PMO-RALG

KILOSA DC CWIQ
Survey on Poverty, Welfare and Services in Kilosa DC

APRIL 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, Jessica Nkonjerwa, Kamugisha Robert, Resti Simon, Pius Sosthenes, Aissa Soud, Adella Theobald, and Honoratha Wycliffe. The data processing software was written by Jim Otto and Neil Chalmers. The data entry team consisted of Mary Stella Andrew and Alieth Mutungi, and was supervised by Thaddeus Rweyemamu. Formatting the final document layout was in the hands of Amina Suedi. The data analysis and report writing were undertaken by Anitha Philbert and Manuel Barron. Assistance from Charles Citinka and Howard Clegg from PMO-RALG is acknowledged.

DEFINITIONS

General

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

Education

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

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

Health

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

Employment

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

Welfare

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

2 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……..... 13
2.5 Orphan and Foster Status……..... 15

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……..... 20
3.2 Dissatisfaction…….....…....…... 22
3.3 Non-Attendance……...…...…..... 23
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…….....….....…..... 41
5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads…….....… 41
5.1.3 Youth Employment…….....…….. 41
5.2 Working Population…….....……... 43
5.3 Underemployment Population…….....…. 45
5.4 Unemployed Inactive Population……...…..... 47
5.5 Household Tasks…….…..... 48
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……..... 56
6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills……..... 56
6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare……..... 58
6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status……..... 58
6.3.1 Assets Ownership……..... 59
6.3.2 Occupancy Documentation ……..... 60
6.4 Agriculture……..... 60
6.4.1 Agriculture Inputs……..... 60
6.4.2 Landholding……..... 62
6.4.3 Cattle Ownership……..... 63
6.5 Perception of Crime and Security in the Community……..... 65
6.6 Household Income Contribution……..... 66
6.7 Other House Items……..... 66

7 HOUESHOLD AMENITIES……..... 69
7.1 Housing Materials and Typing OF Housing Unit……..... 69
7.2 Water and Sanitation……..... 73
7.3 Type of Fuel……..... 74
7.4 Distance to Facilities……..... 75
7.5 Anti -Malaria Measures……..... 78

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

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Variables used to predict consumption expenditure..... 1
Table 1.2 Predicted vs. actual poverty rate in Morogoro Region 2000/01..... 2
Table 1.3 Cluster location……..……. 3
Table 1.4 Socio-economic group…….....…….... 4
Table 1.5 Socio-economic group and gender of 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…. 9
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..... 10
Table 2.8 Percent distribution of heads of households by marital status……..... 11
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 …..... 12
Table 2.11 Percent distribution of children under 18 years old who have lost their mother and /or father..... 13
Table 2.12 Percent distribution of children less than 18 year's old living without mother and/or father..... 14
Table 3.1 Education indicators……..... 16
Table 3.2 Percent of students currently enrolled in school by reasons for dissatisfaction…. 17
Table 3.3 Percent of children 7-9 years who ever attended school by reasons not currently attending..... 18
Table 3.4 Primary School enrolment and drop out rates by age and gender..... 19
Table 3.5 Secondary school enrolment and drop out rates by age and gender…..... 20
Table 3.6 Adult literacy rates by age and gender (persons age 15 and above)……..... 21
Table 3.7 Youth literacy rates by age and gender (persons age 15-24)……..... 22
Table 4.1 Health Indicators……...……. 25
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..... 26
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..... 27
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..... 28
Table 4.5 Percent distribution of health consultation in past 4 weeks by type of health provider consulted……..... 29
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..... 29
Table 4.7 Percent distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by place of birth..... 30
Table 4.8 Percent distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by person who assisted in delivery of the child..... 31
Table 4.9 Nutrition status indicators and program participating rates……..... 33
Table 4.10 Percent distribution of children vaccination by type of vaccination received….. 34
Table 4.11 Percent distribution of children vaccinated by source of information……..... 35
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……..... 42
Table 5.7 Percent distribution of the working population by employer, sex and activity….. 43
Table 5.8 Percent distribution of the working population by employer, sex and employment status..... 43
Table 5.9 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by employment status….. 44
Table 5.10 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by employer…..... 44
Table 5.11 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by activity……..... 45
Table 5.12 Percent distribution of the unemployed population by reason……..…..... 46
Table 5.13 Percent distribution of the economically inactive population by reason…….. 46
Table 5.14 Activities normally undertaken in the households (age 15 and over)……..... 47
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..... 52
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……..... 57
Table 6.7 Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying for health care during the year before the survey……..... 58
Table 6.8 Percent of households owning certain assets……..... 59
Table 6.9 Percent distribution of households by occupancy status……...…. 60
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..... 61
Table 6.12 Percent distribution of households using agricultural inputs by the main source of the inputs……..... 62
Table 6.13 Percent distribution of households by the area of land owned by the household 63
Table 6.14 Percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned by the household..... 63
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..... 64
Table 6.16 Percent distribution of households by principal contributor to household income..... 65
Table 6.17 Percent of households owning selected household items……..... 66
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……..… 72
Table 7.7 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for cooking…….. 73
Table 7.8 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for lighting……..... 74

Table 7.9 Percent distribution of household by time (in minutes) to reach nearest drinking water supply and health facility..... 75
Table 7.10 Percent distribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach the nearest primary and secondary school……..... 76
Table 7.11 Percent distribution of household by time (in minutes) to reach nearest food market and public transportation…..... 76
Table 7.12 Percent distribution of households taking anti-malaria measures and percent taking specific measures……..... 77
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	0.9	0.0	0.9	1.0	1.3	0.8
Head is male	79.8	2.3	76.3	85.7	79.7	79.8
Head is female	20.2	2.4	23.7	14.3	20.3	20.2
Head is monagamous	60.3	3.6	54.8	69.7	65.9	58.9
Head is polygamous	7.2	2.1	7.8	6.1	9.4	6.6
Head is not married	32.5	3.3	37.3	24.3	24.7	34.5
Household welfare						
Household economic situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	45.0	4.0	44.7	45.3	57.7	41.7
Better now	23.7	2.7	23.6	23.8	14.2	26.1
Neighborhood crime/security situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	29.2	3.6	31.1	26.0	29.2	29.2
Better now	38.0	5.0	40.8	33.3	37.0	38.2
Difficulty satisfying household needs						
Food	33.4	3.1	31.0	37.7	49.6	29.3
School fees	0.7	0.3	0.8	0.3	1.5	0.4
House rent	0.8	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.6	0.6
Utility bills	1.0	0.6	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.3
Health care	24.9	2.3	20.5	32.2	37.3	21.7
Agriculture						
Land owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	2.3	0.8	1.6	3.4	3.8	1.9
More now	5.7	1.3	6.0	5.3	2.7	6.5
Cattle owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	3.7	1.6	1.3	7.8	4.9	3.4
More now	2.6	1.1	0.7	5.7	3.7	2.3
Use of agricultural inputs						
Yes	32.6	3.6	34.5	29.3	30.2	33.2
Fertilizers	22.3	7.7	15.7	35.4	26.0	21.4
Improved seedlings	74.2	9.4	80.9	60.6	80.4	72.7
Fingerlings	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hooks and nets	2.7	1.8	2.7	2.8	12.2	0.5
Insecticides	27.6	6.9	28.9	24.9	19.1	29.6
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Household infrastructure						
Secure housing tenure	3.3	1.1	5.0	0.4	0.0	4.1
Access to water	92.2	2.8	95.6	86.4	83.8	94.3
Safe water source	66.0	7.0	71.2	57.1	64.1	66.5
Safe sanitation	11.2	3.0	17.5	0.5	1.8	13.6
Improved waste disposal	39.0	7.7	42.8	32.4	33.3	40.4
Non-wood fuel used for cooking	0.6	0.5	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Ownership of IT/Telecommunications Equipment						
Fixed line phone	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.6
Mobile phone	26.1	5.3	34.5	11.8	14.1	29.2
Radio set	65.0	3.6	69.9	56.6	52.3	68.3
Television set	5.5	2.3	7.8	1.5	0.0	6.9

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Employment						
Employer in the main job						
Civil service	2.1	1.0	3.1	0.4	0.0	2.9
Other public serve	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.2
Parastatal	1.7	1.2	2.7	0.0	0.0	2.2
NGO	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Private sector formal	1.6	0.4	1.6	1.7	0.8	1.9
Private sector informal	44.7	2.6	43.1	47.5	39.7	46.4
Household	46.3	2.1	45.5	47.6	55.2	43.3
Activity in the main job						
Agriculture	60.3	4.1	51.7	75.1	73.7	55.8
Mining/quarrying	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.2
Manufacturing	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.2	0.0	0.6
Services	2.0	0.8	2.8	0.6	0.8	2.4
Employment Status in last 7 days						
Unemployed (age 15-24)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unemployed (age 15 and above))	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Underemployed (age 15 and above)	35.4	1.6	34.4	37.1	31.3	36.7
Male	48.8	1.7	48.7	48.8	38.9	51.8
Female	23.1	2.6	21.5	26.1	25.2	22.4
Education						
Adult literacy rate						
Total	70.4	3.7	76.2	60.4	63.8	72.7
Male	80.6	4.5	88.3	67.3	75.5	82.2
Female	61.1	3.3	65.1	53.8	54.3	63.5
Youth literacy rate (age 15-24)						
Total	82.0	4.1	87.2	73.2	78.8	83.2
Male	83.8	4.9	87.4	77.3	83.0	84.1
Female	80.4	4.5	87.1	70.0	75.1	82.4
Primary school						
Access to School	76.5	6.7	87.4	58.8	64.3	82.8
Primary Gross Enrollment	112.1	4.1	117.6	103.4	103.7	116.5
Male	112.1	5.9	122.9	97.5	96.0	121.5
Female	112.1	4.2	112.8	110.8	112.8	111.8
Primary Net Enrollment	86.0	4.4	92.8	75.1	78.5	90.0
Male	82.5	5.6	88.7	74.0	74.4	87.1
Female	89.7	4.0	96.5	76.5	83.4	92.7
Satisfaction	51.9	5.8	60.5	36.0	55.3	50.3
Primary completion rate	11.8	2.3	14.2	8.0	11.0	12.3

