was reported as the second lead reason for dissatisfaction by non-poor households at a rate of 31 percent. Poor households reported cost and drug unavailability at a similar rate of 24 percent.

Regarding socio-economic status, the 'other' socio-economic group reported the highest dissatisfaction rate at 41 percent. Unclean facilities and drug unavailability was reported highest by the employees at 31 percent and 34 percent. Long wait was the lead reason for dissatisfaction for the employees (47 percent), the self-employed in agriculture (42 percent) and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities (55 percent). Cost was reported as the lead reason for dissatisfaction by other socio-economic groups at 81 percent compared, followed by self-employed in agriculture at 32 percent, self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 28 percent and employees at 20 percent. Unsuccessful treatment was reported highest by other socio-economic group as a reason for dissatisfaction at 56 percent followed by the self-employed in agriculture at 25 percent.

Dissatisfaction does not vary widely by gender, but the reasons do. Females reported higher rates of dissatisfaction due to long waits at 51 percent, while the share for males is 40 percent. 'Unclean facilities' is reported at a higher rate by males at 13 percent, almost twice the rate reported by females. Other reasons are reported at a similar rate.

Regarding type of health provider, virtually all the patients who consulted a private doctor were dissatisfied, followed by public hospitals (45 percent), religious hospitals (43 percent), pharmacists (14 percent) and private hospitals (12 percent).. Long waits is the leading reason for dissatisfaction in public hospitals at 63 percent. The second lead reason for dissatisfaction in public hospitals is drug availability (27 percent), followed by cost (17 percent), and unclean facilities (13 percent). Cost is the lead reason for private hospitals at 44 percent followed by drug availability and long waits, both at 33 percent. The lead reason for dissatisfaction in religious hospitals is cost at 52 percent, followed by long waits and unsuccessful treatment both at a rate of 26 percent. The lead reason for dissatisfaction with private

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

	Percent not consulting	Reasons for not consulting				
		No need	Cost	Distance	No confidence	Other
Total	75.5	97.8	1.2	0.6	0.1	0.7
Cluster Location						
Accessible	75.1	98.7	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.7
Remote	76.0	97.0	1.7	1.1	0.2	0.6
Poverty Status						
Poor	82.1	98.7	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.5
Non-poor	74.9	97.7	1.2	0.6	0.1	0.7
Socio-economic group						
Employee	74.6	99.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Self-employed - agriculture	76.7	95.3	2.9	2.1	0.2	0.4
Self-employed - other	75.5	98.7	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.8
Other	74.3	91.4	5.1	0.0	1.4	2.2
Gender						
Male	77.9	98.0	1.2	0.7	0.2	0.5
Female	73.1	97.6	1.1	0.4	0.0	0.9
Type of sickness/injury						
Fever/malaria	6.2	0.0	67.8	48.2	0.0	10.3
Diarrhea/abdominal pains	5.5	27.4	50.0	22.6	0.0	0.0
Pain in back, limbs or joints	14.5	0.0	61.4	0.0	0.0	38.6
Coughing/breathing difficulty	5.7	0.0	53.1	26.4	18.1	20.5
Skin problems	18.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Ear, nose, throat	14.2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Eye	18.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Dental	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Accident	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

doctors, dentists and traditional healers is unsuccessful treatment at a rate of 100 percent in each case.

4.3 Reasons for Not Consulting

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, 76 percent of the population did not consult a health provider, typically because there was no need (98 percent of the cases). 2 percent of the people who did not consult a health provider had other reasons, mainly cost.

The breakdown by cluster location and poverty status shows no differences.

Regarding socio-economic groups, the self-employed in agriculture show the highest rate of not consulting a healthcare provider at 77 percent. Virtually all (100 percent) the employees did not consult because there was no need. Similarly other groups reported no need as the reason for not consulting by over 90 percent. The 'other' socio-economic group reported cost as a reason for not consulting at 5 percent. The self-employed in agriculture reported cost and distance as reasons for not consulting a healthcare provider at 3 and 2 percent, respectively.

The breakdown by gender shows that male reported 5 points higher of not consulting a healthcare provider (78 percent), than females.

The split-up by type of illness shows that for fever (including malaria) the main reason for not consulting was cost at 68 percent followed by distance at a rate of 48 percent. For Diarrhoea the most common reasons were cost and no need at 50 and 27 percent, followed by distance at 23 percent. For pain in the back, limbs or joints the main reason for not consulting was reported as cost (61percent). 53

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

	Sick or injured	Fever or malaria	Diarrhea/ abdominal pain	Pain in back, limbs or joints	Coughing/ breathing difficulty	Skin problem	Ear, nose, throat,	Eye	Dental	Accident	Other
Total	20.9	50.2	13.8	16.5	20.5	1.1	1.7	3.2	3.2	1.5	4.3
Male Total	17.9	52.3	11.2	11.8	24.1	2.2	1.4	2.2	4.4	0.6	3.2
0-4	29.2	57.0	16.4	0.0	34.3	5.1	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	3.0
5-9	17.1	61.0	0.0	13.5	31.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1
10-14	14.4	55.3	6.0	3.2	37.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
15-29	12.5	49.0	8.6	6.7	20.5	4.0	1.9	0.0	11.3	2.6	3.4
30-49	15.4	56.2	11.7	18.8	20.5	0.0	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9
50-64	23.4	33.4	22.7	36.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	7.8	0.0	0.0
65+	38.7	40.1	14.6	27.5	5.0	2.3	0.0	11.6	10.8	0.0	14.8
Female Total	24.0	48.7	15.9	20.0	17.8	0.3	1.8	4.0	2.2	2.3	5.2
0-4	24.2	70.8	5.4	0.0	31.4	0.9	5.6	1.7	0.0	0.0	2.3
5-9	18.5	58.9	0.0	16.3	31.8	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.5
10-14	16.4	27.1	17.2	13.0	6.8	0.0	10.0	5.3	0.0	11.0	9.7
15-29	19.7	55.7	23.3	6.1	12.8	0.0	0.0	2.1	3.8	2.1	5.2
30-49	26.3	42.5	27.2	26.8	17.0	0.7	0.0	2.7	5.8	3.1	3.8
50-64	41.3	40.7	6.1	43.9	16.5	0.0	0.0	12.3	0.0	0.0	7.9
65+	62.1	26.6	12.9	54.4	10.1	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	10.5

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

percent stated cost as the lead reason for not consulting a healthcare provider in the cases of coughing and breathing difficulties.

4.4 Type of Illness

Table 4.4 shows the percentage of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, fever or malaria is the most common sickness, affecting almost 50 percent of the total population. In turn, coughing and breathing difficulties came in second place with 21 percent, followed by pain in the back, limbs and joints with 17 percent and diarrhoea and abdominal pain at 14 percent, respectively. Eye and dental ailments affected 3 percent of the population.

The gender breakdown shows slight differences in type of sickness. Males reported lower rates of diarhorrea and abdominal pain at 11 percent compared to females at 16 percent. Females reported higher rates of pain in the back, limbs and joints with 20 percent, 8 points higher than males.

The age breakdown shows that the share of sick/injured population starts at around 24 percent for children under 5, decreases for the 5 to 9 cohort, stabilizes around 17 percent, and then starts increasing again for the 30 to 49 cohort, peaking for the population aged 65 and over (39 percent of males and 62 percent of females in that group). The share of ill population affected by malaria comes down with age but other problems emerge.

4.5 Health Provider

Table 4.5 shows the percent distribution of health consultations in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, 43 percent of the consultations were made in a public hospital, 33 percent to a pharmacist or chemist and 13 percent in private hospitals. 8 percent in a religious hospital, and 4 percent to traditional healers.

The breakdown by cluster location shows interesting insights. Households from accessible clusters reported visiting public hospitals at a higher rate (18 percent) compared to households from remote clusters (7 percent). Similarly households in accessible clusters visited religious hospitals at 10 percent vs. 5 percent reported by households in remote clusters. Households from remote clusters reported visiting pharmacists and chemists at 38

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

	Public hospital	Private hospital	Religious hospital	Village health worker	Private doctor, dentist	Pharmacistch emist	Traditional healer	Other	Total
Total	43.2	12.6	7.6	0.1	0.1	33.0	3.5	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	42.9	17.7	9.8	0.0	0.1	28.1	1.4	0.0	100.0
Remote	43.4	7.4	5.4	0.2	0.0	38.0	5.5	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	38.6	15.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	34.0	3.8	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	43.5	12.4	7.6	0.1	0.1	32.9	3.4	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic group									
Employee	49.4	12.1	5.5	0.0	0.0	31.4	1.6	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	39.7	4.2	6.7	0.5	0.3	41.7	6.9	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	41.4	17.5	7.6	0.0	0.0	30.5	3.0	0.0	100.0
Other	44.1	6.1	24.8	0.0	0.0	23.4	1.6	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is population who consulted a health provider

percent, 10 points higher than households from accessible cluster Households from accessible clusters reported lower rates of visiting traditional healers at 1 percent compare to 6 percent reported by households in remote clusters.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households visit public hospitals at 44 percent, a slightly higher rate than poor households at 39 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the employees reported the highest rate of visiting public hospitals at 49 percent higher, that the rate reported by the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 41 percent and 'others' group at 44 percent. The highest rate of reported visits to private hospitals was by the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 18 percent. The highest rate of visits in religious hospitals was reported by the 'other' socio-economic group at 25 percent. Only the self-employed in agricultural activities reported visiting a cluster health worker at 1 percent. The self-employed in agriculture reported the highest rates of visiting pharmacists and chemists at 42 percent followed by employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 31 percent. The self-employed in agriculture reported the highest rates of visiting traditional healers at 7 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, 12 percent of women in this age-group gave birth in the past year. No girls gave birth aged 14 or under in the district. 7 percent of the females between 15 and 19 gave birth. The rate peaks at 25 percent for the 20 to 24 group, and then decreases for the 25 to 29 age-group at 16 percent, reaching less than 1 percent for the group aged 40 to 49. In addition, virtually all (100 percent) pregnant women received prenatal care.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote clusters show the highest rate of child deliveries in the 20-24 cohort at 27 percent, higher by 4 percent that the rate reported by households in accessible clusters. There are no differences by cluster location in other age-groups.

The analysis by poverty status reveals that 12 percent of women from non-poor households had a live birth in the year preceding the survey, higher than the share for poor households by 5 points. Non-poor households reported a rate of 7 percent in the 15 to 19 age-group while the poor households reported none. Non-poor households reported higher rate of birth in the ages between 20 and 25 at 25 percent compared to the poor households at 14 percent. Non-poor households reported births in the 25 to 29 age-group at 15 percent while the poor households reported none. 1 percent of births reported in the 40 plus age bracket were among the non-poor households.

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

	12-14 yrs	15-19 yrs	20-24 yrs	25-29 yrs	30-39 yrs	40+ yrs	Total	Pre-natal care
Total	0.0	6.6	24.8	14.7	15.9	0.4	11.8	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	0.0	7.9	22.9	13.6	16.1	0.9	11.8	100.0
Remote	0.0	4.8	27.0	16.9	15.7	0.0	11.8	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	0.0	0.0	14.2	0.0	17.0	0.0	6.5	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	7.4	25.4	14.8	15.8	0.5	12.2	100.0
Socio-economic group								
Employee	0.0	2.2	16.3	15.4	18.1	0.0	10.1	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.0	0.0	26.8	22.6	19.0	0.0	10.8	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	10.5	30.2	14.1	10.6	1.0	13.2	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.7	0.0	10.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is females aged 12 or older.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows girls aged 15 to 19 from the self-employed in non-agricultural activities reported 11 percent live births and the employees group reported 2 percent of live births. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities reported highest rates of births in the 20-24 age-group at 30 percent followed by self-employed in the agriculture which reported a rate of 27 percent of live births. The self-employed in agriculture reported the highest rate of births among the 25-29 age-group at 23 percent, compared to the around 15 percent reported by both the employees group and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 14 percent Other socio-economic group reported the highest rate of births among the 30-39 percent at 32 percent .

The self-employed in non-agricultural activities is the only group that reported births in the 40 plus category at 1 percent.

Table 4.7 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey. 89 percent of births in the 5 years preceding the survey took place in a hospital, 9 percent at home, less than one percent of the births took place in a dispensary, a health centre or a health post. The ordering remains across cluster location, poverty status, and socio-economic group of the household.

Households in remote clusters reported a higher birth rate at home at 13 percent compared to 4 percent reported by households in accessible clusters. Households in remote clusters reported lower birth rate in hospitals at 83 percent than households in accessible clusters at 95 percent.

The breakdown by poverty status shows poor households reported a lower percentage of deliveries taking place in a hospital at 81 percent compared to non-poor households at 90 percent. Conversely, poor households reported higher rates of births at home at 20 percent compared to 8 percent reported by non-poor households.

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that hospitals are the most common place for deliveries, with the highest rate reported by the employees at 96 percent, the self-employed in agriculture at 78 percent, the self-employed in the non-agricultural activities at 91 percent and the 'other' socio-economic group at 89 percent. The self-employed in agriculture reported the highest share of births that took place at home at a rate of 21 percent, followed by the self-employed in non-agricultural activities with a rate of 6 percent and finally employees with 2 percent. The 'other' socio-economic group is the only group that reported births taking place in a health centre at 11 percent. The self-employed in agriculture group is the only group that reported births taking place in a dispensary at 1 percent.

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, 9 out of 10 deliveries were

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	89.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	8.6	1.9	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	95.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	1.0	100.0
Remote	83.2	0.6	0.6	0.0	12.9	2.7	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	80.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.5	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	89.8	0.3	0.3	0.0	7.5	2.0	100.0
Socio-economic group							
Employee	96.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	2.1	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	78.1	0.0	1.2	0.0	20.7	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	91.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.2	2.8	100.0
Other	89.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

attended by a health professional. 9 percent of deliveries were reported to have taken place without assistance, 83 percent of deliveries were attended by midwives, while traditional birth assistants (TBA) accounted for 1 percent of the deliveries, and 8 percent of deliveries was attended by a doctor or a nurse

The analysis by cluster location shows that deliveries without assistance were more common in remote clusters (12 percent vs. 4 percent), whereas doctors or nurses were more common in accessible clusters (10 percent vs. 6 percent). Households from accessible clusters reported births that were attended by a midwife at 85 percent, 5 points higher than their counterparts in remote clusters. Overall 95 percent of births in households from accessible clusters were attended by a health professional 9 percentage points higher than households in remote clusters, at 86 percent.

As expected, non-poor households show a higher share of deliveries attended by a professional, 91 percent, against 80 percent of poor households. Conversely, poor households report a higher share of deliveries without assistance at 19 percent, 12 points higher than the rate reported by non-poor households. Non-poor households reported a higher share of deliveries attended by a doctor or nurse at 8 percent compared to 0 percent reported by poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the 'other' socio-economic group reported the highest rates of births attended by health professionals at 100 percent, of which 81 percent was attended by midwives and 19 percent attended by a doctor or nurse. . The employees reported the second highest rate of deliveries attended by a doctor or nurse at 17 percent Households in the 'self-employed agriculture' category report the highest share of deliveries without assistance at 17 percent. The highest rate of births attended by a midwife was reported by the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 85 percent.

4.9 Child Nutrition

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

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

The level of malnutrition in a population is determined by comparing the weight and height measurements within the population of interest to those of a well nourished population. Children are considered malnourished if their weight and/or height measurements fall outside the distribution of weight and height measurements of the well nourished population. The reference population

Used, as recommended by the World Health Organisation (WHO), is that of the United States National Centre for Health Statistics (NCHS).