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Secondary school						
Access to School	27.7	8.9	37.1	12.4	30.7	26.2
Secondary Gross Enrollment	17.4	5.9	24.9	5.4	9.1	21.8
Male	21.4	7.7	27.1	9.1	14.1	24.6
Female	13.2	4.9	21.9	2.4	4.7	18.5
Secondary Net Enrollment	14.1	4.6	20.0	4.4	8.1	17.2
Male	15.4	5.2	19.4	7.0	11.9	17.0
Female	12.6	4.8	20.8	2.4	4.7	17.5
Satisfaction	54.6	14.1	58.4	25.5	27.3	60.5
Secondary completion rate	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8
Medical services						
Health access	59.4	8.7	75.9	32.0	44.9	65.3
Need	26.4	1.3	26.1	27.1	23.3	27.7
Use	28.7	1.0	28.3	29.4	24.4	30.4
Satisfaction	61.3	4.2	63.7	57.5	62.9	60.8
Consulted traditional healer	2.5	0.9	1.1	4.8	4.1	2.0
Pre-natal care	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Anti-malaria measures used	83.4	4.4	91.6	69.5	73.2	86.1
Person has physical/mental challenge	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Child welfare and health						
Orphanhood (children under 18)						
Both parents dead	2.2	0.6	2.4	1.9	2.4	2.1
Father only	7.3	1.6	9.4	3.9	10.4	5.7
Mother only	3.2	0.9	3.7	2.4	5.5	2.0
Fostering (children under 18)						
Both parents absent	15.0	1.4	16.5	12.6	18.1	13.3
Father only absent	15.3	3.3	17.0	12.5	21.1	12.3
Mother only absent	5.6	1.9	7.7	2.3	5.4	5.7
Children under 5						
Delivery by health professionals	64.6	6.8	81.9	41.1	62.6	65.5
Measles immunization	77.3	1.9	76.2	78.8	72.1	79.5
Fully vaccinated	44.6	4.9	56.4	28.5	25.3	52.9
Not vaccinated	11.6	2.7	9.6	14.3	14.4	10.4
Stunted	21.0	4.7	17.0	26.0	25.8	18.9
Wasted	1.1	0.8	1.1	1.2	0.0	1.6
Underweight	11.6	3.3	10.2	13.4	11.9	11.5

** 1.96 standard deviations*

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Kilosa District CWIQ

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

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

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

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

Although beyond the purpose of this report, the results of Kilosa 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, Kishapu DC, Korogwe DC, Kyela DC, Ludewa DC, Makete DC, Maswa DC, Meatu DC, Kahama DC, Mbulu DC, Morogoro DC, Mpwapwa DC, Muheza DC, Musoma DC, Ngara DC, Ngorongoro DC, Njombe DC, Rufiji DC, Shinyanga MC, Singida DC, Songea DC, Sumbawanga DC, Tanga MC, Temeke MC. Other African countries that have implemented nationally representative CWIQ surveys include Malawi, Ghana and Nigeria.

1.2 Sampling

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

Table 1.1 Variables Used to Predict Consumption Expenditure in Morogoro Regior

Basic Variables	*Household Assets*
Age of the household head	Ownership of a radio
Number of household members	Ownership of an iron
Level of education of the household head	Ownership of a watch or clock
Main source of income of the household head	Ownerhsip of a motor vehicle
	Ownership of a wheelbarrow
Main activity of the household head	Main material on the roof
	Main material on the floors
Household Amenities	Land ownership
Problems satisfying food needs	
Modern toilet in the household	*Village level variables*
Number of meals per day	% of households with piped water
	% of households with a bank account

Source: HBS 2000/2001 for Morogoro Region

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

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

1.3.1 Poverty Status

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

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

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

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

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

Predicted	Observed		
	Non-Poor	Poor	Total
Non-Poor	76.7	13.4	90.1
Poor	3.2	6.8	9.9
Total	79.9	20.1	100.0

Source: HBS 2000/01 for Morogoro Region

Table 1.3: Cluster Location

	Median Time (in minutes) to:			Poverty Rate	Estimated Number of Households
	District Capital	All-Weather	Public Transport		
Cluster Location					
Remote	30.0	30.0	300.0	25.2	32,235
Accessible	20.0	15.0	120.0	16.8	40,005

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kilosa DC

calculate household consumption. The relationship is set as a positive one, consequently when observing the patterns in the data this relationship may be positive by construction. Table 1.1 lists the variables that have been used to calculate predicted household consumption expenditure.

Once the consumption level of a household has been predicted, it is compared to the Basic Needs Poverty Line set by National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) on the basis of the 2000/01 HBS. The Basic Needs Poverty Line is defined by what a household, using the food basket of the poorest 50 percent of the population, needs to consume to satisfy its basic food needs to attain 2,200 Kcal/day per adult equivalent. The share of non-food expenditures of the poorest 25 percent of households is then added. With this procedure, the Basic Needs Poverty Line is set at TZS 7,253 per 28 days per adult equivalent unit in 2000/01 prices. Households consuming less than this are assumed to be unable to satisfy their basic food and non-food needs1.

The Kilosa 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 just 3 percent of the cases, but at the same time it predicts a poor household to be non-poor in 13 percent of the cases, higher than the share of poor households correctly predicted to be poor: 7 percent. This means that the model is strongly biased towards underestimating poverty, and thus cannot be used as it is. Effectively, when applied to the 2000/2001 HBS data for Morogoro region, this method results in only 10 percent of poor households, while the observed regional poverty rate is 20 percent.

For this reason the method was changed slightly to get the poverty variable, in the following way. First, the model was used to predict household expenditure. Then, households were ranked according to their predicted expenditure. Finally, the 20 percent of households with the lowest expenditure were classified as poor (the poverty rate for Morogoro region obtained with the HBS is 20 percent).

1.3.2 Cluster Location

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

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

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

	Poverty Rate	Percentage Living in Remote Clusters	Accessible Clusters
Socio-Economic Group			
Employees	0.0	51.2	48.8
Self-Employed Agriculture	25.4	52.1	47.9
Self-Employed Other	11.8	69.5	30.5
Other	18.0	55.8	44.2

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kilosa DC

Table 1.3 shows the median time to the district capital, all-weather road and public transport for remote and accessible villages. The poverty rate is remarkably higher in remote villages, at 25 percent, than in accessible villages, at 17 percent.

1.3.3 Socio-economic Group

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

Table 1.4 shows that the poverty rate is highest for households whose main income earner is self-employed in agriculture, at a rate of 25 percent. In turn, poverty is lowest for households where the main income earner is an employee, with virtually none of the employee households being classified as poor. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities are the socio-economic group with the highest share of households living in remote villages, at 70 percent, while the rest of the groups report shares of between 51 and 56 percent.

The gender composition of the socio-economic group is shown in Table 1.5. 80 percent of households are headed by a male. The share of female-headed households is highest for the 'other' socio-economic group at 43 percent, while the remaining groups report shares ranging from 18 to 23 percent.

Table 1.6 shows the breakdown of socio economic groups by main activity of the household heads. As expected, the main economic activity in the district is agriculture, to which 66 percent of the household heads are dedicated. Employees are mostly dedicated to mining, manufacturing, energy or construction, with a share of 77 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities are mostly dedicated to services (85 percent). The 'other' category is split between

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

	Male	Female	Total
Socio-economic Group			
Employees	76.7	23.3	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	81.8	18.2	100.0
Self-Employed Other	77.3	22.7	100.0
Other	42.5	57.5	100.0
Total	79.8	20.2	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kilosa DC

agriculture and household duties (54 and 40 percent, respectively).

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

	Agriculture	Mining Manufacturing Energy Construction	Private and Public Services	Household Duties	Other	Total
Socio-economic Group						
Employees	4.4	76.8	4.0	14.9	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	88.2	0.0	10.7	1.0	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Other	7.9	0.0	84.9	7.2	0.0	100.0
Other	54.3	0.0	0.0	40.4	5.3	100.0
Total	66.0	6.9	23.1	3.9	0.1	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kilosa DC

1 Introduction

2 VILLAGE, POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 Introduction

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

2.2 Main Population Characteristics

Table 2.1 shows the percent distribution of the population by cluster location and poverty status, by gender and age. Overall, the district's population is young. For instance,7 percent of the population is 60 years old or over, whereas 43 percent is under 15 years old. The remaining 50 percent is between 15 and 59 years old. There are no strong differences by cluster location, but poor households have a higher share in the 0-14 group and a lower share in the 15-59 age-group than non-poor households.

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

The mean dependency ratio is 0.9, meaning that on average one adult has to take care of less than 1 person. The breakdown by cluster location does not show strong differences. However, the breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households have a higher dependency rate than non-poor households, at 1.3 and 0.8 respectively.

The dependency ratio increases with the number of household members, from 0.3 for households with 1 or 2 members, to 1.2 for households with 5 or more members. The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the 'other' group has the highest dependency ratio (1.1), whereas the employees have the lowest ratio at 0.6.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that the dependency ratio in female-headed households is slightly higher than in male-headed households, at 1.0 and 0.9, respectively.

Table 2.3 shows the percent distribution of households by number of household members. The mean household size is 4.3 individuals. Households with 7 or more individuals only represent 15 percent of all households in the district. The figure for households with 3 or 4 members is 40 percent.

The breakdown by cluster location shows

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	21.7	24.1	3.1	48.9	21.7	26.0	3.4	51.1	43.4	50.1	6.5	100.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	21.0	25.0	2.4	48.4	21.4	26.3	3.9	51.6	42.4	51.3	6.3	100.0
Remote	23.0	22.6	4.2	49.7	22.1	25.5	2.7	50.3	45.1	48.1	6.9	100.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	25.9	18.2	4.1	48.2	24.6	22.6	4.6	51.8	50.5	40.8	8.7	100.0
Non-poor	20.1	26.5	2.6	49.2	20.5	27.3	3.0	50.8	40.6	53.8	5.6	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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	1.3	1.9	2.2	0.2	4.3	0.9
Cluster Location							
Accessible	0.5	1.3	1.8	2.3	0.2	4.3	0.9
Remote	0.7	1.3	1.9	2.2	0.2	4.3	1.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	0.9	2.1	3.0	2.6	0.3	6.0	1.3
Non-poor	0.5	1.0	1.6	2.2	0.1	3.8	0.8
Household size							
1-2	0.0	0.1	0.1	1.3	0.2	1.6	0.3
3-4	0.6	0.7	1.3	2.0	0.2	3.4	0.7
5-6	0.8	2.0	2.8	2.5	0.2	5.5	1.2
7+	1.1	3.0	4.0	3.6	0.2	7.9	1.2
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.5	1.1	1.6	2.6	0.0	4.2	0.6
Self-employed - agriculture	0.6	1.3	1.9	2.3	0.2	4.4	0.9
Self-employed - other	0.7	1.1	1.7	2.1	0.1	3.9	0.9
Other	0.4	0.7	1.1	1.6	0.8	3.5	1.1
Gender of Household Head							
Male	0.7	1.3	2.0	2.4	0.2	4.5	0.9
Female	0.4	1.0	1.4	1.7	0.3	3.3	1.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	1-2 persons	3-4 persons	5-6 persons	7+ persons	Total	household size
Total	19.0	40.3	25.5	15.1	100.0	4.3
Cluster Location						
Accessible	16.7	43.9	26.4	12.9	100.0	4.3
Remote	22.9	34.1	24.0	18.9	100.0	4.3
Poverty Status						
Poor	3.0	20.3	36.0	40.7	100.0	6.0
Non-poor	23.2	45.5	22.8	8.5	100.0	3.8
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	14.1	41.5	35.0	9.4	100.0	4.2
Self-employed - agric	18.4	39.3	24.6	17.7	100.0	4.4
Self-employed - other	19.7	46.2	25.0	9.1	100.0	3.9
Other	58.8	14.7	21.9	4.5	100.0	3.5
Gender of Household Head						
Male	15.8	38.1	29.2	16.8	100.0	4.5
Female	31.7	48.9	10.9	8.5	100.0	3.3

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

no strong correlation with the distribution of households by number of household members. The difference by poverty status is more pronounced, with poor households reporting a mean household size of 6.0 members, and non-poor households reporting 3.8 members on average.

Regarding socio-economic groups, the self-employed in agriculture have the highest mean household size, at 4.4, while the 'other' socio-economic group has the lowest at 3.5 members.

Finally, households headed by males are larger than female-headed households: the former have 4.5 members in average, whereas the latter have 3.3 members.

2.3 Main Household Characteristics

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

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

When analysing by age-groups, it is clear that the category 'other relatives' is mostly comprised by children under 19 years old. This highlights the importance of the

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

	Head	Spouse	Child	Parents	Other relative	Not related	Total
Total	23.4	17.4	43.4	0.9	14.7	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	23.5	16.8	41.6	1.1	16.6	0.4	100.0
Remote	23.1	18.3	46.4	0.7	11.4	0.1	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	16.7	12.9	47.9	0.0	22.4	0.1	100.0
Non-poor	26.0	19.2	41.6	1.3	11.6	0.4	100.0
Age							
0- 9	0.0	0.0	80.3	0.0	19.5	0.2	100.0
10-19	0.6	3.1	67.8	0.0	27.8	0.7	100.0
20-29	29.4	44.1	18.7	0.0	7.5	0.3	100.0
30-39	50.0	40.4	5.6	0.0	3.8	0.1	100.0
40-49	65.4	29.6	1.3	0.3	3.4	0.0	100.0
50-59	61.8	31.2	4.4	1.5	1.1	0.0	100.0
60 and above	64.8	16.9	0.0	13.0	5.3	0.0	100.0
Gender							
Male	38.1	1.1	46.5	0.1	14.0	0.3	100.0
Female	9.3	33.0	40.4	1.8	15.3	0.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	Never married	Married monog	Married polyg	Informal, loose union	Divorced	Separated	Widowed	Total
Total	35.9	42.9	5.4	4.5	0.2	5.8	5.4	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	36.7	38.7	5.9	5.3	0.0	6.9	6.4	100.0
Remote	34.4	50.1	4.4	3.1	0.6	3.7	3.7	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	46.3	36.2	5.1	1.0	0.4	6.3	4.6	100.0
Non-poor	32.1	45.3	5.5	5.8	0.2	5.5	5.7	100.0
Age								
12-14	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	89.1	6.7	0.0	1.8	0.0	2.3	0.0	100.0
20-24	40.7	42.3	4.2	8.4	0.0	4.4	0.0	100.0
25-29	13.3	59.9	4.5	14.2	0.3	7.8	0.0	100.0
30-39	7.2	67.8	9.6	6.6	0.2	7.9	0.7	100.0
40-49	5.2	70.0	6.0	1.8	0.2	9.4	7.4	100.0
50-59	3.7	57.5	12.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	16.4	100.0
60 and above	0.0	46.8	9.8	2.3	1.1	6.8	33.2	100.0
Gender								
Male	41.8	44.9	5.3	4.7	0.1	2.0	1.2	100.0
Female	30.5	41.0	5.4	4.3	0.4	9.2	9.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	Never married	Married monog	Married polyg	Informal, loose union	Divorced	Separated	Widowed	Total
Total	35.9	42.9	5.4	4.5	0.2	5.8	5.4	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	36.7	38.7	5.9	5.3	0.0	6.9	6.4	100.0
Remote	34.4	50.1	4.4	3.1	0.6	3.7	3.7	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	46.3	36.2	5.1	1.0	0.4	6.3	4.6	100.0
Non-poor	32.1	45.3	5.5	5.8	0.2	5.5	5.7	100.0
Age								
12-14	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	89.1	6.7	0.0	1.8	0.0	2.3	0.0	100.0
20-24	40.7	42.3	4.2	8.4	0.0	4.4	0.0	100.0
25-29	13.3	59.9	4.5	14.2	0.3	7.8	0.0	100.0
30-39	7.2	67.8	9.6	6.6	0.2	7.9	0.7	100.0
40-49	5.2	70.0	6.0	1.8	0.2	9.4	7.4	100.0
50-59	3.7	57.5	12.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	16.4	100.0
60 and above	0.0	46.8	9.8	2.3	1.1	6.8	33.2	100.0
Gender								
Male	41.8	44.9	5.3	4.7	0.1	2.0	1.2	100.0
Female	30.5	41.0	5.4	4.3	0.4	9.2	9.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	2.8	25.1	7.7	64.4	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	4.0	22.0	10.4	63.6	100.0
Remote	0.7	30.5	2.9	65.8	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.0	23.3	3.7	73.0	100.0
Non-poor	3.9	25.9	9.2	61.0	100.0
Age					
5- 9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
10-14	0.0	0.7	0.0	99.3	100.0
15-19	0.0	3.5	4.9	91.6	100.0
20-29	3.7	27.9	16.2	52.2	100.0
30-39	5.1	41.2	19.5	34.2	100.0
40-49	10.1	54.2	11.6	24.1	100.0
50-59	6.8	63.6	2.7	26.9	100.0
60 and above	0.5	68.4	1.6	29.4	100.0
Gender					
Male	4.3	34.6	10.4	50.7	100.0
Female	1.3	16.2	5.1	77.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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 38 and 9 percent, respectively. In turn, females are more likely to be spouses to the household head than males, at rates of 33 and 1 percent, respectively.

Table 2.5 shows the percent distribution of the population age 12 and above by marital status. Overall, 36 percent of the

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	26.7	3.4	32.4	28.3	4.0	0.5	4.6	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	22.6	4.0	32.3	29.7	5.3	0.8	5.2	100.0
Remote	33.7	2.3	32.7	25.9	1.7	0.0	3.6	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	33.9	3.4	34.6	21.1	1.3	0.0	5.7	100.0
Non-poor	23.8	3.4	31.6	31.2	5.0	0.7	4.2	100.0
Age								
5- 9	52.0	19.0	29.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	9.2	0.2	86.5	3.8	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	9.0	0.6	42.8	34.6	12.7	0.0	0.3	100.0
20-29	20.7	0.0	11.2	53.0	8.7	2.8	3.6	100.0
30-39	18.6	0.0	11.1	61.1	2.5	0.2	6.5	100.0
40-49	24.1	0.0	16.2	42.7	4.7	0.0	12.2	100.0
50-59	32.3	0.0	20.5	23.5	2.0	0.5	21.1	100.0
60 and above	63.7	0.0	23.2	2.1	1.1	0.0	10.0	100.0
Gender								
Male	21.6	3.8	33.4	29.3	4.9	1.1	6.1	100.0
Female	31.6	3.1	31.5	27.5	3.2	0.0	3.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

population has never been married. In addition, 43 percent is married and monogamous, and 5 percent is married and polygamous. Despite virtually nobody in the district being 'officially' divorced, 6 percent of the population is 'unofficially' separated. Informal unions constitute 5 percent of the population and a further 5 percent is widowed.

Households from remote villages are more likely to be in a monogamous marriage than households from accessible clusters at 50 and 39 percent respectively.

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 50-59 age-group, at 12 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 42 percent of the men have never been married, but for women the figure is only 31 percent. While 9 percent of women are widowed and a further 9 percent separated, the shares for males are 1 and 2 percent, respectively.

Table 2.6 shows the percent distribution of the population age 5 and above by socio-economic group. Overall, 26 percent of the population is self-employed in agriculture, with 64 percent in other activities. The analysis of the data by cluster location revealed that households from remote villages report a higher share of the self-employed in agriculture, whereas households from accessible villages report a higher share of the self-employed in non-agricultural activities than the former.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that members of poor households are more likely to be in the 'other' category than members of non-poor households at 73 and 61 percent respectively. There are no remarkable differences for the remaining socio-economic categories between.