Height-for-age is a measure of linear growth. A child who is below minus two standard deviations from the median of the

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

	Doctor Nurse	Midwife	Trained T.B.A.	T.B.A.	Other Self	Don't know	Total	Delivery by health prof.
Total	7.7	82.7	0.0	0.7	8.5	0.4	100.0	90.4
Cluster Location								
Accessible	10.1	85.3	0.0	0.3	4.3	0.0	100.0	95.4
Remote	5.5	80.3	0.0	1.1	12.4	0.8	100.0	85.7
Poverty Status								
Poor	0.0	79.6	0.0	0.0	19.3	1.1	100.0	79.6
Non-poor	8.4	83.0	0.0	0.8	7.5	0.3	100.0	91.4
Socio-economic group								
Employee	16.6	79.7	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	100.0	96.3
Self-employed - agriculture	2.5	80.3	0.0	0.0	16.8	0.4	100.0	82.8
Self-employed - other	5.7	85.2	0.0	1.4	7.0	0.6	100.0	90.9
Other	18.9	81.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

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 the children in the district were catalogued as wasted and 18 percent as stunted. 56 percent of children participate in nutrition programs and 85 percent were reported to have been vaccinated

.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that children from households in accessible clusters reported higher rates stunting than children from remote clusters, at rates of 21 and 15 percent, respectively. Children from both remote and accessible clusters reported similar rates of vaccination and wasting.

The breakdown by poverty status reveals that children from poor households reported a higher rate of stunting at 49 percent compared to children from non-poor households at 15 percent. Children from non-poor households were reported to have been vaccinated at a rate of 85 percent, 8 points higher than children from poor households.

Regarding socio-economic status, households in the 'other' socio-economic group and the self-employed in agriculture reported the highest rate of stunted children at 19 percent while children from the employee category reported the lowest rate of stunted children at 15 percent. The self-employed in agriculture reported the highest rate of wasted children at 3 percent. The highest rate of participation in nutrition programs is reported at 78 percent and the highest vaccination rate at 89 percent is reported by the 'other' socio-economic group.

The gender breakdown shows that boys report a rate of stunting at 28 percent, 13 points higher than girls. Furthermore, boys reported a lower rate of vaccination at 81 percent than girls at 89 percent. Boys aged 3 reported higher stunting rates at 32 percent. Boys under the age of one reported higher stunting rates at 13 percent compared to girls at 4 percent. However, girls under 1 reported higher rates of wasting at 5 percent while boys reported no wasting in this age-group.

The breakdown by orphan status shows that orphaned children reported higher stunting rates at 28 percent compared to 18 percent reported by non-orphaned children. Non-orphaned children reported higher participation in nutritional program at 57 percent compared to orphaned children at 48 percent. Orphaned children reported higher rates of vaccination at 100 percent compared to non-orphaned children at 85 percent. Regarding foster status, fostered children reported a higher rate of stunting at 27 percent compared to non-fostered children at 18 percent. Furthermore, fostered children reported a lower rate of attendance to nutritional programs at 29 percent compared to non-fostered children at 59 percent. In addition, fostered children reported lower rates of vaccination at 76 percent compared to 85 percent reported by children from non-fostered children.

Table 4.10 shows the percentage distribution of children vaccinated by type of vaccination received. Overall, 71 percent of children under 5 have been vaccinated against measles, 97 percent against BCG, and roughly between 85 and 97 percent received vaccinations against DPT and OPV. Finally, 69 percent of the

Table 4.9: Nutritional status indicators and program participation rates

	Nutritional status indicators		Program participation		
	Stunted	Wasted	Nutrition	Weigh-in	Vaccinated
Total	17.9	1.3	56.1	98.6	84.7
Cluster Location					
Accessible	21.3	0.5	55.8	99.0	84.5
Remote	15.4	2.0	56.4	98.3	84.9
Poverty Status					
Poor	49.1	0.0	56.9	97.4	77.2
Non-poor	15.4	1.4	56.1	98.7	85.3
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	14.7	1.3	69.6	100.0	80.8
Self-employed - agriculture	19.2	2.9	55.4	98.0	87.9
Self-employed - other	18.8	0.5	49.1	98.9	84.7
Other	19.1	0.0	78.0	89.0	89.0
Gender and age in completed years					
Male	23.8	1.5	55.3	99.4	80.6
0	13.2	0.0	54.1	100.0	98.4
1	28.2	1.7	56.0	100.0	66.7
2	18.8	0.0	42.1	100.0	95.6
3	32.3	0.0	59.9	97.3	54.1
4	24.1	5.8	67.9	98.8	81.7
Female	11.0	1.2	57.1	97.7	89.3
0	4.4	5.2	42.9	94.0	94.0
1	23.8	0.0	57.3	96.4	80.7
2	10.7	0.0	58.3	100.0	97.2
3	16.1	0.0	61.4	100.0	83.9
4	0.0	0.0	77.5	100.0	81.3
Orphan status					
Orphaned	28.3	0.0	47.9	100.0	100.0
Not-orphaned	17.6	1.4	57.4	98.5	84.9
Foster status					
Fostered	26.8	0.0	28.6	94.8	75.6
Not-fostered	17.6	1.5	58.5	98.8	85.1

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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	70.7	96.6	96.5	90.5	86.2	88.3	95.6	87.8	84.5	69.1
Cluster Location										
Accessible	71.8	95.6	96.5	92.2	87.9	90.8	94.6	87.2	84.9	73.8
Remote	69.7	97.6	96.4	88.9	84.7	86.2	96.4	88.3	84.1	65.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	49.8	94.0	94.0	87.4	73.7	71.7	94.0	87.4	73.7	59.1
Non-poor	72.4	96.9	96.7	90.7	87.2	89.7	95.7	87.8	85.4	70.0
Socio-economic group										
Employed	77.8	96.8	98.8	92.5	90.0	100.0	98.8	90.0	87.9	78.0
Self-employed - agric	70.8	96.9	95.1	91.4	83.3	82.6	95.1	91.4	83.3	64.0
Self-employed - other	69.2	96.8	96.5	91.0	87.6	85.9	94.7	87.4	85.8	69.5
Other	37.1	89.0	89.0	56.0	56.0	89.0	89.0	45.1	45.1	37.1
Gender and age in completed years										
Male	69.1	97.0	96.5	92.5	88.4	87.7	94.8	89.1	86.7	71.1
0	14.8	91.5	89.1	79.9	69.6	88.1	89.1	72.3	69.6	20.1
1	71.1	98.1	98.1	90.5	89.8	87.1	91.7	84.0	83.3	74.6
2	96.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.8	90.6	100.0	100.0	94.8	88.6
3	80.9	97.3	97.3	97.3	93.7	92.8	97.3	97.3	93.7	93.7
4	93.2	98.8	98.8	98.8	98.8	80.3	98.8	98.8	98.8	92.3
Female	72.4	96.2	96.4	88.2	83.7	89.1	96.4	86.4	82.0	67.0
0	21.0	88.5	89.3	59.5	49.8	86.6	89.3	57.1	43.6	21.0
1	84.2	96.4	96.4	96.4	92.8	87.7	96.4	96.4	92.8	81.7
2	92.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.7	86.9	100.0	95.7	95.7	85.5
3	92.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	89.4
4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	81.3

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

children in the municipal receive vitamin A supplements.

Regarding cluster location, children from accessible clusters reported higher vitamin A supplement intake at 74 percent, 9 points higher than children from remote clusters. There were no differences in vaccination rates regarding cluster location.

The breakdown by poverty status reveals that children from poor households reported lower rates of vaccination against measles at 50 percent and vitamin A intake at 59 percent compared to their counterparts in non-poor households at 72 percent and 70 percent for vitamin A intake.

The analysis by socio-economic groups shows that vaccination against measles and vitamin A intake is highest for children from the 'employee' category at 78 percent for both, while vaccination against BCG is highest for children from the self-employed in agriculture, self-employed in non-agricultural activities, and employees at 97 percent.

The gender breakdown shows that girls under 1 year of age reported higher rates of vaccination against measles at 21 percent 6 points higher than boys, with no strong differences in the other ages. Finally, the vaccination rates for children under 1 years of age are remarkably lower than the rest of the children, with differences ranging from 20 to 70 percentage points.

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 are no strong differences by cluster location, poverty status, or gender. However, the breakdown by socio-economic status shows that 4 percent of

the employees reported other sources rather than the vaccination card.

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

	Health Card	Other	Total
Total	96.9	3.1	100.0
Cluster Location			
Accessible	96.0	4.0	100.0
Remote	97.8	2.2	100.0
Poverty Status			
Poor	100.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	96.7	3.3	100.0
Socio-economic group			
Employed	95.7	4.3	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	96.8	3.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	97.4	2.6	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	100.0
Gender and age in completed years			
Male	97.4	2.6	100.0
0	88.3	11.7	100.0
1	100.0	0.0	100.0
2	100.0	0.0	100.0
3	100.0	0.0	100.0
4	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	96.4	3.6	100.0
0	86.8	13.2	100.0
1	100.0	0.0	100.0
2	100.0	0.0	100.0
3	100.0	0.0	100.0
4	100.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

5 EMPLOYMENT

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

5.1 Employment Status of Total Adult Population

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

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

5.1.1 Work Status

Table 5.1 shows that 73 percent of the adult population is employed and 21 percent underemployed. Unemployment is virtually 0 percent and the inactivity rate is

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	73.3	20.8	94.1	0.4	5.4	5.9	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	76.7	16.6	93.3	0.6	6.1	6.7	100.0
Remote	69.7	25.3	95.0	0.2	4.7	5.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	71.0	23.5	94.6	0.0	5.4	5.4	100.0
Non-poor	73.5	20.6	94.1	0.5	5.4	5.9	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	64.0	29.2	93.2	0.4	6.3	6.8	100.0
15-29	71.4	19.4	90.8	0.4	8.8	9.2	100.0
30-49	58.8	40.2	99.0	0.7	0.4	1.0	100.0
50-64	52.2	47.8	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	49.5	17.2	66.6	0.0	33.4	33.4	100.0
Female	82.3	12.7	95.0	0.5	4.5	5.0	100.0
15-29	88.4	5.9	94.3	0.0	5.7	5.7	100.0
30-49	77.2	21.7	98.9	0.2	0.9	1.1	100.0
50-64	72.9	21.8	94.6	3.2	2.2	5.4	100.0
65+	74.2	4.1	78.3	0.0	21.7	21.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

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

	Total population			Heads of household		
	Active population	Unemployment rate	Underemploy-ment rate	Active population	Unemploy-ment rate	Underemploy-ment rate
Total	94.6	0.5	22.0	97.5	0.4	36.5
Cluster Location						
Accessible	93.9	0.7	17.7	97.9	0.5	34.6
Remote	95.3	0.2	26.6	97.0	0.2	38.6
Poverty Status						
Poor	94.6	0.0	24.9	100.0	0.0	33.0
Non-poor	94.6	0.5	21.8	97.4	0.4	36.7
Gender and age						
Male	93.7	0.4	31.2	97.7	0.4	40.1
15-29	91.2	0.4	21.3	100.0	0.0	39.0
30-49	99.6	0.7	40.4	99.6	0.8	38.4
50-64	100.0	0.0	47.8	100.0	0.0	48.2
65+	66.6	0.0	25.8	72.5	0.0	27.9
Female	95.5	0.5	13.3	96.9	0.3	25.5
15-29	94.3	0.0	6.2	100.0	0.0	30.2
30-49	99.1	0.2	21.9	97.7	0.8	31.4
50-64	97.8	3.3	22.3	98.3	0.0	18.7
65+	78.3	0.0	5.3	84.7	0.0	11.2

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

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

	Active population				Active		
	Employed	Under emp.	Working	Unemployed	Total	Inactive	Total
Total	83.0	8.1	91.1	0.2	91.3	8.7	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	85.3	4.2	89.5	0.0	89.5	10.5	100.0
Remote	80.4	12.5	92.9	0.4	93.3	6.7	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	80.3	11.0	91.2	0.0	91.2	8.8	100.0
Non-poor	83.3	7.7	91.1	0.2	91.3	8.7	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	76.3	13.6	89.9	0.4	90.2	9.8	100.0
15-16	97.7	2.3	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
17-19	77.5	10.6	88.0	1.2	89.2	10.8	100.0
20-21	64.9	20.8	85.7	0.0	85.7	14.3	100.0
22-23	62.1	23.3	85.4	0.0	85.4	14.6	100.0
Female	89.6	2.7	92.3	0.0	92.3	7.7	100.0
15-16	88.7	0.0	88.7	0.0	88.7	11.3	100.0
17-19	89.8	0.0	89.8	0.0	89.8	10.2	100.0
20-21	80.4	7.8	88.2	0.0	88.2	11.8	100.0
22-23	96.1	3.9	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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.

6 percent. Accessible clusters report a higher rate of employment and a lower rate of underemployment than remote clusters. The difference by poverty status

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	14.9	11.5	29.5	44.1	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	20.8	3.3	34.7	41.1	100.0
Remote	8.7	20.1	24.0	47.3	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	3.4	20.7	19.8	56.1	100.0
Non-poor	16.0	10.7	30.4	43.0	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	19.8	15.3	36.0	29.0	100.0
15-29	12.9	4.0	28.0	55.1	100.0
30-49	27.7	19.1	50.6	2.6	100.0
50-64	31.8	31.7	35.1	1.4	100.0
65+	0.0	78.5	12.7	8.8	100.0
Female	10.2	7.9	23.3	58.6	100.0
15-29	11.1	0.7	16.7	71.4	100.0
30-49	11.4	10.4	31.4	46.8	100.0
50-64	6.9	28.4	27.6	37.1	100.0
65+	0.0	17.2	28.1	54.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

is similar, with poor households resembling accessible clusters, but narrower. For males, underemployment peaks for the cohort aged between 60 and 54 at 48 percent. For females, the 30-49 and 50-64 age-groups report the highest underemployment rates, at 22 percent.

The adult population that was no working in the 4 weeks preceding the survey was mostly inactive, rather than unemployed. This means that most of them were students, sick people, etc. rather than people looking for work and ready for it. As would be expected, the share of inactive population is higher in the 65+ cohort, reaching 33 percent of males and 22 percent of females.

5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads

Table 5.2 shows the principal labour force indicators for the adult population compared to the household heads. Activity rates are similar for total population and household heads, but underemployment is higher among the latter. In the general population some differences are observed in the rate of underemployment but these differences are narrower by household heads.

The gender breakdown shows that in the general population males are more likely to be underemployed than females, with rates of 31 and 13 percent, respectively. In the case of household heads, the shares are 40 and 26 percent, respectively.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that in the case of male household heads, underemployment peaks at 48 percent for the 50-64 cohort, while in the case of women it decreases from 30 percent in the 15-29 and 30-49 cohorts to 11 percent in the 65+ cohort.

5.1.3 Youth Employment

Table 5.3 shows the distribution of the youth (ages 15 to 24) by work status. The activity rate of this group is slightly lower than the general population, at 91 percent. In addition, underemployment is lower: 8 percent of workers is underemployed, as opposed to 21 percent of workers for the whole adult population. The youth from remote clusters has higher underemployment than their counterparts. Similarly, the youth from poor households reports a higher underemployment rate than the youth from non-poor households.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that remote clusters report a higher share of active population, at 93 percent, than accessible clusters, at 90 percent. There

Table 5.5 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employer

	State/NGO/ Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	7.1	49.3	43.6	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	10.6	48.9	40.5	100.0
Remote	3.5	49.6	46.8	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.0	45.0	55.0	100.0
Non-poor	7.8	49.7	42.5	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	9.9	61.9	28.2	100.0
15-29	4.3	41.9	53.9	100.0
30-49	13.0	84.4	2.6	100.0
50-64	27.0	73.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	91.2	8.8	100.0
Female	4.5	37.3	58.3	100.0
15-29	4.4	24.7	70.9	100.0
30-49	4.9	48.3	46.8	100.0
50-64	4.9	58.0	37.1	100.0
65+	0.0	45.3	54.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

are no strong differences in activity rate by poverty status.

The gender breakdown shows that underemployment rate among the male youth is remarkably higher than that for the female youth, with shares of 14 and 3 percent, respectively. It can be seen that underemployment is lower in the 15-16 and 17-18 age-groups.

5.2 Working population

Table 5.4 shows that the vast majority of the working population is formed by self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 30 percent, or in other activities (inactive, unemployed, unpaid workers, domestic workers) at 44 percent. 15 percent of the population is composed by employees, and the self-employed in agriculture account for the remaining 12 percent of the working population. The population self-employed in agriculture is higher in remote clusters and poor households, whereas the employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities report higher shares in accessible clusters and non-poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that males report higher shares in employees, self-employed in agriculture and self-employed in non-agricultural activities, while females report a higher share in 'other' activities. The cut down by age-groups shows that the share of employees peaks for males in the 50-64 cohort (32 percent), the self-employed in agriculture for 65+ males (79 percent), the 'self-employed other' for 30-49 males (51 percent) and 'other' for 15-29 females (71 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 49 percent of the working population, which combined with individuals who work for their own households represent up to 93 percent of the working population. The State, NGOs, and other employers employ the remaining 7 percent of the working population.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote clusters report a higher share of the working population working for the household, while accessible clusters report a higher share working for a the State, NGOs or other employers. The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report a higher share working for the households and lower shares for the remaining types of employer.

Females report a higher share working for the household, while males report higher shares working for a private employer, the State, and NGO or other types of employer. Almost two-thirds of the males (62 percent) work for a private employer, except in the 15-29 cohort, where 54 percent works in the household. The share of females working in the private sector tends to increases with age, but is always lower than the respective shares of males. At the same time, the share of females working for the household decreases with age.

Table 5.6 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by main activity. The categories are agriculture; mining, manufacturing, energy and construction (MMEC); services (transport, trade, private and public services); domestic duties; and other. Almost one third (32 percent) of the working population is engaged in services, 28 percent in domestic duties, a further 28 percent in agriculture, 7 percent in MMEC, and the remaining 6 percent in other activities.

Table 5.6 - Percentage distribution of the working population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	Pub & priv services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	27.5	6.8	32.3	27.6	5.9	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	6.3	7.0	40.4	37.5	8.9	100.0
Remote	49.7	6.5	23.7	17.3	2.7	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	44.0	9.4	14.1	31.4	1.1	100.0
Non-poor	25.9	6.5	34.0	27.3	6.3	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	26.5	12.6	33.9	17.7	9.2	100.0
15-29	22.9	9.3	25.9	35.0	6.9	100.0
30-49	22.0	16.9	47.8	0.0	13.3	100.0
50-64	36.0	17.9	35.5	0.8	9.8	100.0
65+	85.9	0.0	10.7	1.4	2.0	100.0
Female	28.4	1.2	30.7	37.1	2.6	100.0
15-29	19.5	1.8	24.8	51.7	2.2	100.0
30-49	32.4	0.7	40.6	22.1	4.3	100.0
50-64	49.3	0.0	32.7	17.5	0.6	100.0
65+	44.8	0.0	21.2	32.8	1.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

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

The gender breakdown shows that the main differences are in domestic duties, where females report 37 percent and males report 18 percent, and MMEC, where the shares for males and females are 13 and 1 percent. The remaining activities do not show strong differences between genders.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that, for both genders, younger cohorts have higher shares dedicated to household duties. The shares dedicated to agriculture are higher for the older cohorts, where the shares dedicated to services are lower.

Table 5.7 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by employment status, gender and activity. Overall, around 73 percent of the male labour force is in agriculture, whereas the share for females is 69 percent. Services has the second highest share for males (14 percent) and domestic duties has the second highest share for females (20 percent).

For both genders, the majority of employees works in services (70 percent of males, 100 percent of females). The self-employed in non-agricultural activities work also mostly in services, with shares of 92 percent for males and 100 percent for females. The population in the 'other' group is mainly concentrated in agriculture, with domestic duties taking the second place.

The percentage distribution of the working population by employer, gender, and activity is shown in Table 5.8. The working population employed by the government is mostly dedicated to services. The male labour force working for private employers (whether formal or informal) is concentrated in agriculture, whereas the females who work for a private employer are almost evenly split between agriculture and services. Finally, the individuals who were employed by the household, the main activity was agriculture were mainly concentrated in agriculture, with domestic duties in second place.

5.3 Underemployed Population

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status is shown in Table 5.9. Overall, 51 percent of the underemployed population is self-employed in non-agricultural activities, 28 percent self-employed in agriculture, 14 percent is in

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	65.4	72.2	72.9	68.7
Mining & non-primary	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Services	69.7	100.0	0.0	0.0	91.9	100.0	0.0	1.4	14.1	11.2
Domestic duties	30.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.6	26.4	11.9	20.1
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

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

	Government		Private		Household		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture	22.6	0.0	74.1	48.5	73.1	73.4	72.7	67.6
Mining & non-primary	13.9	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0
Services	63.6	100.0	22.4	50.1	0.0	1.4	14.3	11.9
Domestic duties	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.4	26.9	25.2	11.9	20.6
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

'other' activities and 12 percent is formed by employees. Even though self-employed in agriculture are 12 percent of the working population, they represent 24 percent of the underemployed.

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

The breakdown by poverty status shows similar differences, with poor households resembling remote clusters.

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

For males, the share of employees peaks at 24 percent in the 50-64 cohort. The share self-employed in agriculture tends to increase with age. The 'self-employed other' group is lower for the older cohorts, and the 'other' group shows important rates only in the 15-29 age-group. In the case of females, the share self-employed in agriculture increases with age until the 50-64 cohort, and the share in 'other' activities is higher in the 15-29 cohort. The share in 'self-employed other' is highest in the 65+ cohort, at 72 percent.

Table 5.10 shows the percentage distribution of the underemployed population by type of employer. Overall, the underemployed population mostly works for a private employer at 78 percent and in second place for the household at 14 percent. The State, NGOs, and other types of employer account for the remaining 9 percent of the underemployed population.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible clusters report a higher percentage of underemployed population working for the State, and NGO or other employer than remote clusters, and the latter report a higher share working for the household. The breakdown by poverty status shows similar differences, with poor households resembling remote clusters.

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed males are strongly concentrated in private employers at 84 percent, while the share for females is 65 percent. Almost one third of the latter (30 percent) works for the household.

Table 5.10 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer

	State/NGO/Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	8.8	77.8	13.5	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	19.2	76.0	4.9	100.0
Remote	1.5	79.0	19.5	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.0	77.9	22.1	100.0
Non-poor	9.7	77.7	12.6	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	10.2	83.6	6.2	100.0
15-29	10.3	75.1	14.6	100.0
30-49	7.2	90.1	2.7	100.0
50-64	18.2	81.8	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	5.5	64.5	29.9	100.0
15-29	0.0	65.5	34.5	100.0
30-49	5.6	64.9	29.5	100.0
50-64	12.0	59.9	28.1	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	11.6	23.8	51.1	13.5	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	24.2	3.9	66.9	5.0	100.0
Remote	2.7	37.8	39.9	19.5	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.0	43.5	34.5	22.1	100.0
Non-poor	12.8	21.8	52.8	12.6	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	12.6	24.4	56.8	6.2	100.0
15-29	11.4	11.7	62.3	14.6	100.0
30-49	9.4	22.8	65.2	2.7	100.0
50-64	23.7	40.2	36.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	92.1	7.9	0.0	100.0
Female	9.3	22.4	38.1	30.1	100.0
15-29	10.6	1.8	53.1	34.5	100.0
30-49	7.9	22.6	39.7	29.8	100.0
50-64	12.0	44.6	15.3	28.1	100.0
65+	0.0	28.2	71.8	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

The age breakdown shows that both genders report higher shares working for the household in the youngest cohort. The share working for the State, and NGO or other employers is higher in the 50-64 age-group. In every case the highest share is employed by a private employer.

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by main economic activity is presented in Table 5.11. Overall, 43 percent of the underemployed workers are dedicated to services, 35 percent to agriculture, 12

percent to MMEC, 9 percent to other activities and 1 percent to domestic duties.

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

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed women have a higher share dedicated to agriculture than underemployed males, who have higher shares in services and other activities. The age breakdown shows that the share of underemployed males dedicated to agriculture increases with age, while the share in services and other activities decreases. The share of females in agriculture peaks at 69 percent for the 50-64 cohort. The share working in services decreases with age, while the share in other activities is remarkably higher in the oldest cohort.

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. The only cause of unemployment reported in the district is non-availability of work. The small sample size does not allow decomposing the results in the usual fashion.

Table 5.13 shows the main causes of economic inactivity. Overall, being a student is the main cause for inactivity (44 percent), followed by infirmity (20 percent) and being too old (13 percent).

The breakdown by cluster location shows that being a student or being retired are more common causes for economic inactivity in accessible clusters than in remote clusters. In turn, being too old and infirmity are more common in the latter.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that, surprisingly, being a student is a more common cause for economic inactivity among poor households than among non-poor households. Being too old was also reported more frequently by poor households, while non-poor households reported infirmity and retirement more frequently.

Table 5.11 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	private services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	35.2	11.6	43.0	1.2	8.9	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	6.8	13.5	64.6	2.5	12.6	100.0
Remote	55.2	10.3	27.9	0.4	6.2	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	65.5	20.6	13.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	32.1	10.7	46.1	1.4	9.8	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	30.5	15.3	42.0	0.2	12.0	100.0
15-29	23.6	15.7	44.3	0.5	15.9	100.0
30-49	25.5	16.3	47.0	0.0	11.2	100.0
50-64	44.7	14.6	32.0	0.0	8.7	100.0
65+	92.1	0.0	7.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	45.9	3.4	45.3	3.6	1.8	100.0
15-29	22.6	6.9	56.8	13.7	0.0	100.0
30-49	47.4	3.3	46.8	0.7	1.8	100.0
50-64	69.3	0.0	28.3	0.0	2.4	100.0
65+	28.2	0.0	49.3	0.0	22.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 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	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender and age										
Male	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-49	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Female	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
30-49	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is unemployed population aged 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	0.0	61.5	0.0	13.1	0.0	19.6	3.9	2.0	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	0.0	0.0	71.4	0.0	7.5	0.0	14.7	6.5	0.0	100.0
Remote	0.0	0.0	46.5	0.0	21.5	0.0	27.1	0.0	5.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	0.0	0.0	67.7	0.0	22.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	0.0	60.9	0.0	12.1	0.0	21.5	4.3	1.3	100.0
Gender and age										
Male	0.0	0.0	63.2	0.0	11.4	0.0	14.9	7.0	3.5	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	90.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	0.0	2.1	100.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.6	0.0	34.6	24.7	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	0.0	59.2	0.0	15.2	0.0	25.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	90.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.2	0.0	32.8	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is inactive population aged 15+

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

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	64.0	23.3	62.1	57.0	71.5	96.3
Cluster Location						
Accessible	61.8	5.1	59.6	56.7	71.3	96.8
Remote	66.4	42.9	64.8	57.3	71.8	95.8
Poverty Status						
Poor	67.5	34.7	57.5	46.7	77.2	98.2
Non-poor	63.7	22.3	62.5	57.9	71.0	96.1
Gender and age						
Male	38.4	13.3	35.9	17.1	66.8	96.3
15-29	60.3	14.7	49.1	26.4	55.4	96.1
30-49	15.1	12.3	21.4	5.4	83.8	99.4
50-64	15.5	9.1	23.4	12.1	75.9	97.5
65+	13.7	14.6	22.3	6.9	54.8	75.1
Female	89.0	33.1	87.5	95.8	76.2	96.3
15-29	94.7	28.3	90.0	97.7	71.5	98.4
30-49	87.0	34.5	91.4	97.7	88.6	97.6
50-64	86.4	44.8	85.1	98.4	71.7	94.0
65+	46.1	46.5	41.5	54.8	57.4	70.6

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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	75.3	22.3	37.9	33.7	63.4	88.4
Cluster Location						
Accessible	74.1	4.1	33.3	30.7	56.6	81.2
Remote	76.2	36.7	41.5	36.1	68.8	94.1
Poverty Status						
Poor	83.6	45.3	35.3	34.5	79.6	93.2
Non-poor	74.1	19.1	38.2	33.6	61.2	87.8
Gender and age						
Male	68.5	13.7	32.2	17.0	67.5	87.8
5-9	49.7	10.3	16.6	5.2	68.3	77.7
10-14	88.2	17.2	48.3	29.3	66.7	98.3
Female	83.0	32.2	44.5	52.9	58.7	89.1
5-9	66.6	23.2	27.3	23.5	52.5	79.9
10-14	95.3	39.0	57.4	75.1	63.4	96.1
Orphan status						
Orphaned	74.4	19.9	39.3	32.6	47.3	89.7
Not-orphaned	75.2	22.6	37.4	33.7	66.6	88.5
Foster status						
Fostered	80.9	26.5	38.2	30.3	71.3	85.6
Not-fostered	74.6	20.7	36.4	33.3	63.1	88.4

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

5.5 Household Tasks

Table 5.14 shows the activities normally undertaken in the household by its members. First the population aged 15 and above is analysed. The most common activities for the population aged 15 and above are taking care of the sick, elderly, and children. All the activities are undertaken by more than 50 percent of the members, except fetching firewood at 23 percent.

Remote clusters report higher shares of population fetching water, fetching firewood and cleaning the toilets than accessible clusters, while there are no

Table 5.16 - Child labour (age 5 to 14)

		Main activity			Employer	
	Working	Agriculture	Household	Other	Private	Household
Total	54.5	15.5	84.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	52.0	1.8	98.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	56.6	26.1	73.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	61.0	22.1	77.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	53.7	14.6	85.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	55.3	15.4	84.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-9	39.0	5.8	94.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	96.9	25.2	74.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	53.7	15.6	84.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-9	33.2	7.0	93.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	99.0	22.0	78.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Orphan status						
Orphaned	78.9	18.5	81.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Not-orphaned	51.9	15.1	84.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Foster status						
Fostered	65.9	17.8	82.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Not-fostered	51.7	15.2	84.8	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

strong differences in cooking, taking care of the children or taking care of the elderly or sick.

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

The most important differences are shown in the gender and age-breakdown. Females report remarkably higher shares in all the activities, with rates fluctuating between 76 and 96 percent, except for cleaning the toilet at 33 percent. In the case of males, the shares range from 13 to 67 percent, except for taking care of the sick and elderly (96 percent).

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

5.6 Child Labour

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

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

The breakdown by orphan status shows no remarkable differences, except for taking care of children, where non-orphaned children report a higher share. A similar observation is made by foster status, but in this case the share of fostered children taking care of children is higher than that of non-fostered children.

The main descriptive statistics for child labour are presented in Table 5.16. The most important result of the table is that 54 percent of the children are economically active. Their main economic activity is mostly household duties at 85 percent. Virtually all the working children are employed by the household.

The share of working children is higher in remote clusters and poor households. Children from remote clusters are more likely than children from accessible clusters to work in agriculture, at 26 and 2 percent. In turn, the latter are more likely to work in household duties.

Similarly, children from poor households are more likely to work in agriculture than children from non-poor households, but the difference is not as wide as in the breakdown by cluster location.