The analysis by age-groups is particularly interesting. The share of employees peaks at 10 percent for the 40-49 cohort. The share for the 'self-employed other' category is higher for the population in the 30-39 age-group, at 20 percent. The share of self-employed in agriculture tends to increase with age, peaking at 68 percent for the 60+ cohort. On the contrary, the

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	6.7	60.3	7.2	6.3	19.5	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	7.1	54.8	7.8	7.5	22.7	100.0
Remote	6.0	69.7	6.1	4.3	13.9	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	5.0	65.9	9.4	1.9	17.9	100.0
Non-poor	7.1	58.9	6.6	7.5	19.9	100.0
Age						
15-19	49.4	0.0	0.0	50.6	0.0	100.0
20-29	17.2	57.6	2.8	12.9	9.5	100.0
30-39	7.5	67.1	8.5	10.6	6.3	100.0
40-49	4.7	68.7	3.4	1.5	21.6	100.0
50-59	0.0	46.3	16.2	0.0	37.5	100.0
60 and above	0.0	52.3	9.2	1.8	36.8	100.0
Gender						
Male	5.6	75.5	9.0	5.3	4.7	100.0
Female	11.0	0.7	0.0	10.6	77.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	Employed	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	8.5	70.7	18.8	2.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	12.0	60.6	25.3	2.1	100.0
Remote	2.7	87.9	7.7	1.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.0	87.5	10.8	1.7	100.0
Non-poor	10.7	66.4	20.9	2.0	100.0
Age					
15-19	0.0	20.5	79.5	0.0	100.0
20-29	14.2	61.0	24.8	0.0	100.0
30-39	6.7	63.8	28.9	0.5	100.0
40-49	10.8	71.6	17.4	0.3	100.0
50-59	12.0	84.0	2.7	1.2	100.0
60 and above	0.8	83.8	6.5	8.8	100.0
Gender					
Male	8.2	72.5	18.2	1.0	100.0
Female	9.8	63.6	21.0	5.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

category 'other' tends to decrease with age, showing a sharp decrease between 15-19 and 20-29, from 92 to 52 percent, then decreases steadily until 24 percent for the 40-49 cohort.

The gender breakdown shows that males are more likely to be self-employed (whether in agriculture or non-agricultural activities) than women. In turn, females are more likely to be in the 'other' category, with a share of 77 percent against 51 percent for the males.

Table 2.7 shows the percent distribution of the population aged 5 and above by highest level of education. Roughly 27 percent of the population has no education, 32 percent has some primary, and 28 percent has complete primary. The remaining levels have shares of at most 5 percent each.

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	23.1	16.7	44.0	4.2	0.9	11.1	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	17.1	17.1	46.9	5.1	1.4	12.4	100.0
Remote	33.3	16.1	39.0	2.8	0.0	8.8	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	35.6	11.3	29.3	1.6	0.0	22.2	100.0
Non-poor	19.9	18.1	47.8	4.9	1.1	8.2	100.0
Age							
15-19	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
20-29	19.1	12.6	50.8	5.2	3.7	8.7	100.0
30-39	11.7	9.6	67.9	3.5	0.3	6.9	100.0
40-49	16.6	17.7	49.5	6.8	0.0	9.3	100.0
50-59	23.0	14.8	29.4	3.3	0.9	28.7	100.0
60 and above	54.3	28.8	3.2	1.7	0.0	12.0	100.0
Gender							
Male	17.0	16.7	47.6	5.1	1.1	12.5	100.0
Female	47.0	17.0	30.0	0.8	0.0	5.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote villages report a higher share of population with no education, while accessible villages report a higher share with complete primary. The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report a higher share of population with no education than non-poor households. In turn the latter report a higher share with complete primary than the former.

The age breakdown shows that 52 percent of the children between 5 and 9 have no formal education, but 87 percent of the children 10-14 have some primary. Rates of no education are lowest for the population in the 15-19 cohort (9 percent) and higher for the older groups. In the groups between 20 and 39 years old, the most common is completed primary.

The gender breakdown shows that females have a higher share of uneducated population than males: 32 against 22 percent, but at the same time similar shares with some or complete primary.

2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household

Table 2.8 shows the percent distribution of household heads by marital status. Overall, 60 percent of the household heads are married and monogamous, 20 percent are divorced, separated or widowed, 7 percent are married and polygamous, a further 7 percent have never been married and 6 percent live in an informal union.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote villages report a higher share of married monogamous household heads than accessible villages. In turn, the latter report a higher share in widowed, divorced or separated than the former.

Regarding poverty status, heads of poor households are more likely to be in a monogamous marriage than heads of non-poor households at 66 and 59 percent respectively.

The breakdown by age-group shows that the 'married-monogamous' category decreases with age, as 'married-polygamous' and 'divorced, separated or widowed' increase. 'Never married' also shows correlation with age, decreasing rapidly as the population gets older.

Most female household heads are divorced, separated or widowed (78 percent), whereas for males, this category roughly represents 5 percent. Most male household heads are married, monogamous or polygamous (76 and 9 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,

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	3.2	7.3	2.2
Cluster Location			
Accessible	3.7	9.4	2.4
Remote	2.4	3.9	1.9
Poverty Status			
Poor	5.5	10.4	2.4
Non-poor	2.0	5.7	2.1
Age			
0-4	0.5	0.6	0.0
5-9	2.4	3.9	1.0
10-14	3.7	12.9	4.6
15-17	9.6	16.4	4.3
Gender			
Male	2.7	7.8	2.0
Female	3.7	6.8	2.4

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

who is not always the household head. As expected, the great majority of the district's household heads belongs to the self-employed in agriculture, with a share of 71 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities represent 19 percent of the household heads, the 'other' category (unemployed, inactive and household workers) represents only 2 percent, and the employees are a further 9 percent.

The analysis by cluster location shows that the share of household heads self-employed in agriculture in remote villages is higher than in accessible villages, with shares of 88 and 61 percent, respectively. In accessible villages, household heads are more likely to be in the 'self-employed other' group than heads of households in remote villages, with shares of 25 and 8 percent, respectively.

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

The breakdown by age of the household head shows interesting insights. For all age-groups, 'self-employed agriculture' is the most important category, representing at least 3 out of 5 household heads in each age-group. The 'employee' category peaks at 12 percent for the 50-59 age-group. The 'self-employed other' is lower for the 50-59 and 60+ cohorts. The 'other' category gains importance in the 60+ age-group, with a share of 9 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 self-employed in agriculture than in female-headed households. In the latter, the main income earner is more likely to be in the 'other' category than in the former.

Table 2.10 shows the percent distribution of the heads of household by highest level of education. Overall, around 11 percent of the household heads have any education after secondary. 23 percent of the household heads have no education, 17 percent have some primary and 44 percent have complete primary.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that household heads from remote villages are more likely to have no education than household heads from accessible villages. In turn the latter report a higher share with complete primary than the former at 47 and 39 percent respectively. Poverty status is strongly correlated with the education of the household heads. This should be no surprise, since education of the household head is one of the poverty predictors used to define poverty status. However, the difference is still important: household heads from poor households are more likely to have no education than heads from non-poor households, whereas the latter are more likely to have complete primary or post secondary studies than the former.

The age breakdown shows that 54 percent of household heads aged 60 or over have no education, and a further 29 percent have just some primary. Complete primary represents 68 percent for the 30-39 age-group, but only 3 percent in the 60+ cohort. In the latter groups, 'post secondary' gains importance.

The analysis by gender shows that female household heads are more likely to have no education than male household heads, with rates of 47 and 17 percent, respectively. Males report a higher share with complete primary than females. Furthermore, 13 percent of the male

household heads has post secondary education, against 6 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, 3 percent lost only their mother and 7 percent lost only their father. This amounts to 12 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 30 percent of the children between 15 and 17 years lost at least one parent, and 16 percent 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 36 percent of children under 18 were living in non-nuclear households at the time of the survey.

Children from accessible clusters are more likely to live in non-nuclear households than children from remote clusters, at 41 and 27 percent, respectively. In turn, 45 percent of children from poor households live in non-nuclear households, while the share for non-poor households is 31 percent.

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

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

Table 2.12 - Foster status of children under 18 years old

	Children living with mother only	Children living with father only	Children living with no parents	Children living in non-nuclear households
Total	15.3	5.6	15.0	35.8
Cluster Location				
Accessible	17.0	7.7	16.5	41.1
Remote	12.5	2.3	12.6	27.4
Poverty Status				
Poor	21.1	5.4	18.1	44.6
Non-poor	12.3	5.7	13.3	31.3
Age				
0-4	17.3	0.6	3.2	21.1
5-9	14.5	4.9	13.6	33.0
10-14	16.3	8.7	22.3	47.3
15-17	10.8	10.6	26.3	47.7
Gender				
Male	15.3	5.6	13.5	34.3
Female	15.3	5.6	16.6	37.4

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

2Village, population and household characteristics

3 EDUCATION

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

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

3.1 Overview of the Education indicators

3.1.1 Literacy

Table 3.1 shows the main education indicators for the district. Literacy is defined as the ability to read and write in any language, as reported by the respondent. Individuals who are able to read but cannot write are considered illiterate. The adult literacy rate[1] is 70 percent. Literacy rates differ between accessible and remote villages at 76 and 60 percent respectively.
There is a large difference in literacy rate among individuals living in poor and non-poor households. Whereas the literacy rate among non-poor households stands at 73 percent, the individuals in poor households have a literacy rate of 64 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that, while the literacy rate is 99 percent for employees, the share for households in the 'other' category is 45 percent. The remaining socio-economic categories report shares above 65 percent each.

The gender breakdown shows an important literacy rate gap between men and women. The literacy rate among men is 20 percentage points higher than that of women at 81 percent and 61 percent respectively.

Fostered children have a literacy rate of 82 percent, whereas the rate for non-fostered children is 6 points higher, at 88 percent. In contrast, orphaned children have higher literacy rate than non-orphaned children.

3.1.2 Primary School Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction

Access

Primary school access rate is defined as the proportion of primary school-age children (7 to 13 years) reporting to live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school. Over three quarters (77 percent) of primary school-age children live within 30 minutes of a primary school. Primary school access is higher in accessible villages than in remote villages at 87 and 59 percent respectively.

83 percent of the children aged 7 to 13 years living in non-poor households live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school compared to 64 percent of children living in poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that virtually all the children living in households belonging to the 'employee' category have access to primary schools, whereas the share for the children living in households of the 'self-employed other' socio-economic group is 73 percent.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no strong correlation with primary school accessibility.

Orphaned children have a higher access rate to primary schools than non-orphaned children, at 82 and 76 percent, respectively. Similarly, 85 percent of fostered children have access to primary schools, whereas the rate for non-fostered is 77 percent.

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

Enrolment

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

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

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

The primary school GER was 112 percent

Table 3.1: Education indicators

		Primary				Secondary			
	Adult Literacy rate	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction
Total	70.4	76.5	112.1	86.0	51.9	8.6	17.4	14.1	54.6
Cluster Location									
Accessible	76.2	87.4	117.6	92.8	60.5	11.1	24.9	20.0	58.4
Remote	60.4	58.8	103.4	75.1	36.0	4.5	5.4	4.4	25.5
Poverty Status									
Poor	63.8	64.3	103.7	78.5	55.3	11.4	9.1	8.1	27.3
Non-poor	72.7	82.8	116.5	90.0	50.3	7.1	21.8	17.2	60.5
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	98.7	100.0	131.0	98.5	79.1	7.2	51.7	48.8	57.0
Self-employed - agriculture	65.7	73.3	112.0	83.4	51.6	10.3	11.3	8.3	48.2
Self-employed - other	79.1	80.0	102.5	91.6	38.8	0.0	29.1	22.0	66.6
Other	44.5	86.9	119.9	100.0	33.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender									
Male	80.6	75.4	112.1	82.5	52.7	7.7	21.4	15.4	58.0
Female	61.1	77.5	112.1	89.7	51.0	9.6	13.2	12.6	48.6
Orphan status									
Orphaned	90.1	81.6	134.2	83.5	56.6	17.8	8.5	8.5	0.0
Not-orphaned	86.5	76.1	108.2	86.8	50.8	6.5	16.1	16.1	61.3
Foster status									
Fostered	81.6	85.2	105.6	90.4	58.5	5.9	6.0	6.0	46.2
Not-fostered	88.1	75.7	111.0	85.6	52.4	5.5	14.9	14.9	62.3

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

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

		Reasons for dissatisfaction							
	Percent dissatisfied	Books/ supplies	Poor Teaching	Lack of teachers	Teachers absent	Lack of space	Facilties in bad condition	High fees	Other
Total	46.6	56.7	20.5	51.7	7.1	31.6	49.7	3.0	6.5
Cluster Location									
Accessible	38.9	66.0	10.4	32.2	0.9	35.9	54.6	4.7	0.9
Remote	63.2	44.3	33.9	77.9	15.3	25.9	43.2	0.7	14.1
Poverty Status									
Poor	45.0	51.0	18.5	64.7	11.6	39.6	55.1	1.0	10.3
Non-poor	47.2	59.0	21.2	46.6	5.2	28.5	47.6	3.8	5.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	25.3	83.4	0.0	50.7	0.0	35.7	41.4	7.2	2.1
Self-employed - agriculture	47.5	54.5	26.4	57.6	6.2	32.8	51.4	2.1	8.1
Self-employed - other	55.3	54.8	4.4	31.3	13.8	25.3	43.2	5.7	0.0
Other	66.8	83.6	0.0	16.4	0.0	33.8	71.2	0.0	16.4
Gender									
Male	46.6	53.6	20.8	51.2	6.1	28.6	56.1	2.6	7.9
Female	46.6	60.0	20.1	52.2	8.1	34.9	43.1	3.4	5.0
Type of school									
Primary	48.1	55.4	23.9	50.9	7.2	33.3	52.6	0.6	7.3
Government	48.4	55.4	23.9	50.9	7.2	33.3	52.6	0.6	7.3
Private	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Secondary	45.4	68.0	3.8	80.3	6.8	27.2	43.9	7.1	0.0
Government	47.8	76.0	4.2	82.0	0.0	30.4	44.9	7.9	0.0
Private	23.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Other	35.5	60.0	0.0	33.4	6.0	18.5	25.6	24.0	3.8
Government	36.8	58.8	0.0	31.4	6.2	19.0	26.4	24.8	3.9
Private	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

at the time of the survey. This figure indicates that all individuals who were at primary school constitute 112 percent of all children of primary school-age in the district. The NER further shows that 86 percent of all primary school-age children were attending school. While the GER for households located in accessible villages is 118 percent, the share for households located in remote villages is 103 percent. Likewise, NER for households located in accessible villages is higher than that of households in remote villages at 93 and 75 percent, respectively.

Furthermore, while GER for non-poor households is 117 percent, the share for poor households is 104 percent. Likewise, NER for non-poor households is higher than that of poor households at 90 and 79 percent respectively.

GER is highest among people living in households belonging to the 'employee' category at 131 percent, and lowest for the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 103 percent. On the other hand, NER is highest among households where the main income earner is in the 'other' category with a rate of 100 percent and is lowest among households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category at 83 percent, respectively.

There are no differences in GER between male and females, but females report a higher NER than males at 90 and 83 percent respectively.

The breakdown by orphan status shows higher GER for orphaned children than non-orphaned children but with similar shares of NER. There appears to be no strong correlation between foster status and primary school enrolment.

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	17.4	9.3	0.6	19.7	28.5	2.3	5.5	9.7	19.8	24.4	12.9	0.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	15.9	7.7	0.0	20.8	30.7	1.9	7.1	6.0	24.0	12.4	16.3	0.0
Remote	20.3	11.8	1.5	17.9	25.3	2.8	3.1	15.1	13.5	42.0	7.8	0.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	20.7	7.2	1.6	21.6	24.1	1.5	3.2	0.0	18.6	23.0	9.1	0.0
Non-poor	15.9	10.6	0.0	18.4	31.2	2.8	6.9	15.7	20.5	25.2	15.2	0.0
Socio-economic Group												
Employee	9.7	32.1	0.0	24.9	38.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	13.8	20.0	21.1	0.0
Self-employed - agric	18.1	9.8	0.8	18.1	28.5	2.2	3.7	11.9	21.1	25.2	10.2	0.0
Self-employed - other	18.2	0.0	0.0	24.5	23.5	3.7	17.3	0.0	17.6	14.9	25.9	0.0
Other	22.5	0.0	0.0	28.5	37.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	71.5	0.0	0.0
Gender												
Male	14.9	10.2	1.5	19.8	29.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	31.4	18.0	14.8	0.0
Female	20.0	8.6	0.0	19.5	28.1	3.3	9.6	17.0	11.1	29.2	11.4	0.0
Age												
7-13	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.6	14.9	0.0	0.0	58.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
14-19	41.7	10.2	0.7	21.5	29.3	1.1	6.0	10.6	16.1	26.7	14.1	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

Satisfaction

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

52 percent of all primary school pupils were satisfied with school. 61 percent of pupils living in accessible villages are satisfied with school compared to 36 percent of pupils living in remote villages. In contrast, while 55 percent of pupils living in poor households reported to be satisfied with school, the share for pupils living in non-poor households is 50 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that households belonging to the 'employee' category have the highest rate of satisfaction with their primary schools at 79 percent, while the share for pupils living in households belonging to the 'other' category is 33 percent.

3.1.3 Secondary school Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction

Access

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

Less than a tenth (9 percent) of all pupils in secondary school live within 30 minutes of travel to the nearest secondary school. The difference in access to secondary school between people living in accessible and remote villages is noticeable at 11 and 5 percent respectively. In addition, the access rate for individuals living in poor households is higher than that of individuals in non-poor households.

The socio-economic status of the household seems to be strongly correlated with the secondary school access rate. While respectively, the 'self-employed agriculture' and the 'employee' categories have the highest rate of access to secondary school at 10 and 7 percent, the

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	82.5	89.7	86.0	1.7	1.5	1.6
7	78.5	78.1	78.3	1.3	0.0	0.8
8	62.7	97.9	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	90.6	100.0	95.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
10	89.8	89.5	89.6	0.0	2.8	1.5
11	89.8	88.8	89.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
12	94.7	91.6	93.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
13	67.9	85.0	77.9	8.8	5.2	6.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

shares for the remaining categories are virtually null.

The access rate for orphaned children is 11 percentage points higher than that for non-orphaned children at 18 and 7 percent, respectively. Finally, gender and foster status are not strongly correlated to secondary school accessibility.

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 17 percent and NER was 14 percent. The secondary school GER for households located in accessible clusters is 20 percentage points higher than that of households located in remote clusters at 25 and 5 percent respectively. Likewise, secondary school NER is higher in accessible clusters than in remote clusters at 20 and 4 percent respectively. Furthermore, both secondary GER and NER are higher in non-poor households than in poor households, with a difference of 13 and 9 percentage points respectively.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities are the categories with highest NER and GER, whereas the 'other' category shows practically null enrolment rates.

The GER is higher among males than in females at 21 and 13 percent respectively. NER do not show strong differences between males and females.

Furthermore, while GER and NER for orphaned children is 9 percent, the share for non-orphaned children is 16 percent. Similarly, while the GER and NER for fostered children is 6 percent, the share for non-fostered children is 15 percent.

Satisfaction

More than a half (55 percent) of the total population enrolled in secondary schools is satisfied with their schools. This satisfaction rate is similar to satisfaction rate in primary schools (52 percent). The satisfaction rate is higher among people living in households located in accessible villages than that of people living in remote villages at 58 and 26 percent respectively. Likewise, 61 percent of pupils living in non-poor households was satisfied with their school whereas, the share for those living in poor households is 27 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that 67 percent of pupils living in households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category are satisfied with secondary school, while the share for those living in households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category is virtually null.