The gender breakdown shows no strong differences in working population, main activity or type of employer between boys and girls. The main difference is given by the age breakdown. Roughly one third of children in the 5-9 cohort were part of the working population, whereas almost all the children in the 10-14 cohort were working at the time of the survey.

The breakdown by orphan and foster status shows stark differences. Orphaned children are more likely to be working than non-orphaned children, at rates of 79 and 52 percent, respectively. Similarly, foster children are more likely to be working than non-fostered children, at rates of 66 and 52 percent, respectively. Orphaned children are more likely to work in agriculture than non-orphaned children, who in turn report a higher share working for the hosuehold.

6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES

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

6.1 Economic Situation

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

6.1.1 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Community

Table 6.1 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of the economic situation of the community compared to the year before the survey. Results show that 34 percent of all households in the district reported a positive change in the economic situation of their community. 32 percent of the population reported observing no changes in their community's economic situation. Even though 30 percent the respondents reported the community's economic condition to have deteriorated, 3 percent reported the situation to be much worse.

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

	Much Worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better	Don't Know	Total
Total	2.7	26.5	31.9	33.4	0.8	4.7	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	3.2	26.4	31.3	31.4	0.4	7.3	100.0
Remote	2.1	26.6	32.5	35.8	1.2	1.7	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	0.0	32.8	37.7	29.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	2.8	26.2	31.6	33.6	0.8	4.9	100.0
Household size							
1-2	2.3	29.0	37.6	27.1	0.0	4.0	100.0
3-4	3.1	23.1	27.9	39.5	0.0	6.3	100.0
5-6	1.3	21.1	33.2	35.9	2.5	6.0	100.0
7+	4.2	33.5	28.4	30.8	1.1	2.1	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	4.1	25.7	32.0	33.4	0.0	4.9	100.0
< 1 ha	0.0	23.2	38.9	29.4	0.0	8.5	100.0
1-1.99 ha	1.5	22.8	49.5	24.3	0.0	1.9	100.0
2-3.99 ha	1.7	21.6	27.3	32.8	6.0	10.6	100.0
4-5.99 ha	2.4	32.5	20.9	44.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	0.0	35.0	23.9	36.6	2.0	2.4	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	3.2	27.0	32.9	31.1	0.8	5.2	100.0
Small only	0.0	22.2	30.9	43.3	0.0	3.6	100.0
Large only	3.2	30.7	16.6	38.1	3.3	8.0	100.0
Both	1.5	23.9	35.3	39.0	0.0	0.2	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.0	31.2	28.8	36.1	0.0	3.9	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	3.6	19.4	37.0	38.7	0.0	1.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	2.9	27.3	31.8	30.8	0.0	7.2	100.0
Other	10.4	25.6	26.4	22.6	15.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	2.6	26.5	30.6	35.7	0.3	4.4	100.0
Female	3.1	26.5	35.7	26.6	2.3	5.7	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	3.7	34.5	26.7	34.2	0.0	1.0	100.0
Monogamous	2.0	26.0	29.0	37.4	0.4	5.1	100.0
Polygamous	7.5	25.5	40.4	26.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	16.0	70.5	13.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	3.2	25.4	37.3	25.6	2.3	6.2	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	4.8	18.7	41.0	25.2	3.6	6.7	100.0
Primary	3.1	27.7	32.7	32.1	0.0	4.4	100.0
Secondary +	1.0	28.5	25.4	40.2	0.8	4.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

Cluster location and poverty status of the household show some correlation with the perceived economic change. 37 percent of the households in remote clusters reports an improvement in their community's economic situation compared to 32 percent of those living in accessible clusters. Likewise, while 35 percent of non-poor households reports an improvement in their community's economic situation, the share for poor households is 29 percent.

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported deterioration in their community's economic situation is higher than that of households with one or two members at 38 and 31 percent respectively. Furthermore, there is a difference of 6 percentage points between households owning six or more hectares of land and those owning no land who reported improving conditions in their community's economic situation at 39 and 33 percent respectively. Likewise, the percentage of households owning small livestock who reported improving conditions in their community's economic situation is higher than that of households owning no livestock at 43 and 32 percent respectively.

While 39 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category reported an improvement in their community's economic situation, the share for households whose main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed other' category is 31 percent. In contrast, while 36 percent of the households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category reported deterioration in their community's economic situation, the share for households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category is 23 percent. Furthermore, 39 percent of households where the household head is single reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their communities whereas, the share for households where the household head has a loose union is 16 percent. In contrast, 71 percent of households where the head has union reported same conditions in their community's economic situation. It is also observed that the percentage of households where the head has secondary education or more and reported improving conditions in their community's economic situation is 19 percentage points higher than that of households where the head has no education. Lastly, while 36 percent of male-headed households reported an improvement in their community's economic situation, the share for female-headed households is 29 percent.

6.1.2 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Household

Table 6.2 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of their economic situation compared to the year before the survey. Only 35 percent of the households reported an improvement in their economic conditions, while 30 percent reported same conditions compared to the year preceding the survey.

Cluster location does not show strong correlation with perception of change in the economic situation of the household. On the other hand, poor households express negative views on the change in their economic condition more frequently than non-poor households, with a difference of 11 percentage points at 45 and 34 percent respectively.

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their households is higher than that of households with one or two members at 38 and 29 percent respectively. Likewise, while 48 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their households, the share for households owning no land is 35 percent. Disaggregation of the data further shows that 60 percent of households owning large livestock express positive views on their households' economic conditions compared to 29 percent of households owning no livestock.

The percentage of households in the 'self-employed other' category who reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households is remarkably higher than that of households whose main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category at 43 and 24 percent respectively. Likewise, while 51 percent of households where the head is widowed, divorced or separated reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households, the share for households where the head has a loose union is 16 percent. In

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	10.1	24.5	30.3	33.7	1.4	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	9.1	25.7	28.4	34.8	2.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	11.3	23.1	32.4	32.5	0.7	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	23.9	20.5	35.0	20.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	9.4	24.7	30.1	34.4	1.4	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	10.7	29.1	31.3	26.6	2.3	0.0	100.0
3-4	13.1	20.6	30.4	34.5	1.5	0.0	100.0
5-6	4.4	25.1	30.8	38.9	0.7	0.0	100.0
7+	11.4	22.9	28.4	36.6	0.7	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	10.2	22.6	32.3	33.6	1.3	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	26.2	37.4	8.4	28.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	9.5	30.1	35.4	23.4	1.5	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	5.7	18.0	39.8	36.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	9.4	30.9	25.0	34.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	5.3	21.7	25.2	43.4	4.4	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	9.9	26.7	34.6	27.8	0.9	0.0	100.0
Small only	16.6	18.8	24.2	40.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	11.4	15.2	13.0	55.0	5.3	0.0	100.0
Both	5.7	19.4	16.3	55.5	3.2	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	6.4	18.0	32.8	40.3	2.4	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	8.0	21.2	31.0	38.4	1.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	12.7	29.9	26.3	30.2	0.9	0.0	100.0
Other	14.9	21.7	50.3	13.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	7.2	22.2	30.6	38.1	1.8	0.0	100.0
Female	19.1	31.3	29.2	20.3	0.1	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	12.6	32.5	26.2	28.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	6.5	20.2	32.3	39.1	1.9	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	1.9	30.4	27.9	35.0	4.8	0.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	16.0	71.1	12.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	20.4	31.3	25.2	23.1	0.1	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	24.2	19.9	31.7	24.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	9.5	27.3	31.0	30.8	1.5	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	3.8	21.8	28.2	44.1	2.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

contrast, 71 percent of households where the head has a loose union reported same conditions in their households' economic situation.

50 percent of female-headed households reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households compared to 29 percent of male-headed households. Likewise, 44 percent of households where the head has no formal education reported deterioration in their households economic situation compared to 26 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more.

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	31.3	24.1	36.9	7.8	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	45.6	25.1	25.6	3.7	100.0
Remote	15.0	23.0	49.7	12.3	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	1.3	19.1	55.7	24.0	100.0
Non-poor	32.8	24.4	35.9	6.9	100.0
Household size					
1-2	35.0	24.0	29.9	11.2	100.0
3-4	33.3	28.3	33.9	4.5	100.0
5-6	32.0	21.4	43.1	3.6	100.0
7+	23.0	21.3	43.5	12.2	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	38.2	23.9	32.4	5.4	100.0
< 1 ha	22.1	17.5	36.7	23.6	100.0
1-1.99 ha	16.2	33.0	37.9	12.9	100.0
2-3.99 ha	17.0	28.1	51.1	3.7	100.0
4-5.99 ha	23.9	23.0	47.8	5.4	100.0
6+ ha	33.3	18.8	37.7	10.1	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	31.9	24.1	35.9	8.0	100.0
Small only	18.5	20.4	45.4	15.6	100.0
Large only	34.3	34.5	31.1	0.0	100.0
Both	34.8	20.3	40.2	4.7	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	50.2	21.0	27.6	1.2	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	13.1	26.6	52.5	7.7	100.0
Self-employed - other	30.3	26.6	32.7	10.4	100.0
Other	21.1	6.7	55.1	17.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	34.3	25.2	34.5	6.0	100.0
Female	21.9	20.6	44.3	13.2	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	31.2	36.9	28.8	3.1	100.0
Monogamous	35.3	24.2	34.8	5.8	100.0
Polygamous	35.8	26.7	35.5	1.9	100.0
Loose union	28.9	0.0	44.6	26.5	100.0
Widow/div/sep	20.4	19.8	45.1	14.7	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	12.3	20.1	45.8	21.8	100.0
Primary	24.0	28.1	40.6	7.3	100.0
Secondary +	54.6	19.0	25.3	1.1	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

6.2 Self-reported Difficulties in Satisfying Household Needs

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

6.2.1 Food Needs

Table 6.3 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in satisfying the food needs of the household during the year before the survey. Overall, 55 percent

of the district's households never/seldom experience food shortages while the remaining population experience food shortages frequently (often/always). While 46 percent of households in accessible clusters never experienced food shortages, the share for households in remote clusters is 15 percent. Likewise, 33 percent of non-poor households never experienced food shortages compared to only 1 percent of poor households.

62 percent of households owning no land never/seldom experienced problems satisfying food needs compared to 52 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land. Furthermore, while 35 percent of households with one or two members never experienced food shortages, the share for households with seven or more members is 23 percent. There is also some correlation between livestock ownership and satisfying food needs. While 61 percent of households owning small livestock frequently experienced food shortages, the share for households owning large livestock is 31 percent.

The socio-economic group of the household also shows some correlation with the household's ability to satisfy its food needs. 50 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' socio-economic group never experienced problems satisfying food needs compared to only 13 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture. In contrast, 72 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category reported frequent problems satisfying food needs. Furthermore, while 36 percent of households where the head is polygamous never experienced food shortages, the share for households where the head is widowed/divorced or separated is 20 percent. On the other hand, 72 percent of households where the head has a loose union frequently experienced food shortages.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that male-headed households reported having food shortages less frequently than female-headed households as 34 percent of male-headed households never experienced food shortages compared to 22 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, while 55 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more never experienced food shortages, the share for households where the head has no education is 12 percent.

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	86.8	5.0	6.7	1.4	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	84.3	6.4	7.6	1.7	100.0
Remote	89.7	3.4	5.8	1.1	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	80.0	0.0	16.5	3.5	100.0
Non-poor	87.2	5.2	6.3	1.3	100.0
Household size					
1-2	96.3	2.0	1.7	0.0	100.0
3-4	88.3	4.4	4.8	2.5	100.0
5-6	86.3	5.5	6.7	1.5	100.0
7+	73.1	9.1	16.0	1.9	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	85.9	5.6	6.6	2.0	100.0
< 1 ha	93.3	3.4	3.3	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	86.9	6.9	6.2	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	85.8	1.8	12.5	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	89.6	2.7	5.3	2.4	100.0
6+ ha	86.2	5.9	6.5	1.5	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	87.5	4.7	6.0	1.7	100.0
Small only	80.1	2.7	15.2	2.0	100.0
Large only	80.7	11.6	7.6	0.0	100.0
Both	91.0	4.2	4.8	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	81.3	6.7	10.6	1.4	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	91.5	2.5	6.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	87.3	5.2	5.1	2.3	100.0
Other	90.4	4.3	5.3	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	86.5	5.2	7.2	1.1	100.0
Female	87.9	4.2	5.3	2.6	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	94.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	86.5	5.3	7.2	1.0	100.0
Polygamous	92.7	2.6	4.6	0.0	100.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	83.1	4.7	8.9	3.4	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	94.8	0.0	3.1	2.2	100.0
Primary	89.5	2.9	6.4	1.2	100.0
Secondary +	77.7	11.4	9.4	1.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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, 87 percent of the households in the district reported that they never had

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	83.0	12.1	4.6	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	74.4	19.2	6.5	0.0	100.0
Remote	92.8	4.1	2.5	0.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	94.6	0.0	5.4	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	82.4	12.7	4.5	0.3	100.0
Household size					
1-2	81.5	13.8	3.5	1.2	100.0
3-4	75.3	17.4	7.4	0.0	100.0
5-6	85.6	12.1	2.2	0.0	100.0
7+	92.6	2.7	4.7	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	74.8	17.2	7.4	0.6	100.0
< 1 ha	94.6	5.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	92.9	7.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	88.9	10.4	0.7	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	97.7	0.0	2.3	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	91.3	6.0	2.7	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	78.2	15.7	5.7	0.4	100.0
Small only	89.5	6.1	4.4	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	84.2	13.3	2.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	90.4	6.8	2.8	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	78.2	14.3	7.1	0.3	100.0
Other	89.0	8.0	0.0	3.1	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	84.3	11.4	4.3	0.0	100.0
Female	79.0	14.3	5.4	1.3	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	68.6	22.6	7.0	1.8	100.0
Monogamous	84.9	11.3	3.8	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	86.6	12.1	1.3	0.0	100.0
Loose union	55.4	0.0	44.6	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	84.4	10.7	4.2	0.7	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	89.0	4.1	5.8	1.0	100.0
Primary	79.9	14.4	5.3	0.3	100.0
Secondary +	85.3	12.1	2.6	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

problems paying school fees and only 8 percent of the households reported that they often/always had problems paying school fees. It is worth noting that children in primary state schools do not pay fees. While children in secondary state schools do pay fees, the secondary school enrolment rates are very low (for more details, see chapter 3).

90 percent of households located in remote clusters never experienced problems paying school fees compared to 84 percent of households located in accessible clusters. Likewise, while 87 percent of non-poor households never experienced problems paying school fees, the share for poor households is 80 percent.

Furthermore, smaller households find problems paying school fees less frequently than larger households. While 96 percent of households with one or two members never had problems with paying

school fees, the share for households with seven or more members is 73 percent.

93 percent of households owning 1 hectare of land never experienced problems paying school fees compared to 86 percent of landless households and those owning 6 or more hectares of land. Likewise, 91 percent of households owning both small and large livestock never had problems with paying school fees whereas, the share for households owning small livestock is 80 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that 92 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category never had problems paying school fees compared to 81 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee.

Furthermore, virtually all households where the head has a loose union never had problems paying school fees, compared to about 83 percent of 'widowed/divorced/separated' household heads. Lastly, 95 percent of households where the household head has no education never experienced problems paying school fees compared to 78 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more.

6.2.3 Paying House Rent

Table 6.5 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying house rent during the year before the survey. 83 percent of all households in the district reported that they never had problems paying house rent. Only 5 percent of the households reported that they often/always had problems paying house rent.

93 percent of households located in remote clusters never experienced problems paying house rent compared to 74 percent of households located in accessible clusters. Likewise, 95 percent of poor households never experienced problems paying house rent compared to 82 percent of non-poor households.