The satisfaction rate for males is higher than that of females at 58 and 49 percent respectively.

61 percent of non-orphaned children are satisfied with their school, whereas the share for orphaned children is virtually null. In addition, 62 percent of non-fostered children report to be satisfied with their secondary schools, whereas the share for fostered children is 46 percent.

3.2 Dissatisfaction

One of the aims of the survey is to inform on perceptions of quality of services received among individuals for whom these are provided. To obtain this information, primary and secondary school students who were not satisfied with the schools they were attending at the time of the survey were asked to provide reasons for their dissatisfaction. Complaints regarding lack of books and other resources were allocated into the "Books/Supplies" category, while those relating to quality of teaching and teacher shortages were grouped into the "Teaching" category. The "Facilities" category incorporates complaints regarding overcrowding and bad condition of facilities. The results are shown in Table 3.2.

Overall, 47 percent of students who were enrolled in either primary or secondary school reported dissatisfaction with the schools they were attending. 57 percent of the dissatisfied individuals reported lack of books and supplies as the cause of their dissatisfaction. In addition, 52 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools because of lack of teachers, while 50 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools due to facilities being in bad condition.

The dissatisfaction rate for people living in remote villages is 24 percentage points higher than that of those living in accessible villages. 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 65 and 47 percent respectively. Likewise, while 78 percent of people living in remote clusters reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers, whereas the share for those living in accessible clusters is 32 percent. It is also observed that 66 percent of people living in accessible clusters reported dissatisfaction due to lack of books and supplies compared to 44 percent of people living in remote clusters.

The breakdown by socio-economic groups shows that the dissatisfaction rate among households belonging to the 'other' category is the highest (67 percent). At the same time, the 'employee' category reported the lowest dissatisfaction rate (25 percent). It is also observed that 58 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category and 51 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers, whereas the share for households belonging to the 'other' category is 16 percent.

Gender breakdown shows that 60 percent of females reported dissatisfaction due to lack of books and supplies compared to 53 percent of males. In turn the latter report a higher dissatisfaction due to 'facilities in bad condition' than the former at 56 and 43 percent respectively.

Those attending primary school report the lack of books and supplies as the most common reason for dissatisfaction at (55 percent), followed by bad condition of facilities (53 percent) and 'lack of teachers' (51 percent), while those

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	15.4	12.6	14.1	11.1	16.3	13.6
14	14.8	3.3	9.2	5.1	12.9	8.8
15	14.5	9.5	12.2	3.2	18.4	10.1
16	22.8	14.7	19.8	6.1	34.3	16.5
17	9.6	14.0	11.4	29.6	29.2	29.4
18	6.5	23.7	17.9	18.0	2.8	7.9
19	19.7	13.3	15.6	18.0	2.8	8.2

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

attending secondary schools report dissatisfaction due to 'lack of teachers' (80 percent) followed by 'lack of textbooks and supplies' (68 percent) and facilities in bad condition (44 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 17 percent of 7 to 19 year olds who were not attending school. Around 9 percent of the non-attending population did not attend because they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level. 20 percent of respondents reported that school was useless or uninteresting and a further 20 percent due to cost. While 29 percent were not attending school due to work and 24 percent because they failed standard four, seven or form four exams, only 2 percent were not attending due to illness.

21 percent of children from poor households do not attend school compared to 16 percent of children from non-poor households. Further breakdown of the data shows that while 42 percent of children living in households located in remote clusters were not attending school because they failed standard four, seven or form four exams, the share for those living in households located in accessible clusters is 12 percent. In addition, 21 percent of children from poor households do not attend school compared to 16 percent of children from non-poor households. Furthermore, 31 percent of children living in non-poor households were not attending school because of work compared to 24 percent of those living in poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that 23 percent of children from households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category do not attend school compared to 10 percent of those from households belonging to the 'employee' category. Further breakdown of the data shows that 26 percent of the children from households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed other' category were not attending because they were awaiting admissions, whereas the share for those from households belonging to the 'other' category is virtually null.

The gender breakdown shows that non-attendance rate among females is higher than that of males at 20 and 15 percent respectively. However, further breakdown of the data shows that while 29 percent of girls were not attending because they failed standard four, seven or form four exams, the share for boys is 18 percent. It is also observed that while 10 percent of girls were not attending school due to marriage, the share for males was virtually null.

Nearly all the primary school-aged children attend school, as their non-attendance rate is only 2 percent. On the other hand, 58 percent of secondary school-aged individuals attend school. 26 percent of secondary school-aged individuals not attending secondary school because they failed standard four, seven or form four exams, 10 percent report having completed school (standard seven, O and A-level); while 16 percent said it was useless or uninteresting.

3.4 Enrolment and Drop-out rates

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

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	80.6	61.1	70.4
15-19 years	88.0	87.3	87.7
20-29 years	81.9	70.5	75.2
30-39 years	83.4	69.7	76.5
40-49 years	82.9	54.0	69.7
50-59 years	82.5	40.3	59.1
60+ years	55.1	7.7	30.0
Accessible	88.3	65.1	76.2
15-19 years	92.3	93.6	92.9
20-29 years	85.8	76.8	80.5
30-39 years	92.7	71.5	82.1
40-49 years	92.3	62.9	79.5
50-59 years	100.0	40.7	67.3
60+ years	58.0	7.9	27.1
Remote	67.3	53.8	60.4
15-19 years	79.6	78.7	79.1
20-29 years	74.5	57.3	64.7
30-39 years	62.7	65.4	64.0
40-49 years	67.6	42.4	55.2
50-59 years	63.5	40.0	50.4
60+ years	52.3	7.2	34.5

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is population age 15+

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. Therefore, only enrolment rates will be analysed.

Overall, 86 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), 90 percent of girls and 83 percent of boys were enrolled. The required age at which children should start standard one is 7 years. However, data on primary school enrolment shows that at the time of the survey only 78 percent of all seven year olds were enrolled. Children are most likely to be in school by ages 10 or 11 years, where the NER is at 100 percent.

Secondary School

Table 3.5 shows secondary net enrolment patterns by gender. Secondary school enrolment rates are much lower than those at primary level. Only 14 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 biggest difference in enrolment rates is observed between the age of 16 and 17. Furthermore, 18 percent of 18 year olds reported to be enrolled at the time of the survey. It is also noticeable that the rate of girls and boys enrolled in secondary school at the age of 14 is the lowest at 9 percent.

Secondary school drop-out rates among secondary school-age individuals (14 to 19 years) are higher compared to those of primary school. 14 percent of children of secondary school-age had dropped out in the year prior to the survey. In general, the highest drop-out rate is observed among 17 year olds (at 29 percent) for both genders.

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, 70 percent of the population aged 15 and above in the district are literate. The difference in literacy rates among men and women is 20 percentage points at 81 and 61 percent respectively. Individuals aged between 15 and 19 have the highest literacy rate (88 percent) while only 30 percent of those who are above 60 years know how to read and write. There are significant gender differences in literacy, being larger for the older cohorts.

The literacy rate in accessible villages is 16 percentage points higher than in remote villages. The literacy rate for the 15-19 age-group in remote villages is 79 percent, whereas for accessible villages the rate is 93 percent. Furthermore, in accessible villages the literacy rate of men is 23 percentage points higher than that of women. In remote villages, the difference decreases to 13 percentage points. On the contrary, while the literacy rate of women in accessible villages is about 11 points higher than that of women in remote

villages, the difference in literacy rates between men in accessible and remote villages is 21 percentage points. Finally, there is a significant difference in literacy rates among men and women above 60 years in both cluster locations. In both cases, the literacy rates of men over 60 years is above 45 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 82 percent. The literacy rate of male youth in accessible villages is 10 percentage points higher than that of males in remote villages at 87 and 77 percent respectively. Similarly women from accessible villages report a higher literacy rate than their counterparts at 86 and 70 percent respectively.

Analysis by age-groups shows that 21-22 year olds have the highest literacy rate at 96 percent. Youth literacy rate in remote villages is about 14 points higher than that of youth in accessible villages at 87 and 73 percent respectively.

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	83.8	80.4	82.0
15-17 years	88.2	87.5	87.9
18-20 years	83.1	77.6	80.0
21-22 years	93.5	89.8	90.7
23-24 years	61.9	61.6	61.7
Accessible	87.4	87.1	87.2
15-17 years	93.0	97.9	94.8
18-20 years	80.1	76.3	78.1
21-22 years	94.0	95.8	95.5
23-24 years	75.6	75.4	75.5
Remote	77.3	70.0	73.2
15-17 years	77.2	73.2	75.2
18-20 years	88.1	79.2	82.8
21-22 years	93.2	77.2	83.0
23-24 years	40.2	35.0	37.2

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is population aged 15-24

3 Education

4 HEALTH

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

4.1. Health Indicators

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

Table 4.1 - Health Indicators

	Medical Services			
	Access	Need	Use	Satisfaction
Total	59.4	26.4	28.7	61.3
Cluster Location				
Accessible	75.9	26.1	28.3	63.7
Remote	32.0	27.1	29.4	57.5
Poverty Status				
Poor	44.9	23.3	24.4	62.9
Non-poor	65.3	27.7	30.4	60.8
Socio-economic group				
Employee	87.7	19.5	21.5	77.7
Self-employed - agriculture	52.8	25.4	27.1	58.3
Self-employed - other	76.3	32.9	38.2	67.0
Other	35.3	40.1	41.4	52.5
Gender				
Male	59.1	23.9	25.9	63.7
Female	59.7	28.9	31.4	59.5
Age				
0-4	61.2	36.8	63.3	51.9
5-9	59.6	23.4	20.6	65.5
10-14	50.7	20.4	19.7	58.7
15-19	58.9	19.8	16.2	64.9
20-29	66.1	18.8	19.2	68.6
30-39	67.4	34.3	33.7	73.0
40-49	54.2	21.4	21.5	71.2
50-59	31.7	31.9	31.9	62.1
60+	55.8	35.3	29.7	55.5