While 93 percent of households with seven or more members never experienced problems paying house rent, the share for households with one or two members is 82 percent. Likewise, 91 percent households owning 6 or more hectares of land never experienced problems paying house rent compared to 75 percent of landless households. It is also observed that virtually all households owning both small and large livestock and those owning large livestock never experienced problems paying house rent compared to 78 percent of households owning no livestock at all.

Furthermore, 90 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture never experienced problems paying house rent compared to 78 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category. Likewise, 87 percent of households where the head is polygamous never had problems paying house rent compared to 55 percent of households where the head has a loose union.

While 84 percent of male-headed households never experienced problems paying house rent, the share for female-headed households is 79 percent. Lastly, 89 percent of households where the head has no formal education never had problems paying house rent compared to 85 percent of household heads with secondary or more education level.

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. Overall 75 percent households in the district faced no problems paying utility bills whereas, 13 percent of the households reported that they often/always had problems paying utility bills.

82 percent of households located in remote clusters never had problems paying utility bills compared to 69 percent of households located in accessible clusters. Likewise, 88 percent of poor households faced no problems paying utility bills compared to 74 percent of non-poor households.

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	74.6	12.8	10.9	1.6	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	68.5	18.0	10.9	2.6	100.0
Remote	81.6	7.0	11.0	0.5	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	88.3	4.6	7.2	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	73.9	13.2	11.1	1.7	100.0
Household size					
1-2	80.5	8.4	9.1	2.1	100.0
3-4	68.7	17.3	12.1	1.9	100.0
5-6	73.2	8.7	17.4	0.7	100.0
7+	76.6	16.8	4.9	1.6	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	67.3	17.1	13.1	2.6	100.0
< 1 ha	93.7	1.0	5.3	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	78.4	5.2	14.0	2.3	100.0
2-3.99 ha	77.0	11.1	11.9	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	95.0	0.9	4.2	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	78.5	16.0	5.5	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	72.2	13.2	12.4	2.2	100.0
Small only	81.7	9.3	9.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	83.3	12.2	4.5	0.0	100.0
Both	80.2	13.6	6.1	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	69.9	13.4	16.2	0.6	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	84.2	8.3	6.5	1.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	74.2	15.1	10.0	0.7	100.0
Other	63.1	8.4	11.6	16.9	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	74.6	13.5	10.8	1.1	100.0
Female	74.9	10.8	11.2	3.1	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	90.5	4.5	5.1	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	73.6	14.0	12.4	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	67.3	9.0	6.5	17.2	100.0
Loose union	55.4	44.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	73.6	12.2	11.0	3.2	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	78.0	6.7	11.8	3.4	100.0
Primary	75.7	13.3	9.3	1.7	100.0
Secondary +	70.9	15.2	13.4	0.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

While 81 percent of households with one or two members never had problems paying utility bills, the share for households with seven or more members is 77 percent. On the other hand, 79 percent of households owning 6 or more hectares of land faced no problems paying utility bills compared to 67 percent of landless households. Furthermore, 83 percent of households owning large livestock faced no problems paying utility bills compared to 72 percent of households owning no livestock at all.

84 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category faced no problems paying utility bills compared to 63 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category. On the other hand, 91 percent of households where the head is single faced no problems paying utility bills compared

to 55 percent of households where the head has a loose union.

Furthermore, 78 percent of households where the head has no education faced no problems paying utility bills compared to 71 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more. Finally, gender does not show strong correlation with the ability to pay utility bills.

6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare

Table 6.7 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying for healthcare during the year before the survey. 77 percent of the households reported that they never/seldom experienced problems paying for healthcare in the year prior to the survey. Disaggregation of the data further shows that 49 percent of households located in accessible clusters never experienced problems paying for healthcare compared to 28 percent of households located in remote clusters. Likewise, while 41 percent of non-poor households never experienced problems paying for healthcare, the share for poor households is 7 percent.

44 percent of households with one or two members never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 33 percent of households with seven or more members. Likewise, while 52 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for landless households is 41 percent.

Furthermore, 50 percent of households owning both small and large livestock never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 26 percent of households owning small livestock. On the other hand, while 52 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' socio-economic group is 29 percent.

55 percent of households where the household head is single never had problems paying for healthcare whereas, the share for households where the household head is polygamous is 19 percent. On the other hand, 35 percent households where the head is polygamous frequently experienced problems paying for healthcare. 41 percent of male-headed households never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 35 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, 58 percent of household heads with secondary education or more never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 20 percent of household heads with no education.

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

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	39.2	38.0	19.0	3.8	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	48.8	32.0	16.2	3.0	100.0
Remote	28.3	44.8	22.2	4.8	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	7.4	72.3	20.3	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	40.8	36.3	18.9	4.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	44.3	32.3	18.8	4.6	100.0
3-4	36.6	44.5	15.1	3.8	100.0
5-6	42.2	31.9	22.2	3.7	100.0
7+	32.9	43.1	21.0	3.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	41.2	36.9	19.0	2.9	100.0
< 1 ha	19.3	41.1	34.1	5.5	100.0
1-1.99 ha	43.2	38.8	13.1	4.9	100.0
2-3.99 ha	27.6	52.0	17.9	2.4	100.0
4-5.99 ha	33.1	40.7	23.0	3.3	100.0
6+ ha	52.4	27.2	12.8	7.6	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	39.0	39.0	18.1	3.8	100.0
Small only	26.0	44.9	22.8	6.2	100.0
Large only	39.6	34.2	26.1	0.0	100.0
Both	50.4	28.1	17.1	4.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	52.3	29.6	16.4	1.6	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	29.1	45.9	20.3	4.7	100.0
Self-employed - other	37.5	38.9	19.9	3.7	100.0
Other	30.7	38.9	18.1	12.3	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	40.7	39.1	16.4	3.8	100.0
Female	34.7	34.7	26.8	3.8	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	55.2	36.8	8.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	42.1	36.5	17.9	3.4	100.0
Polygamous	18.7	46.9	23.8	10.6	100.0
Loose union	28.9	71.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	30.4	38.7	25.8	5.1	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	19.7	50.3	25.9	4.1	100.0
Primary	34.7	43.1	17.1	5.1	100.0
Secondary +	57.9	22.2	18.7	1.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status

This section discusses ownership of selected assets and household occupancy status. These assets are as houses, land, livestock, vehicles, motorcycles, bicycles and wheelbarrows. This section will also provide detailed information on asset ownership by household characteristics. Household occupancy status describes the type of arrangement the household has in terms of their current dwelling. Respondents were asked whether they own, rent, live free or temporarily live in their current dwelling, and if they held any documentation to support the occupancy status. Besides the respondent's testimony, the survey did not use any further methods to verify this information.

6.3.1 Asset Ownership

Table 6.8 shows the percent distribution of households owning a selected group of assets. Overall, 53 percent of the district's households owns their dwellings while 46 percent owns some land. 11 percent of all households owns both small and large livestock while 8 percent of all households owns small livestock. While 54 percent of all households owns a bicycle, the share for households owning a motorcycle is 2 percent.

Table 6.9 shows the percent distribution of households by occupancy status. While 75 percent of households located in remote clusters owns their dwellings, the share for households located in accessible clusters is 34 percent. Likewise, 80 percent of poor households owns their dwellings compared to 52 percent of non-poor households.

Disaggregation of the data shows that 83 percent of households with seven or more members owns their dwellings compared to 33 percent of households with one or two members. Furthermore, while 79 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category owns their dwellings, the share for households whose main income earner is an employee is 40 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that while 54 percent of male-headed households owns their dwellings, the share for female-headed households is 50 percent. It is also observed that 65 percent of male-headed households owns a bicycle compared to 19 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, 72 percent of households with seven or more members owns a bicycle compared to 31 percent of

Table 6.8: Percentage of households owning certain assets

			Livestock				Motor-		Wheel
	Home	Land	Small	Large	Both	Vehicle	cycle	Bicycle	barrow
Total	53.1	45.6	8.4	6.8	10.8	3.2	2.3	53.6	13.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	33.8	29.4	5.2	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.3	54.9	11.6
Remote	74.9	64.1	12.1	8.9	17.5	1.2	0.0	52.1	14.6
Poverty Status									
Poor	80.3	76.6	26.9	8.7	14.5	0.0	0.0	48.0	28.6
Non-poor	51.7	44.1	7.5	6.7	10.6	3.3	2.4	53.8	12.2
Household size									
1-2	32.8	42.8	7.0	2.6	3.1	0.0	0.0	30.7	7.4
3-4	43.0	33.8	4.5	5.0	7.0	0.9	2.8	47.3	8.4
5-6	62.4	52.2	7.9	12.0	11.7	3.9	3.8	72.2	13.8
7+	83.1	58.5	16.2	9.4	24.9	9.7	3.1	72.1	25.7
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	39.8	30.8	5.0	8.1	4.3	2.7	4.6	63.2	11.8
Self-employed - agric	78.9	84.4	9.0	8.8	30.0	0.0	0.0	53.1	13.3
Self-employed - other	49.0	38.3	11.0	5.5	6.5	5.3	2.4	51.8	13.8
Other	48.5	25.4	0.0	4.3	2.2	0.0	0.0	22.9	10.8
Gender of the head of household									
Male	53.9	46.0	8.6	7.4	12.6	4.2	3.0	65.0	15.9
Female	50.4	44.4	8.0	5.3	5.2	0.1	0.1	18.7	4.1

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

Table 6.9: Percent distribution of households by occupancy status

	Own	Rent	Free	Other	Total
Total	53.1	41.0	5.2	0.7	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	33.8	63.4	2.7	0.0	100.0
Remote	74.9	15.6	8.0	1.5	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	80.3	5.4	14.3	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	51.7	42.8	4.8	0.7	100.0
Household size					
1-2	32.8	59.2	7.0	1.1	100.0
3-4	43.0	51.1	5.2	0.7	100.0
5-6	62.4	35.5	1.2	0.9	100.0
7+	83.1	9.7	7.1	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	39.8	55.3	3.3	1.5	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	78.9	10.9	10.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	49.0	48.5	2.6	0.0	100.0
Other	48.5	28.3	17.4	5.8	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	53.9	41.1	4.4	0.5	100.0
Female	50.4	40.8	7.6	1.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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	17.4	14.2	4.3	12.2	52.0	100.0	35.9
Cluster Location							
Accessible	22.4	21.8	7.7	9.9	38.2	100.0	51.9
Remote	11.7	5.5	0.5	14.7	67.6	100.0	17.7
Poverty Status							
Poor	16.4	0.0	0.0	7.2	76.4	100.0	16.4
Non-poor	17.4	14.9	4.5	12.4	50.7	100.0	36.9
Household size							
1-2	3.3	21.5	3.2	9.8	62.2	100.0	28.0
3-4	12.8	16.7	7.8	14.1	48.7	100.0	37.3
5-6	28.9	11.3	4.4	10.7	44.7	100.0	44.7
7+	29.7	4.5	0.8	14.2	50.8	100.0	35.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	22.9	24.1	2.5	10.2	40.2	100.0	49.6
Self-employed - agı	4.2	3.6	0.3	15.0	76.9	100.0	8.1
Self-employed - oth	21.6	15.2	7.0	11.0	45.2	100.0	43.8
Other	6.5	0.0	5.6	20.0	67.9	100.0	12.1
Gender of the head of household							
Male	19.0	14.8	5.3	12.1	48.8	100.0	39.1
Female	12.6	12.3	1.2	12.3	61.7	100.0	26.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

households with one or two members. Similarly, while 63 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee owns a bicycle, the share for households where the head belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group is 23 percent.

Furthermore, 77 percent of poor households owns some land compared to 44 percent of non-poor households. Likewise, 64 percent of households located in remote clusters owns some land compared to 29 percent of households located in accessible clusters. It is also noticeable that 84 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed

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	29.0	70.4	51.1	0.3	0.7	16.5	0.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	22.6	69.2	60.3	0.0	0.0	21.9	0.0
Remote	36.3	71.4	44.6	0.4	1.2	12.6	0.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	55.0	71.2	53.2	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0
Non-poor	27.7	70.4	50.9	0.3	0.7	17.5	0.0
Household size							
1-2	13.1	66.2	55.7	2.1	0.0	23.8	0.0
3-4	21.2	63.2	51.2	0.0	0.0	10.5	0.0
5-6	43.4	69.0	50.2	0.0	0.0	24.7	0.0
7+	45.1	78.1	50.3	0.0	2.0	9.1	0.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	27.2	62.5	82.4	0.0	0.0	27.0	0.0
Self-employed - agric	51.6	75.3	35.3	0.7	1.8	7.3	0.0
Self-employed - other	20.9	70.2	41.9	0.0	0.0	20.8	0.0
Other	17.3	75.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	31.7	70.5	50.4	0.0	0.8	16.5	0.0
Female	20.9	70.4	54.4	1.5	0.0	16.1	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

agriculture' category own some land compared to 25 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category.

6.3.2 Occupancy Documentation

The percent distribution of households by type of occupancy documentation is shown in Table 6.10. Most residents in the district do not have any documentation to verify their occupancy status. Only 35 percent of the households possess formal occupancy documentation, which include a title deed, renting contract or payment receipt. 52 percent of households in this district have no documentation at all.

6.4 Agriculture

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

6.4.1 Agricultural Inputs

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

29 percent of all farmers applies agricultural inputs to their farms and the majority (70 percent) of those who use farm inputs apply fertilizers. 36 percent of households located in remote clusters uses agricultural inputs compared to 23 percent of households located in accessible clusters. Further breakdown of data shows that 60 percent of households in accessible clusters uses improved seedlings compared to 45 percent of households in remote clusters. Furthermore, while 55 percent of poor households uses agricultural inputs, the share for non-poor households is 28 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that as the number of household members increases, the usage of agricultural inputs also tends to increase as 45 percent of households with seven or more members uses agricultural inputs compared to 13 percent of households with one or two members. Furthermore, while 52 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category uses agricultural

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

	Open market	Government	Donor agency	Coop.	Other	Total
Total	58.0	0.2	0.7	2.1	39.0	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	72.7	0.6	0.0	0.8	26.0	100.0
Remote	47.5	0.0	1.2	3.1	48.3	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	60.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	39.7	100.0
Non-poor	57.8	0.3	0.7	2.3	38.9	100.0
Household size						
1-2	51.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	46.4	100.0
3-4	48.4	1.1	3.2	5.2	42.1	100.0
5-6	68.7	0.0	0.0	2.0	29.2	100.0
7+	55.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.1	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	81.7	0.0	0.0	5.5	12.7	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	39.2	0.6	1.7	1.1	57.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	58.3	0.0	0.0	1.0	40.7	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	56.4	0.3	0.8	2.2	40.4	100.0
Female	65.8	0.0	0.0	1.8	32.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

1. Base is households using agricultural inputs

inputs, the share for households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group is 17 percent. Likewise, use of agricultural inputs in male-headed households is higher than in female-headed households. While 32 percent of male-headed households uses agricultural inputs, the share for female-headed households is 21 percent.

Most households that use agricultural inputs purchase them at an open market (58 percent) and in second place obtain them by preparing them themselves (39 percent). While 2 percent of the households gets their inputs from cooperatives, 1 percent reports donor agencies and none reports government as their main source.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that the percentage of households located in accessible clusters who purchases agricultural inputs at an open market is higher than that of households located in remote clusters at 73 and 48 percent respectively. In contrast, 48 percent of households located in remote clusters obtains agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves compared to 26 percent of households located in accessible clusters. There are no strong differences in the share of households purchasing the inputs at an open market by poverty status.

In addition, while 56 percent of households with seven or more members purchases agricultural inputs at an open market, the share for households with one or two members is 51 percent.

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

	None	< 1 ha	1-1.99	2-3.99	4-5.99	6+ ha	Total
Total	54.4	6.8	9.6	9.5	8.3	11.5	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	70.6	6.0	8.4	6.3	2.4	6.3	100.0
Remote	35.9	7.7	11.0	13.2	14.9	17.4	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	23.4	10.2	20.6	14.3	22.0	9.5	100.0
Non-poor	55.9	6.6	9.1	9.3	7.6	11.6	100.0
Household size							
1-2	57.2	12.2	11.4	8.2	4.2	6.8	100.0
3-4	66.2	3.8	6.9	4.2	6.4	12.4	100.0
5-6	47.8	4.4	11.7	17.3	10.0	8.8	100.0
7+	41.5	6.2	8.8	10.2	14.2	19.2	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	69.2	4.1	7.9	7.0	5.0	6.8	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	15.6	5.9	16.5	12.2	21.6	28.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	61.7	9.4	8.3	9.2	4.6	6.8	100.0
Other	74.6	0.0	1.4	14.3	2.2	7.4	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	54.0	5.7	10.2	8.3	8.4	13.4	100.0
Female	55.6	9.9	7.8	13.4	7.7	5.6	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

Virtually all households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category purchase their agricultural inputs at an open market compared to 39 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' socio-economic group. In turn, 57 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category obtain agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves. Lastly, while 66 percent of female-headed households purchases agricultural inputs at an open market, the share for male-headed households is 56 percent. In contrast, 40 percent of male-headed households obtains agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves compared to 32 percent of female-headed households.

6.4.2 Landholding

Table 6.13 shows the percent distribution of households by the area of land owned. Around 71 percent of households own less than two acres of land (including 54 percent of landless households). 9 percent owns between two and four acres and 20 percent owns four or more acres.

Landless households are more common in accessible clusters and households owning large portions of land are more common in remote clusters as 71 percent of households in accessible clusters are landless compared to 36 percent of households in remote clusters. Likewise, the percentage of landless households among non-poor households is higher than that of poor households, at 56 and 23 percent respectively.

Regarding household size, while 57 percent of households with one or two members are landless, the share for households with seven or more members is 42 percent. In contrast, larger households seem to own larger landholdings more frequently than households with less members.

While households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category reported the highest share of landless households (75 percent), the share for households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category is 16 percent. In turn, 50 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category owns four or more acres of land. Finally, male-headed households have larger landholdings (4 or more acres) compared to female-headed households at 21 and 14 percent respectively.

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	82.4	1.5	10.8	3.1	1.9	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	90.1	1.2	6.1	1.4	0.6	0.5	100.0
Remote	73.6	1.9	16.1	5.0	3.4	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	76.9	6.2	12.9	4.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	82.6	1.3	10.7	3.0	2.0	0.3	100.0
Household size							
1-2	94.2	0.7	2.8	0.0	2.3	0.0	100.0
3-4	88.0	2.2	9.3	0.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	76.3	0.0	16.0	4.9	2.8	0.0	100.0
7+	65.7	3.3	17.7	8.6	3.3	1.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	87.6	1.1	8.8	1.1	1.3	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	61.3	4.2	22.1	8.4	4.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	88.0	0.7	7.6	1.6	1.6	0.6	100.0
Other	93.5	0.0	2.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	80.0	1.5	11.4	4.1	2.6	0.4	100.0
Female	89.5	1.6	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

6.4.3 Cattle Ownership

Table 6.14 shows the percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned. Overall 82 percent of the households own no cattle at all, and 11 percent owns between 2 and 10 heads of cattle. While 90 percent of households in accessible clusters owns no cattle, the share for households in remote clusters is 74 percent. Likewise, the percentage of non-poor households that own no cattle is higher than that of poor households at 83 and 77 percent respectively.

94 percent of households with one or two members owns no cattle, compared to 66 percent of households with seven or more members. Likewise, about 88 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' and 'self-employed other' categories and 94 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category owns no cattle compared to 61 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category. Finally, while 90 percent of female-headed households owns no cattle, the share for male-headed households is 80 percent.

6.5 Perception of Crime and Security in the Community

This section gives an overview of how the district residents perceive the current crime and security situation compared to the year preceding the survey. Respondents were asked to categorise the current crime and security situation as the same, better or worse than the previous year. Results are shown in Table 6.15

49 percent the households reported the security situation was improving, 31 percent said it was the same while 18 percent reported it was deteriorating. The percentage of households located in accessible clusters who reported the current crime and security situation as improving is higher than that of households located in remote clusters at 51 and 46 percent respectively. Likewise, 57 percent of poor households reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 49 percent of non-poor households.

While 50 percent of households with seven or more members reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households with one or two members is 39 percent. Similarly, 51 percent of households

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

	Much Worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better	Don't Know	Total
Total	2.2	16.2	31.0	36.0	12.7	1.9	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	0.9	15.6	30.4	34.6	16.4	2.1	100.0
Remote	3.8	16.9	31.7	37.6	8.4	1.6	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	11.8	12.1	19.6	45.5	10.9	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	1.7	16.4	31.6	35.5	12.7	2.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	5.1	14.1	37.9	29.6	8.6	4.7	100.0
3-4	0.2	20.0	26.8	37.2	14.7	1.0	100.0
5-6	0.8	13.6	27.7	40.5	16.0	1.3	100.0
7+	2.7	16.5	31.3	37.9	11.7	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	1.4	14.8	30.4	38.4	12.7	2.4	100.0
< 1 ha	0.0	20.3	23.3	33.1	19.1	4.1	100.0
1-1.99 ha	12.3	11.9	24.6	33.5	17.7	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	3.2	19.5	32.9	31.6	9.6	3.1	100.0
4-5.99 ha	0.0	18.6	42.4	33.1	5.9	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	0.0	19.6	34.1	34.3	12.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	3.0	15.4	29.5	36.9	13.0	2.2	100.0
Small only	0.0	16.6	36.3	35.4	8.2	3.6	100.0
Large only	0.0	23.8	31.5	20.7	24.1	0.0	100.0
Both	0.0	16.7	37.0	40.0	6.3	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	1.2	18.6	23.0	36.1	17.7	3.2	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	3.6	14.8	43.6	28.5	9.4	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	2.4	16.1	28.9	38.8	12.3	1.6	100.0
Other	0.0	10.4	38.2	41.3	4.3	5.8	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	2.3	15.5	29.2	38.1	14.1	0.8	100.0
Female	2.0	18.2	36.6	29.5	8.4	5.3	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	3.0	7.5	43.4	37.6	2.6	5.9	100.0
Monogamous	2.7	15.2	27.9	37.9	15.3	1.0	100.0
Polygamous	0.0	13.2	27.8	40.7	18.3	0.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	57.5	29.5	12.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	1.2	20.5	34.9	30.9	9.4	3.1	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	6.9	15.1	29.5	37.1	5.0	6.5	100.0
Primary	1.5	18.0	32.6	35.7	12.2	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	1.1	13.5	29.0	35.9	17.7	2.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

owning no land reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 46 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land. While 50 percent of households owning no livestock reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households owning small livestock is 43 percent.

While 54 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category is 38 percent. In turn, 44 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category reported same conditions in the current crime and

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

	Principal contributor of income				
	Head	Spouse	Child	Other	Total
Total	86.4	3.8	4.1	5.6	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	92.1	4.2	1.4	2.3	100.0
Remote	79.9	3.3	7.3	9.4	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	80.9	4.0	15.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	86.7	3.8	3.6	5.9	100.0
Household size					
1-2	80.5	2.7	5.6	11.2	100.0
3-4	89.9	3.0	2.8	4.2	100.0
5-6	86.9	5.0	3.8	4.3	100.0
7+	88.8	5.2	4.3	1.7	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	91.6	3.8	2.4	2.1	100.0
Self-employed - agric	88.3	3.5	2.1	6.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	88.6	3.7	6.3	1.4	100.0
Other	33.2	6.2	2.2	58.4	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	91.7	5.1	1.6	1.6	100.0
Female	70.2	0.0	11.9	17.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

security situation. On the other hand, 52 percent of male-headed households reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 38 percent of female-headed households.

59 percent of households where the household head is polygamous reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation whereas, the share for households where the head has a loose union is 13 percent. Lastly, the percentage of households where the head has secondary education or more and reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation is 12 percentage points higher than that of household heads with no education at 54 and 42 percent respectively.

6.6 Household Income Contributions

Table 6.16 shows the percent distribution of households by main contributor to household income. The survey includes information on household income contributions by listing all the income contributors in the households and then identifying the household member who contributes the largest portion. For the majority (86 percent) of households the head is the main contributor.

92 percent of the households located in accessible clusters reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 80 percent of households located in remote clusters. While 87 percent of non-poor households reported the household head as the main income contributor, the share for poor households is 81 percent.

89 percent of households with seven or more members reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 81 percent of households with one or two members. On the other hand, while 6 percent of households with one or two members reported the child as the main income contributor, the share for households with seven or more members is 4 percent.

Furthermore, 92 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 33 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category. The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that up to 5 percent of male-headed households reported the spouse as the main income contributor, while the share for female-headed households is virtually null. It is also observed that 92 percent of male-headed households reported the household

head as the main income contributor compared to 70 percent of female-headed households.

6.7 Other Household Items

Table 6.17 shows the percentage distribution of households owning selected household items. 97 percent of households owns at least one mattress or bed, 75 percent owns a radio, 65 percent owns a watch or clock and 46 percent owns an electric iron. Although 7 percent of households owns a fixed line phone, 46 percent owns a mobile phone. Households in accessible clusters and non-poor households have higher rates of ownership in almost every selected item.

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

Table 6.17: Percentage of households owning selected household items

	Electric iron	Refrigerator	Sewing machine	Modern stove	Mattress or bed	Watch or clock	Radio	Televison	Fixed line phone	Mobile phone
Total	46.1	15.1	20.2	14.1	96.6	65.4	75.3	25.5	6.5	45.6
Cluster Location										
Accessible	57.2	25.3	25.3	20.9	98.4	74.3	85.7	40.9	10.4	63.0
Remote	33.5	3.6	14.5	6.4	94.5	55.3	63.6	8.1	2.2	25.8
Poverty Status										
Poor	28.7	0.0	3.5	1.3	93.6	55.8	27.6	6.0	0.0	19.3
Non-poor	47.0	15.9	21.1	14.8	96.7	65.9	77.8	26.5	6.9	46.9
Household size										
1-2	23.3	3.2	11.3	9.0	92.5	43.2	64.7	11.0	0.5	31.1
3-4	43.8	12.3	17.7	18.1	99.0	70.6	78.3	31.0	5.3	45.2
5-6	61.2	28.7	25.7	14.6	97.6	74.9	80.8	34.1	6.9	58.4
7+	63.1	20.1	29.5	15.0	97.5	77.3	79.4	27.8	15.7	51.6
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	65.6	26.8	33.9	17.3	97.1	81.1	92.1	49.9	14.3	70.2
Self-employed - agric	24.4	1.7	8.2	6.0	96.2	48.6	57.5	4.1	2.1	13.1
Self-employed - other	46.8	16.0	20.0	17.3	96.7	67.1	78.9	24.2	5.0	47.0
Other	33.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	94.2	41.2	34.3	4.3	0.0	44.8
Gender of the head of household										
Male	50.5	18.4	23.5	14.0	97.2	72.0	84.2	31.0	7.9	52.3
Female	32.7	5.2	10.3	14.6	94.6	45.1	48.4	8.7	2.5	25.2

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

7 HOUSEHOLD AMENITIES

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

7.1 Housing Materials and Type of Housing Unit

Table 7.1 shows the distribution of households according to the main material used in the roof of the house. Overall, 23 percent of households uses thatch as their main roof material and 76 percent has iron sheets.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote clusters are more likely to use thatch than households in accessible clusters at 47 and 1 percent respectively. In turn, households in accessible clusters tend to use iron sheets more often. Similarly, 42 percent of poor households uses thatch as their main roof material compared to 22 percent of non-poor households. On the other hand, while 77 percent of non-poor households uses iron sheets, the share for poor households is 54 percent.

The breakdown by household size shows that 64 percent of households with 3 to 4 members uses thatch compared to 26 percent of households with 7 or more members. In turn, households with 3 to 4 members are more likely to use iron sheets for their roofs, at 80 percent. The split-up by socio-economic group shows that the 'self-employed agriculture' category has the highest share of households using thatch for the roof (at 55 percent), and that employees are the group that does uses thatch less at 5 percent.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no apparently strong correlation between gender of the household and type of material used for roofing the house.

Table 7.2 shows the distribution of

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	22.5	0.0	76.2	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	0.0	1.3	0.0	98.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	1.2	46.6	0.0	50.7	0.7	0.0	0.8	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	4.0	42.0	0.0	53.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.4	21.5	0.0	77.4	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
Household size									
1-2	0.0	23.2	0.0	75.0	1.1	0.0	0.7	0.0	100.0
3-4	0.0	20.4	0.0	79.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	0.6	21.4	0.0	77.2	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	100.0
7+	2.0	25.7	0.0	72.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	0.0	4.7	0.0	94.6	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	2.6	55.0	0.0	42.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	15.6	0.0	83.3	0.7	0.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	38.0	0.0	62.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	0.6	22.0	0.0	76.5	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	100.0
Female	0.5	24.1	0.0	75.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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	48.4	0.0	2.5	49.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	22.6	0.0	3.5	73.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	77.7	0.0	1.4	20.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	77.5	0.0	0.0	22.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	46.9	0.0	2.7	50.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size								
1-2	56.9	0.0	0.3	42.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	41.1	0.0	5.2	53.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	44.9	0.0	1.3	53.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	50.7	0.0	3.1	46.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group								
Employee	14.4	0.0	2.3	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	88.8	0.0	0.4	10.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	46.3	0.0	3.9	49.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	69.4	0.0	0.0	30.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household								
Male	43.9	0.0	2.9	53.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	62.0	0.0	1.2	36.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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	39.9	0.0	0.5	59.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	13.9	0.0	1.0	85.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	69.4	0.0	0.0	30.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	62.1	0.0	0.0	37.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	38.8	0.0	0.6	60.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	46.2	0.0	0.0	53.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	35.0	0.0	1.1	63.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	36.4	0.0	0.0	63.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	42.2	0.0	1.1	56.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	10.8	0.0	1.1	88.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	79.0	0.0	0.0	21.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	35.3	0.0	0.0	64.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	63.6	0.0	4.3	32.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	35.4	0.0	0.7	63.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	53.7	0.0	0.0	46.3	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

households by type of material used in the walls. Overall, there is no correlation between households by materials used for walls of the house.