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

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

		Reasons for dissatisfaction						
	Percent dissatisfied	Facilities not clean	Long wait	No trained professionals	Cost	No drugs available	Treatment unsuccessful	Other
Total	38.7	21.6	47.7	28.9	19.1	40.1	13.7	3.6
Cluster Location								
Accessible	36.3	23.7	48.7	28.2	18.2	52.5	7.7	1.5
Remote	42.5	18.8	46.3	29.8	20.2	23.1	22.0	6.4
Poverty Status								
Poor	37.1	12.8	39.5	26.8	25.8	26.7	15.1	6.8
Non-poor	39.2	24.3	50.2	29.5	17.0	44.2	13.3	2.6
Socio-economic group								
Employee	22.3	21.7	60.2	21.7	5.6	20.6	5.6	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	41.7	24.1	52.7	33.3	18.6	39.6	14.3	3.7
Self-employed - other	33.0	15.1	32.2	17.4	15.1	51.5	12.3	3.1
Other	47.5	0.0	6.6	0.0	74.4	0.0	19.1	6.6
Gender								
Male	36.3	19.6	48.7	26.2	12.6	41.2	14.9	1.2
Female	40.5	23.1	47.0	30.8	23.6	39.3	12.9	5.3
Type of provider								
Public hospital	49.3	27.8	59.9	32.1	6.6	50.2	8.3	4.0
Private hospital	18.0	0.0	30.0	33.8	51.2	16.3	38.7	0.0
Religous hospital	41.1	0.0	13.6	0.0	100.0	0.0	13.6	0.0
Village health worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private Doctor/Dentist	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pharmacist	18.7	0.0	0.0	20.4	65.1	4.7	25.5	3.1
Trad. Healer	45.4	0.0	0.0	8.7	44.8	0.0	64.9	0.0
Other	44.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

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

Table 4.1 shows indicators regarding medical services by cluster location, poverty status, socio-economic status, gender and age. Overall, 59 percent of the population has access to medical services, 26 percent reported having needed them, and 29 percent reported having used medical services. Finally, 61 percent of those who used medical services reported being satisfied with them.

As would be expected, household in accessible villages have a higher access rate to medical services than households in remote villages. Both show similar proportions of need and use, but households in accessible villages report a higher satisfaction rate (64 percent) than households in remote villages (at 56 percent).

Non-poor households report a higher access rate to medical services than poor households, with shares of 65 and 45 percent, respectively. While both poor and non-poor households report similar satisfaction rates, non-poor households report higher shares of need and use of medical services than poor households.

Regarding socio-economic status, the employees show the highest access rate, at 88 percent. The remaining categories show rates of less than 80 percent each. In contrast the employees showed a lower rate of need than the remaining socio-economic categories, at 20 percent. The ‘other’ category reports the lowest satisfaction rate at 53 percent, but the highest need and use rates.

There are no gender differences in access, but females report higher need and use

rates than males at 29 and 31 percent against 24 and 26 percent of males respectively.

Access does not vary widely by age-groups, but the rate of use does. It starts at 63 percent for children under 5, reduces to around 16 percent for the population aged between 15 and 19, and then starts going up again, peaking at 32 percent for the 50-59 age-group. The rate of need follows a similar trend: it starts decreasing with age but then increases for the older cohorts. Satisfaction is lowest for the 0-4 age-group, the heaviest users of medical service; and highest for the 20-29 age-group, the group with the lowest need rate.

4.2 Reasons for Dissatisfaction

Table 4.2 shows the percentage of population who consulted a health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and were not satisfied. Overall, 39 percent users of healthcare facilities are dissatisfied, mostly because of long waits (48 percent), drug unavailability (40 percent) lack of trained professionals (29 percent), facilities being not clean (22 percent), cost of the treatment (24 percent) and unsuccessful treatment (14 percent).

The analysis by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages are more commonly dissatisfied by unavailability of drugs (53 percent, against 23 percent for households in remote villages), whereas households in remote villages report unsuccessful treatment more often (22 percent, against 8 percent of the households in accessible villages).

The breakdown by poverty status shows that, whereas poor households are more dissatisfied by the cost of the treatment than non-poor households (26 and 17 percent, respectively), the latter report higher shares dissatisfied by long waits (50 against 40 percent) respectively.

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	71.3	96.4	2.4	0.6	0.4	0.6
Cluster Location						
Accessible	71.7	97.2	2.4	0.2	0.4	0.1
Remote	70.6	95.2	2.2	1.1	0.3	1.6
Poverty Status						
Poor	75.6	96.8	2.0	0.9	0.0	0.3
Non-poor	69.6	96.3	2.5	0.4	0.5	0.8
Socio-economic group						
Employee	78.5	98.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
Self-employed - agriculture	72.9	96.3	2.4	0.7	0.4	0.7
Self-employed - other	61.8	95.5	3.9	0.0	0.6	0.0
Other	58.6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender						
Male	74.1	97.4	1.7	0.5	0.3	0.6
Female	68.6	95.5	3.1	0.6	0.5	0.6
Type of sickness/injury						
Fever/malaria	4.9	0.0	84.7	16.2	0.0	7.9
Diarrhea/abdominal pains	2.6	0.0	54.8	0.0	45.2	0.0
Pain in back, limbs or joints	15.8	0.0	100.0	3.7	0.0	0.0
Coughing/breathing difficulty	11.3	3.0	56.4	15.7	0.0	44.8
Skin problems	4.6	0.0	100.0	28.1	0.0	0.0
Ear, nose, throat	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Eye	9.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
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	15.5	0.0	100.0	28.7	8.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

Employees are the socio-economic group with the lowest dissatisfaction rate. Furthermore, 60 percent of the employees report dissatisfaction due to long waits, and 22 percent due to lack of trained professionals or facilities being not clean. The 'other' socio-economic group report the long wait more frequently, whereas the remaining socio-economic groups report long waits and drugs unavailability more often.

The gender breakdown shows that females report a higher dissatisfaction rate than males, at 41 and 36 percent, respectively. In addition, females report lack of trained professionals and cost of treatment more often than males. The remaining reasons for dissatisfaction do not show gender differences.

Regarding health provider, the main cause of dissatisfaction in public hospitals is the long wait (60 percent), whereas in private and religious hospitals, as well as in pharmacists, the cost of healthcare at 51,100 and 65 percent respectively. Furthermore, public hospitals show the highest rate of dissatisfaction.

4.3 Reasons for Not Consulting When Ill

The distribution of the population who did not consult a health provider in the four weeks preceding the survey is shown Table 4.3. The table shows that overall, 71 percent of the population did not consult a health provider, typically because there was no need (96 percent of the cases).

As would be expected, the breakdown by poverty status indicates that poor households report a higher rate of not consulting a healthcare provider than non-poor households, with shares of 76 and 70 percent respectively. There are no strong differences in the reasons for not consulting a healthcare provider by cluster location and poverty status.

Regarding socio-economic groups, the 'employee' group report the highest rate not consulting a health service provider, at 79 percent, while the 'other' category report the lowest rate not consulting a health service provider at 59 percent. Virtually all households in the 'other' category who did not consult the health service provider reported 'no need' as their main reason for not consulting.

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	26.4	62.7	7.9	10.5	18.2	4.7	0.7	1.4	1.6	2.6	8.8
Male Total	23.9	66.8	4.6	7.8	16.8	6.5	1.2	1.3	1.4	3.6	6.9
0-4	37.9	71.1	5.0	1.6	35.6	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0
5-9	20.8	63.0	5.9	1.1	14.8	11.2	2.9	1.4	1.5	0.0	11.0
10-14	16.9	57.1	0.0	0.0	8.2	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.2	7.1	21.2
15-29	15.9	68.8	6.5	9.8	10.0	2.3	0.0	1.2	2.5	2.2	5.5
30-49	27.2	75.2	4.5	9.8	8.7	6.7	1.1	0.0	0.9	8.4	4.8
50-64	22.2	66.6	10.2	15.5	12.2	15.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1
65+	38.5	40.4	0.0	34.6	19.7	1.7	7.2	13.2	0.0	0.0	13.0
Female Total	28.9	59.4	10.5	12.7	19.3	3.3	0.3	1.4	1.8	1.8	10.2
0-4	35.7	75.1	3.0	1.3	30.7	2.7	0.0	0.8	0.0	3.9	5.3
5-9	25.9	53.7	1.8	0.0	17.5	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.5
10-14	23.9	59.2	14.3	4.9	10.0	6.5	2.6	0.0	3.7	7.8	10.8
15-29	23.0	61.2	13.1	12.7	25.4	2.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	5.9
30-49	31.1	61.9	20.5	9.7	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	0.0	10.5
50-64	34.8	52.7	2.5	33.9	16.2	6.6	0.0	7.5	3.1	3.1	7.3
65+	48.5	31.3	8.4	56.9	33.6	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	15.2

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

2. Base is population sick.

The gender breakdown shows that 74 percent of the males did not consult a health service provider compared to 69 percent of females. There appears to be no strong correlation between gender and the reason for not consulting health providers.

The split-up by type of illness shows that for most infirmities, fever (including malaria) diarrhoea, pain, and coughing, the main cause for not consulting a health practitioner is cost. It is worth noticing the relatively low percentage of people not receiving attention (5 percent) for fever or malaria.

4.4 Type of Illness

Table 4.4 shows the percentage of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, fever or malaria is the most common sickness, affecting almost 63 percent of the total population. In turn, coughing or breathing difficulties and pain in back, joints or limbs come in second and third place, with 18 and 11 percent of the population respectively. Diarrhoea or abdominal pain affected 8 percent of the ill population, whereas other illnesses affected minor shares of the population.

The gender breakdown reveals that females make up a higher share of sick or injured population: 29 vs. 24 percent of males. Males report to have been affected by fever or malaria more frequently than females at 67 and 59 percent respectively. There are no sharp differences between males and females for the remainder of the sicknesses or injuries.