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

	Pipe borne treated	Pipe borne untreated	Bore hole/hand pump	Protected well	Unprotected well	Rain water	River, lake or pond	Vendor, truck	Other	Total	Safe source
Total	46.5	18.0	10.8	1.8	5.6	0.0	2.9	14.3	0.0	100.0	59.2
Cluster Location											
Accessible	61.1	24.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	12.5	0.0	100.0	62.2
Remote	30.1	10.9	21.7	3.9	12.0	0.0	5.0	16.5	0.0	100.0	55.7
Poverty Status											
Poor	57.5	9.5	13.8	6.9	2.5	0.0	8.3	1.4	0.0	100.0	78.2
Non-poor	46.0	18.4	10.6	1.6	5.8	0.0	2.6	15.0	0.0	100.0	58.2
Household size											
1-2	46.4	14.0	10.0	1.2	4.8	0.0	2.6	21.0	0.0	100.0	57.7
3-4	44.3	22.9	10.3	0.6	3.8	0.0	3.4	14.7	0.0	100.0	55.1
5-6	49.8	17.8	11.8	1.6	6.9	0.0	1.6	10.4	0.0	100.0	63.2
7+	46.3	16.7	11.4	4.6	7.7	0.0	3.9	9.4	0.0	100.0	62.3
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	55.2	20.7	5.1	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.4	18.0	0.0	100.0	60.9
Self-employed - agric	27.4	16.7	25.9	5.3	18.2	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	58.7
Self-employed - other	51.3	17.4	7.6	1.1	2.4	0.0	2.6	17.5	0.0	100.0	60.0
Other	40.0	14.9	5.3	0.0	10.3	0.0	2.2	27.3	0.0	100.0	45.3
Gender of the head of household											
Male	46.9	17.7	11.1	2.0	5.7	0.0	2.6	14.0	0.0	100.0	60.0
Female	45.4	18.8	9.8	1.4	5.3	0.0	3.9	15.5	0.0	100.0	56.5

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

The analysis of cluster location reveals that households in remote clusters (78 percent) have mud or mud bricks more frequently than households in accessible clusters (23 percent). On the other hand, while 74 percent of households in accessible clusters uses burnt bricks, the share for households in remote clusters is 21 percent.

The analysis by poverty status reveals that 78 percent of poor households uses mud or mud bricks compared to 47 percent of non-poor households. The use of burnt bricks by poor households is 23 percent, while 51 percent of non-poor households uses burnt bricks on their walls. Similarly, 57 percent of households with up to 2 members uses mud or mud bricks as main material in the walls of the house compared to 41 percent of households with 3 to 4 members.

'Employee' is the category with the lowest share living in houses made of mud or mud bricks (14 percent) compared to 89 percent of members self-employed in agriculture. On the other hand, the self-employed in agriculture have the lowest share living in houses made of cement (how much?).

The gender breakdown shows that households headed by females use mud or mud bricks more often than male-headed households, at rates of 62 and 44 percent of males. In turn, 37 percent of female-headed households uses cement or secrete compared to 53 percent of male-headed households.

The distribution of households by type of material used in the floor is shown in Table 7.3. Overall, the floor in 40 percent of households is made of mud or dirt, and 60 percent of concrete or cement.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible clusters, with a rate of 85 percent, have a slightly higher share of houses with concrete floor than households in remote clusters, with a rate of 31 percent. In turn, households in remote clusters have a higher share of houses with mud or dirt floor (69 percent, against 14 percent households in accessible clusters). Analysis by poverty status reveals that 62 percent of poor households has mud or dirt floor compared to 39 percent of non-poor households. On the other hand, 61 percent of non-poor households uses concrete or cement as material for the floor.

The breakdown by household size shows that 46 percent of households with up to 2 members has floors made of mud or dirt compared to 36 percent of households with 3 to 4 members. The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that the employees have the lowest share of mud or dirt (11 percent) and the highest share of concrete (88 percent). Nearly 79 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture has houses with mud or dirt floor.

The gender breakdown shows that 54 percent of female-headed households uses mud or dirt compared to 35 percent of male-headed households.

Table 7.4 shows the percentage distribution of households by type of housing unit they occupy. Overall, 51 percent of households occupies the whole building where they live.

The breakdowns by cluster location shows that households in accessible clusters, with a rate of 34 percent, have a lower share of occupants in whole buildings than households in remote clusters, with a rate of 70 percent.

Analysis by poverty status reveals that 51 percent of non-poor households occupies a whole building compared to 48 percent of poor households. Conversely, 37 percent of poor households occupies other types of building compared to 7 percent of non-poor households. The breakdown by household size shows that 67 percent households with 7 or more members occupies the whole building where they live compared to 28 percent households with up to 2 more members. The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that the 'self-employed - agriculture' category has the highest share of occupying a whole building (67 percent) and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities and employees have the lowest share (45 percent).

Analysis by gender reveals that male-headed households are more likely to occupy a whole building than female-headed households at 52 percent and 46 percent respectively. Conversely, female-headed households occupy a single room more often than male-headed household at 30 and 16 percent respectively.

7.2 Water and Sanitation

The percentage distribution of households by source of drinking water is shown in Table 7.5. Overall, 90 percent of households has a safe source of water, whereas 6 percent of them gets it from an

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

	None (bush)	Flush to sewer	Flush to septic tank	Pan/ bucket	Covered pit latrine	Uncovered pit latrine	Ventilated pit latrine	Other	Total	Safe sanitation
Total	4.7	0.8	27.8	0.0	61.5	1.1	4.1	0.0	100.0	90.1
Cluster Location										
Accessible	1.1	1.5	46.8	0.0	43.0	0.1	7.5	0.0	100.0	91.3
Remote	8.8	0.0	6.4	0.0	82.4	2.2	0.3	0.0	100.0	88.8
Poverty Status										
Poor	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	95.1	1.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	95.1
Non-poor	4.8	0.8	29.3	0.0	59.8	1.1	4.3	0.0	100.0	35.4
Household size										
1-2	9.4	0.0	30.8	0.0	57.0	1.7	1.1	0.0	100.0	87.8
3-4	3.3	2.7	25.2	0.0	61.1	0.7	7.0	0.0	100.0	89.1
5-6	3.6	0.0	32.8	0.0	57.6	1.9	4.2	0.0	100.0	90.4
7+	1.8	0.0	22.5	0.0	71.7	0.0	4.0	0.0	100.0	94.2
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	1.1	1.7	47.1	0.0	43.6	0.0	6.4	0.0	100.0	92.5
Self-employed - agriculture	9.8	0.0	3.0	0.0	82.5	4.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	85.5
Self-employed - other	4.3	0.7	29.5	0.0	60.2	0.1	5.2	0.0	100.0	90.4
Other	5.8	0.0	19.7	0.0	74.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	94.2
Gender of the head of household										
Male	3.5	0.6	29.8	0.0	59.6	1.2	5.4	0.0	100.0	90.0
Female	8.7	1.4	22.0	0.0	67.1	0.8	0.1	0.0	100.0	90.5

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

	Firewood	Charcoal	Kerosene/ oil	Gas	Electricity	Crop residue/ sawdust	Animal waste	Other	Total	Non-wood fuel for cooking
Total	36.7	58.8	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	100.0	3.4
Cluster Location										
Accessible	7.7	85.1	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	100.0	5.3
Remote	69.7	29.1	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	1.2
Poverty Status										
Poor	75.5	24.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Non-poor	34.8	60.6	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	100.0	3.5
Household size										
1-2	29.0	58.6	8.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	100.0	8.6
3-4	30.4	66.9	2.6	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	2.7
5-6	41.4	58.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
7+	50.4	48.6	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	1.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	10.4	85.2	4.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	4.4
Self-employed - agriculture	84.2	15.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	28.9	64.9	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	100.0	4.0
Other	41.6	51.9	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	6.5
Gender of the head of household										
Male	35.3	59.3	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	100.0	4.0
Female	41.1	57.4	1.4	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	1.5

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

unprotected well. 47 percent of all households gets drinking water from treated pipes. Safe sources of drinking water are untreated pipes, vendors and trucks, as well as boreholes and hand pumps.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 91 percent of households in accessible clusters has a safe source of drinking water, whereas the share for households in remote clusters is 56 percent. On the other hand, 12 percent of households in remote clusters gets drinking unprotected wells whereas households from accessible clusters that get water from unprotected well is virtually null. Poverty status of the household reveals that 78 percent of non-poor households gets water from safe sources compared to 58 percent of the non-poor households. In turn, 58 percent of poor households gets their drinking water from treated pipes against 46 percent of non-poor households.

The breakdown by household size shows that 90 percent of households with 5 to 6 members have access to safe water compared to 89 percent of households with 3 to 4 members. On the other hand up to 8 percent of households with 7 or more members accesses water from unprotected wells.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the employees have the highest access to safe sources of drinking water (92 percent), followed by the self-employed in agriculture (85percent), while 'other' is the category with the lowest access to safe water (45 percent). On the other hand, 18 percent of the households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed-agriculture' category gets drinking water from unprotected well compared to virtually null of households where the main income earner is in an employee.

The breakdown by gender of the household head reveals that male-headed households have higher access to safe sources of water (60 percent) compared to female-headed households (57 percent).

Table 7.6 shows the percentage distribution of households by main type of toilet. Overall, 90 percent of households has safe sanitation, whereas up to 62 percent uses a covered pit latrine.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that there is no correlation with safe sanitation. Similarly, 95 percent of poor households has safe sanitation compared to 90 percent of non-poor households.

Table 7.7 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for lighting

	Kerosene/ paraffin	Gas	Mains electricity	Solar panels/ generator	Battery	Candles	Firewood	Other	Total
Total	65.2	0.0	33.9	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	42.3	0.0	57.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	91.1	0.0	7.0	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.6	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	95.3	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	63.6	0.0	35.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	100.0
Household size									
1-2	70.5	0.0	27.5	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.7	1.0	100.0
3-4	61.5	0.0	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	60.5	0.0	39.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	68.1	0.0	30.6	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	36.8	0.0	62.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	95.9	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.9	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	65.0	0.0	34.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	100.0
Other	80.3	0.0	19.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	60.8	0.0	38.7	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	78.6	0.0	19.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.1	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

The breakdown by household size shows households with more than 7 members have the highest access rate to safe sanitation at 94 percent while households with up to 2 members report a share of 88 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that the households in the 'other' category have the highest rate of safe sanitation, at 94 percent while the self-employed in agriculture have the lowest rate of safe sanitation at 86 percent.

7.3 Type of Fuel

Table 7.7 shows the distribution of households by fuel used for cooking. Overall, 37 percent of households uses firewood and 59 percent uses charcoal. Almost 70 percent of households in remote clusters uses firewood compared to just 8 percent of households in accessible clusters. The breakdown by poverty status reveals that 76 percent poor households uses firewood compared with 35 percent of non-poor households.

Analysis of household size reveals that households with 7 or more members uses firewood (50 percent) more frequently than households with up to 2 members (29 percent). In turn, households with 3 to 4 members have the highest uses of charcoal at 67 percent.

The split-up by socio-economic group shows that households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture report the highest use of firewood (84 percent) and the employees report the lowest use of firewood (10 percent). The employees report the highest rate of use of charcoal at 85 percent.

The breakdown by gender of the household head reveals that female-headed households have the higher rate of uses for firewood (41 percent) whereas there appears to be no correlation between gender of household head and charcoal use.

Table 7.8 shows the distribution of households according to the fuel used for lighting. Overall, 65 percent of the households in the district uses kerosene or paraffin and 34 percent uses firewood. Gas and candles are virtually not used for lighting in the district.

The analysis of cluster location shows that about 91 percent of households in remote clusters uses kerosene/paraffin compared with 42 percent of households in accessible clusters. It is observed that the use of firewood by both clusters is virtually null. Poor households have the highest rate of use for kerosene or paraffin (95 percent).

The breakdown by household size reveals that 71 percent of households with up to 2 members uses kerosene/paraffin compared to 61 percent of households with 5 to 6 members. On the other hand, about 39 percent of households with 3 to 4 members and 5 to 6 uses firewood compared to 28 percent of households with up to 2 more members.

The analysis by socio-economic group of the household shows that the self-employed in agriculture have the highest rate of use of kerosene and paraffin at 96 percent compared to 37 percent in the 'employee' category. In turn, 62 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category uses electricity, while the share for the self-employed- agriculture category is just 3 percent.

Finally, female-headed households are more likely to use kerosene/paraffin than male-headed households at 79 and 61 percent respectively. On the other hand, 39 percent of male-headed households uses electricity compared to 20 percent of female-headed households.

7.4 Distances to Facilities

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

Overall, 95 percent of households are located under 30 minutes of a drinking water supply. In addition, 62 percent of the households are located under 30 minutes of a health facility.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that virtually all (100 percent) households in accessible clusters have access to a source of drinking water and 81 percent to a health facility, whereas the shares for households in remote clusters are 89 and 40 percent. Similar differences are observed by poverty status, with non-poor households showing higher access rates than poor households.

Table 78 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	83.2	11.6	3.6	1.5	100.0	28.7	33.3	25.2	12.8	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	96.7	3.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	43.8	37.6	16.5	2.1	100.0
Remote	67.9	21.1	7.8	3.2	100.0	11.5	28.4	35.2	25.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	68.1	20.6	11.3	0.0	100.0	25.5	21.1	43.5	9.8	100.0
Non-poor	84.0	11.2	3.3	1.6	100.0	28.8	33.9	24.3	13.0	100.0
Household size										
1-2	88.1	8.1	2.8	1.0	100.0	31.6	35.5	19.4	13.5	100.0
3-4	85.1	12.1	2.6	0.3	100.0	29.7	37.0	23.1	10.1	100.0
5-6	78.5	14.9	3.5	3.0	100.0	31.5	28.9	28.1	11.4	100.0
7+	79.4	12.1	6.3	2.2	100.0	20.5	29.8	32.6	17.1	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	95.4	3.8	0.8	0.0	100.0	32.3	40.0	21.2	6.5	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	55.0	27.2	12.6	5.2	100.0	17.9	24.7	31.3	26.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	89.0	8.7	1.5	0.8	100.0	31.8	35.1	22.9	10.2	100.0
Other	87.7	12.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	27.2	19.1	41.3	12.5	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	82.0	12.6	3.9	1.4	100.0	27.3	34.9	25.8	12.0	100.0
Female	87.0	8.5	2.8	1.7	100.0	32.8	28.2	23.5	15.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

Analysis of household size reveals that households with 3 to 4 members have the highest access to sources of drinking water at 97 while housdeholds with 3 to 4 members and those with up to 2 members have the highest access to health facilities at 67 percent respectively. Conversely, households with 7 or more members have the lowest access to drinking water supply and health facilities at 92 and 50 percent respectively.

The 'other' category has the highest rate of access to drinking water (100 percent) whereas the employees have the highest access to health facilities (72 percent). On the other hand, households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture have the lowest access to both drinking water supply and health facilities at 82 and 43 percent respectively.The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that male-headed households have higher access rate to drinking water supply at 95 percent compared to 88 percent of female-headed households. There appears to be no strong correlation between gender and health facilities.

Table 7.10 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest primary and secondary school. Overall, 91 percent of households are located within 30 minutes of a primary school. However only 55 percent of households live within 30 minutes of a 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 96 percent of households in accessible clusters has access to primary school, against 85 percent in accessible clusters. For secondary school, the rate for accessible clusters is 75 percent against 32 percent for those in remote clusters. On the other hand, the breakdown by poverty status of the household reveals that non-poor households have higher access to both primary and secondary school at 91 and 56 percent respectively. The shares for poor households are 88 and 46 percent respectively.

Analysis by household size reveals no strong correlation between number of members and access to primary education. On the other hand, households with 3 to 4 members have the highest access to secondary education at 60 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households in the 'employee' category have the highest rate of access to

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

	Primary school					Secondary school				
	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total
Total	62.2	28.6	8.0	1.2	100.0	22.9	32.2	25.7	19.2	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	72.7	23.4	3.9	0.0	100.0	31.3	44.0	22.4	2.4	100.0
Remote	50.4	34.4	12.6	2.6	100.0	13.4	18.8	29.5	38.3	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	39.6	48.5	11.9	0.0	100.0	21.2	25.2	21.9	31.7	100.0
Non-poor	63.4	27.5	7.8	1.3	100.0	23.0	32.5	25.9	18.6	100.0
Household size										
1-2	64.9	24.3	9.7	1.0	100.0	22.0	32.7	26.9	18.4	100.0
3-4	62.5	29.1	6.7	1.6	100.0	23.6	30.6	28.7	17.2	100.0
5-6	65.0	27.8	5.9	1.4	100.0	28.1	32.2	25.0	14.7	100.0
7+	55.5	34.1	9.6	0.8	100.0	17.8	33.7	20.9	27.6	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	59.5	35.3	4.1	1.1	100.0	30.8	35.1	25.4	8.7	100.0
Self-employed - agric	54.4	30.0	12.3	3.3	100.0	14.1	13.3	29.7	42.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	68.0	23.4	8.0	0.5	100.0	24.4	39.8	21.4	14.4	100.0
Other	56.9	34.4	8.7	0.0	100.0	7.2	28.6	48.6	15.6	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	62.4	29.6	6.5	1.5	100.0	22.4	34.3	24.4	18.9	100.0
Female	61.6	25.4	12.5	0.5	100.0	24.6	25.6	29.7	20.1	100.0

primary and secondary schools, at 95 and 66 percent, respectively. On the other hand, the self-employed in agriculture have the lowest access rate to primary and secondary schools at 84 and 27 percent respectively.

Households headed by males have higher access rates to primary school and secondary education at 92 and 56 percent respectively. For the female-headed households, the rates are 87 and 50 percent respectively.

Table 7.11 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest food market and public transportation. Overall, 70 percent of households has access to a food market, and 88 percent to public transportation.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 90 percent of households in accessible clusters lives within 30 minutes of a food market, against 48 of households in remote clusters. The shares for public transportation are 97 percent for accessible and 78 percent for remote clusters. Non-poor households have higher rates of access to food markets, with a rate of 72 percent, against 32 of poor households. Similarly, while 89 percent of non-poor households have access to public transportation, the share for poor households is 71 percent.

The analysis by household size shows that households with up to 2 members have higher rates of access to food markets as well as public transportation at 78 and 91 percent respectively. Those in the 'other' category have the lowest access to food markets and public transportation at 58 and 85 percent respectively.

Although analysis by socio-economic group reveals that employees have the highest rate of access to food markets and public transportation, with 91 percent and 94 percent respectively.

Finally, female-headed households have a higher access rate to food market at 77 percent, whereas there is no strong correlation between gender of the household head and access to public transportation.

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, 91 percent of households take measures against malaria. The most commonly taken measures are insecticide-treated nets (73 percent) and bed nets (19 percent).

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

	Food market					Public transportation				
	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total
Total	39.2	31.2	19.1	10.5	100.0	70.5	17.9	8.6	3.0	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	55.6	34.4	9.4	0.7	100.0	88.5	8.9	2.6	0.0	100.0
Remote	20.6	27.5	30.2	21.7	100.0	49.9	28.2	15.4	6.5	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	4.2	37.6	27.6	30.6	100.0	38.6	32.5	19.0	9.9	100.0
Non-poor	41.0	30.8	18.7	9.5	100.0	72.1	17.2	8.1	2.7	100.0
Household size										
1-2	52.7	25.4	15.1	6.8	100.0	73.5	17.1	7.3	2.2	100.0
3-4	38.8	31.9	20.7	8.6	100.0	72.6	15.8	8.6	3.0	100.0
5-6	36.3	35.6	18.4	9.7	100.0	70.6	18.7	8.9	1.8	100.0
7+	25.2	33.0	22.9	18.8	100.0	63.5	21.1	10.0	5.5	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	45.5	32.8	16.7	5.0	100.0	83.8	9.4	6.8	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	24.6	17.8	30.7	26.8	100.0	40.2	25.2	23.5	11.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	42.6	34.5	16.6	6.3	100.0	75.6	19.6	3.7	1.1	100.0
Other	37.8	48.2	5.6	8.5	100.0	83.0	14.8	0.0	2.2	100.0
Gender of head of household										
Male	37.8	30.3	21.2	10.7	100.0	70.3	18.0	8.3	3.4	100.0
Female	43.4	33.9	12.6	10.0	100.0	70.8	17.8	9.4	2.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

	Single room	Flat	Two or more rooms	Whole building	Other	Total
Total	19.7	0.0	21.1	50.6	8.6	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	33.2	0.0	31.9	33.6	1.3	100.0
Remote	4.4	0.0	8.7	70.0	16.8	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	0.0	15.7	47.6	36.7	100.0
Non-poor	20.7	0.0	21.3	50.8	7.2	100.0
Household size						
1-2	46.7	0.0	21.0	28.4	3.9	100.0
3-4	22.6	0.0	25.4	49.4	2.5	100.0
5-6	1.4	0.0	26.9	64.0	7.7	100.0
7+	0.0	0.0	9.2	67.1	23.7	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	24.6	0.0	28.9	45.2	1.2	100.0
Self-employed - agric	5.2	0.0	6.7	66.7	21.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	23.3	0.0	25.0	45.3	6.4	100.0
Other	23.4	0.0	6.5	58.5	11.6	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	16.2	0.0	23.1	52.1	8.5	100.0
Female	30.4	0.0	14.7	46.0	8.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

The analysis of cluster location shows that 98 percent of households in accessible clusters takes measures against malaria, compared to 83 percent of households in remote clusters. On the other hand, while 76 percent of households in accessible clusters uses insecticide treated nets, the share for households in remote clusters is 68 percent.

In addition, 92 percent of non-poor households takes measures against malaria compared to 71 percent of poor households. The rates for maintenance of good sanitation are lower, though non-poor households report maintenance of good sanitation more often than poor households at 13 and 8 percent respectively.

Analysis by household size reveals that households with 5 to 6 members have the highest share taking measures at 97 percent, whereas those with up to 2 members have the lowest at 83 percent. The analysis of socio-economic status shows that 98 percent of households in the 'employee' category share take measures against malaria compared with 80 percent in the 'self-employed agriculture' category. Finally, there appears to be no correlation between gender and share taking measures though male-headed households use insecticide treated nets more than females at 76 and 64 percent respectively.

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

	Share taking measures	Use bed net	Insect-icide	Anti-malaria drug	Fumi-gation	Insecticide treated net	Maintain good drainage	Maintain good sanitation	Herbs	Burn leaves	Window/ door net
Total	90.9	18.8	8.7	9.5	4.1	72.8	1.6	12.3	0.8	0.5	5.0
Cluster Location											
Accessible	97.8	18.2	8.6	7.7	6.8	76.4	1.8	10.2	1.0	0.0	7.3
Remote	83.0	19.6	8.9	11.9	0.4	67.8	1.3	15.0	0.5	1.0	1.9
Poverty Status											
Poor	71.4	19.4	0.0	8.9	4.7	66.9	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	91.9	18.8	9.0	9.5	4.0	73.0	1.6	12.5	0.8	0.5	5.2
Household size											
1-2	82.7	23.9	6.2	7.5	0.0	68.2	0.7	10.2	0.6	0.0	2.2
3-4	95.3	23.6	9.6	12.4	6.4	69.2	2.0	14.9	0.9	1.4	4.0
5-6	97.1	16.6	15.0	9.9	5.2	68.5	2.5	11.0	1.4	0.1	10.2
7+	89.1	8.2	3.2	7.4	4.3	88.2	0.9	12.5	0.0	0.0	3.9
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	98.0	14.3	8.2	8.3	4.0	84.3	0.0	15.1	1.2	0.8	10.4
Self-employed - agric	80.3	23.1	9.0	19.2	0.7	67.6	0.0	13.5	0.4	1.1	0.0
Self-employed - other	92.6	19.1	9.8	6.9	5.9	68.9	3.3	10.2	0.6	0.1	4.3
Other	84.4	25.2	0.0	4.2	0.0	63.7	0.0	11.1	1.7	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household											
Male	91.1	17.6	7.4	10.8	4.9	75.7	2.1	12.3	0.9	0.6	5.3
Female	90.3	22.4	12.9	5.6	1.6	63.8	0.0	12.2	0.3	0.1	4.1

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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 mtaa, 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 mtaa, ward and Municipal 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 3 times with the dots replaced by mtaa, ward and district. The percentage distribution for meeting attendance is higher at mtaa level than in the higher government levels. Attendance at mtaa meetings was 74 percent. Ward and district level meetings did not attain attendance of the majority of households at only 24 percent at ward level and 4 percent at Municipal level.

Data as presented in table 8.1 exposed interesting information in meeting attendance by accessibility of the cluster. The meeting attendance in the higher two levels does not differ by cluster location. However, in the case of mtaa level meetings, the attendance rate is higher among households in remote clusters with 12 percentage points of difference.

Looking at the breakdown of the results by poverty status, it is shown that poor households report a null rate of attendance at district level meetings. No difference was observed in meeting attendance between poor and non-poor households at ward level. The only difference is observed at mtaa level where meeting attendance rates were higher among poor households.

Analysis of the results by socio-economic groups indicates that households in the 'other' socio-economic category report a null attendance rate at municipal level meetings. The results also suggest a poor representation in meetings of households in the 'self-employed agriculture' category in the municipal level meetings. Generally, ward and district level meetings are characterised by lower attendance rates by all socio-economic groups as opposed to the attendance at mtaa level.

8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders

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

The results, displayed in Table 8.2, show that the majority of respondents are satisfied with their leaders at all government levels. The satisfaction rates exhibit a declining trend as the level of government increases. The satisfaction rate was 87 percent at mtaa level, declining to 70 percent for ward leaders,

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

	Mtaa Meeting	Ward Meeting	District Meeting
Total	73.7	24.4	3.9
Cluster Location			
Accessible	67.7	24.6	3.8
Remote	80.6	24.1	4.0
Poverty Status			
Poor	91.7	26.5	0.0
Non-poor	72.8	24.3	4.1
Socio-economic Group			
Employee	63.3	22.6	4.6
Self-employed - agriculture	86.1	26.9	3.1
Self-employed - other	75.3	25.7	4.3
Other	60.5	10.7	0.0
No. of Obs.	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

	Mtaa Leaders	Ward Leaders	District Leaders	District Councillor
Total				
Satisfied	86.6	70.2	64.4	58.4
Not Satisfied	10.7	15.6	10.0	37.0
Don't Know	2.7	14.2	25.6	4.6
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location				
Accessible	89.0	70.7	65.6	62.1
Remote	83.8	69.7	63.1	54.2
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status				
Poor	83.5	85.0	68.9	60.2
Non-poor	86.7	69.5	64.2	58.3
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group				
Employee	86.4	63.7	64.4	60.0
Self-employed - agriculture	81.5	72.8	64.8	59.0
Self-employed - other	89.3	74.9	66.1	56.5
Other	84.4	50.8	47.7	64.1
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)				
Political differences	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.5
Embezzlement/corruption	6.8	10.4	2.9	2.6
They do not listen to people	29.7	19.6	6.3	19.0
Favouritism	15.8	7.2	1.1	9.9
Lazy/inexperienced	12.1	3.3	0.9	13.6
Personal Reasons	4.3	2.1	2.5	1.6
I see no results	36.0	17.1	13.2	39.1
They never visit us	23.6	48.0	75.3	47.7
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

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

and to 64 and 58 percents for the municipal leaders and the district councillor respectively. While proportion of respondents who answered 'I don't know' was also low, the proportion of respondents who were not satisfied with their municipal councillor was high at 37 percent. Disaggregation of the data by cluster location exposed that satisfaction rates were higher among accessible clusters across all government levels, as well as the municipal councillor. The breakdown by poverty status shows that the shares of satisfaction are slightly higher among non-poor households in the lowest level of government and higher among poor household as government levels increases, including the municipal councillor. The breakdown by socio-economic groups suggests that the 'other' category reports the lowest dissatisfaction rates at most levels, but the highest at district councillor.

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

Results as presented in the bottom part of table 8.2 clearly show that political affiliation of a leader is not important reason for dissatisfaction. Instead, the failure of leaders to listen to the people, seeing no results and leaders' failure to pay visits are prominent reasons for dissatisfaction. It is clearly shown that the

dissatisfaction rates owing to lack of visits increases as the government level increases, reaching 75 percent at the district level. Dissatisfaction with the councillor in connection with this reason was also high at 48 percent. Other important reason at mtaa level was favouritism. Personal reasons were not prominent among reasons for dissatisfactions on leadership at all levels government as well as on the councillor. The most common reason for dissatisfaction with councillors is on their failure to pay visits and seeing no results at 48 and 39 percent respectively.

8.3. Public Spending

This section discusses the results of questions on the extent to which financial information reached the sample of respondent, as well as their satisfaction with public spending. Table 8.3 shows the distribution of respondents that reported having received financial information from three different levels of government. Information on finances seems to reach small shares of households at all levels of government. Overall, higher shares of households in accessible clusters reported to have received financial information in the past twelve months compared with households in remote clusters. Disaggregating households by poverty status and socio-economic category exposed no strong differences.

The data as presented in table 8.3 clearly show that attending to meetings is the most common means to acquire information on public finances, followed by rumours or hear say at all levels of government. Radio or newspaper was the most important source of information on district finances.

Respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with spending at different levels of government and were requested to respond either 'yes', 'no' or 'don't know'. Table 8.4 shows the results. Satisfaction with public spending is slightly higher at mtaa level at 49 percent, whereas satisfaction with public spending at ward and district was reported at 39 and 37 percent respectively. It is worth mentioning that the shares of respondents who are specifically unsatisfied with public spending were low, while the share of respondents that reported 'I don't know' is higher at higher levels of government.

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

	Mtaa Finances	Ward Finances	District Finances
Total	14.5	3.3	2.2
Cluster Location			
Accessible	18.1	4.2	3.1
Remote	10.4	2.4	1.2
Poverty Status			
Poor	14.6	8.6	0.0
Non-poor	14.5	3.1	2.3
Socio-economic Group			
Employee	15.8	2.5	2.7
Self-employed - agriculture	15.0	3.1	0.0
Self-employed - other	14.0	4.3	3.2
Other	10.7	0.0	0.0
Source			
Letter	0.9	0.0	0.0
Notice board	0.0	0.0	0.0
Meeting	76.0	79.3	32.9
Rumours/hear-say	18.8	20.7	0.0
Radio/newspapers	0.0	0.0	53.6
No. of Obs.	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC

The share of satisfaction by cluster location showed slightly higher shares of satisfaction with public finances in accessible clusters. For instance the satisfaction rate with public spending at ward level is 9 percentage points higher in accessible clusters than in remote clusters at 43 and 34 percent respectively. The satisfaction with public spending is not remarkably different between poor and non-poor households at mtaa and ward levels, but at district level is higher among non-poor households. The breakdown by socio-economic groups showed that the 'other' group displays relatively lower satisfaction rates in government spending at all levels, while the self-employed in agriculture report the highest satisfaction rates.

Further probing on why respondents were not satisfied, or why they did not know whether they were satisfied, the most common response by the majority at all levels was that they did not receive any information or that they could see no results

Table 8.4: Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction

	Mtaa Spending	Ward Spending	District Spending
Total			
Satisfied	49.3	38.8	36.5
Not Satisfied	16.1	17.2	10.8
Don' Know	34.7	44.0	52.7
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location			
Accessible	52.2	42.7	39.0
Remote	45.9	34.4	33.6
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status			
Poor	49.7	35.8	28.6
Non-poor	49.2	39.0	36.9
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group			
Employee	45.3	33.7	36.2
Self-employed - agriculture	55.2	47.6	42.5
Self-employed - other	50.9	39.3	35.2
Other	30.2	24.6	24.6
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)			
I see no results	21.4	15.7	9.8
Embezzlement/corruption	8.4	11.5	5.8
Favouritism	0.0	0.6	0.0
This is what I hear	1.9	2.0	0.3
They give no information	72.3	76.0	84.5
No. of Obs.	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Shinyanga MC