The age breakdown shows that the share of sick/injured population starts at around 36 percent for children under 5, decreases for the 5-9 cohort, stabilizes between 15 and 29 percent, and then starts increasing again for the 30-49 cohort, peaking for the population aged 65 and over (39 percent for males, and 49 percent for females in that group). The share of ill population affected by malaria comes down with age but other problems emerge.

4.5 Health Provider

Table 4.5 shows the percent distribution of health consultations in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, 61 percent of the consultations were made in a public hospital, 29 percent to a pharmacist or chemist, 5 percent in private hospitals, and 3 percent to traditional healers. Religious hospitals were consulted just in 2 percent of the cases.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages seem to go more often to public hospitals than households in remote villages, and the latter to chemists and traditional healers than the former.

Non-poor households make their consultations in public hospitals more often than poor households, with shares of 63 and 54 percent, respectively. In turn, members of poor households tend to consult chemists more often (36 and 24 percent respectively).

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	61.1	4.9	2.2	0.0	0.0	28.8	2.5	0.5	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	68.5	4.2	1.7	0.0	0.0	24.3	1.1	0.2	100.0
Remote	49.3	5.9	3.1	0.0	0.0	36.1	4.8	0.8	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	54.0	2.6	0.8	0.0	0.0	37.2	4.1	1.3	100.0
Non-poor	63.4	5.6	2.7	0.0	0.0	26.1	2.0	0.2	100.0
Socio-economic group									
Employee	75.1	5.7	5.1	0.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	56.6	4.5	2.6	0.0	0.0	32.8	3.0	0.5	100.0
Self-employed - other	72.4	5.8	0.4	0.0	0.0	20.7	0.0	0.6	100.0
Other	46.6	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.7	22.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is population who consulted a health provider

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

	12-14 yrs	15-19 yrs	20-24 yrs	25-29 yrs	30-39 yrs	40+ yrs	Total	Pre-natal care
Total	0.0	12.8	26.4	23.8	15.1	1.4	13.2	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	0.0	12.9	23.6	27.4	12.9	0.0	13.0	100.0
Remote	0.0	12.6	31.5	14.4	20.2	3.3	13.5	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	0.0	12.6	31.5	11.8	35.1	5.3	15.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	12.9	25.4	25.7	8.5	0.0	12.5	100.0
Socio-economic group								
Employee	0.0	0.0	47.0	31.1	0.0	0.0	15.4	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.0	14.6	21.6	20.5	17.9	1.9	12.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	17.0	26.2	29.2	12.6	0.0	16.1	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is females aged 12 or older.

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	33.8	4.3	18.1	0.0	43.0	0.6	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	47.3	3.6	25.9	0.0	23.2	0.0	100.0
Remote	15.5	5.4	7.5	0.0	70.1	1.5	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	24.4	5.8	24.3	0.0	45.5	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	37.9	3.7	15.5	0.0	42.0	0.9	100.0
Socio-economic group							
Employee	76.7	0.0	17.6	0.0	5.7	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	29.3	2.8	17.8	0.0	49.2	0.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	32.4	11.4	20.4	0.0	35.8	0.0	100.0
Other	57.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities go to public hospitals more often than the rest (with rates of around 72 percent each), while the remaining socio-economic groups visited chemists and traditional healers more often.

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, 13 percent of women in this age-group gave birth in the past year. No girls aged 14 or under gave birth in the district. Around 13 percent of the females between 15 and 19 gave birth. The rate peaks at 26 percent for the 20-24 group, and then goes down, ending at 4 percent for the group aged 40 to 49. Virtually all pregnant women in this district received prenatal in the year preceding the survey.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote villages show a higher delivery rate for women between 20-24 years old, whereas households in accessible villages show a higher rate for the 25-29 cohort. A similar trend is observed when analysing by poverty status with poor households resembling households from remote villages.

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	6.3	52.3	6.0	23.1	12.3	0.0	100.0	64.6
Cluster Location								
Accessible	8.6	71.7	1.6	9.4	8.7	0.0	100.0	81.9
Remote	3.1	25.9	12.0	41.8	17.1	0.0	100.0	41.1
Poverty Status								
Poor	9.3	46.2	7.1	24.6	12.8	0.0	100.0	62.6
Non-poor	5.0	55.0	5.6	22.5	12.0	0.0	100.0	65.5
Socio-economic group								
Employee	18.3	76.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	94.3
Self-employed - agriculture	6.5	45.3	7.9	29.1	11.2	0.0	100.0	59.7
Self-employed - other	1.4	67.4	2.3	8.1	20.8	0.0	100.0	71.1
Other	0.0	57.0	0.0	43.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	57.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that the highest delivery rates correspond to the self-employed in non-agricultural activities and the employees at 16 and 15 percent, whereas the share for women in the 'other' socio economic group is virtually null. Employees report the highest rate (47 percent) for the 20-24 cohort, whereas the 'self-employed other' have their highest rate in the 25-29 cohort (29 percent). It is worth noting that 2 percent of the women in the 'self-employed agriculture' category gave birth in the 40+ cohort.

Table 4.7 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey. Roughly, 43 percent of births in the 5 years preceding the survey took place at home, almost 33 percent in hospitals and 18 percent at a dispensary. The ordering remains across cluster location, poverty status, and socio-economic group of the household head.

While households in remote villages had more births at homes, households in accessible villages had more births in hospitals and dispensaries.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that, whereas non-poor had ma share of deliveries in hospitals (with shares of 38 and 24 percent, respectively), poor households had a share of deliveries in dispensaries (24 and 16 percent, respectively).

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that hospitals and homes are the most common place for deliveries for all socio-economic groups. Dispensaries and health centres take the second place. While home represents 49 percent of deliveries for the self-employed in non-agricultural activities, the share for the employees is only 6 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, 65 deliveries were attended by a health professional, mostly midwives (52 percent of births). Traditional birth assistants (TBA) and trained TBA accounted for 23 and 6 percent respectively, and a further 6 percent were attended by doctors.

The analysis by cluster location shows that TBA were more common in remote villages (42 vs. 9 percent), whereas midwife assisted deliveries were more common in accessible villages (72 against 26 percent). Similar observations are evident when analysing by poverty status with non-poor households resembling households from accessible villages.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households in the 'employee' category report a higher share of deliveries attended by professionals: 94 percent, than the remaining socio-economic categories. In addition, the self-employed in agriculture show the lowest share of deliveries attended by midwives at 45 percent, whereas the 'other' category reports the highest share of births attended by TBAs at 43 percent.

Table 4.9: Nutritional status indicators and program participation rates

	Nutritional status indicators		Program participation		
	Stunted	Wasted	Nutrition	Weigh-in	Vaccinated
Total	21.0	1.1	68.9	98.1	88.3
Cluster Location					
Accessible	17.0	1.1	78.1	100.0	90.2
Remote	26.0	1.2	56.3	95.6	85.7
Poverty Status					
Poor	25.8	0.0	60.9	96.2	85.2
Non-poor	18.9	1.6	72.3	99.0	89.6
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	10.3	0.0	83.5	97.2	90.5
Self-employed - agriculture	24.4	0.7	64.4	98.4	89.1
Self-employed - other	9.6	3.5	80.1	100.0	86.3
Other	22.3	0.0	44.6	57.0	57.0
Gender and age in completed years					
Male	16.5	1.1	68.4	97.7	86.4
0	11.1	0.0	71.3	95.2	95.9
1	45.4	0.0	71.2	94.6	86.4
2	7.4	0.0	77.5	100.0	86.7
3	8.1	4.5	72.0	98.0	94.6
4	15.0	0.0	42.1	100.0	61.0
Female	25.9	1.2	69.4	98.6	90.2
0	17.6	0.0	63.8	97.4	86.3
1	43.0	0.0	64.7	97.9	83.9
2	12.4	0.0	71.3	100.0	100.0
3	16.7	0.0	76.1	100.0	100.0
4	28.6	7.3	86.0	100.0	92.2
Orphan status					
Orphaned	43.0	0.0	57.0	57.0	57.0
Not-orphaned	20.7	1.1	69.0	98.6	88.6
Foster status					
Fostered	4.6	19.0	52.9	100.0	70.4
Not-fostered	21.0	0.6	69.7	98.5	89.2

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

4.7 Child Nutrition

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

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

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

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

Weight-for-height is a measure of body mass in relation to body height and is an indicator of immediate nutritional status. A child who is below minus two standard

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

	Measles	BCG	DPT1	DPT2	DPT3	OPV0	OPV1	OPV2	OPV3	Vitamin A
Total	77.3	96.1	95.8	92.1	87.2	60.3	96.8	91.8	88.1	70.9
Cluster Location										
Accessible	76.2	96.8	96.0	92.8	87.5	76.1	97.7	92.8	89.2	73.7
Remote	78.8	95.1	95.6	91.1	86.7	38.8	95.6	90.6	86.7	67.1
Poverty Status										
Poor	72.1	95.8	91.8	89.5	77.6	54.2	95.0	88.8	80.8	48.5
Non-poor	79.5	96.2	97.6	93.2	91.3	63.0	97.6	93.2	91.3	80.6
Socio-economic group										
Employed	76.7	97.2	97.2	85.6	85.6	84.8	97.2	85.6	85.6	76.7
Self-employed - agriculture	78.5	96.8	97.8	94.8	89.3	55.3	97.8	94.5	89.3	67.5
Self-employed - other	74.4	95.4	90.7	87.0	82.3	68.4	95.4	87.0	87.0	81.4
Other	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0	57.0
Gender and age in completed years										
Male	82.2	96.9	95.6	93.1	91.9	62.2	97.5	95.0	93.8	74.0
0	25.2	97.8	95.2	82.0	80.1	48.7	95.2	82.0	80.1	47.7
1	88.0	94.6	83.2	83.2	83.2	66.8	94.6	94.6	94.6	75.7
2	97.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.4	76.4	100.0	100.0	96.4	71.3
3	98.0	93.8	98.0	98.0	98.0	55.9	98.0	98.0	98.0	90.7
4	94.8	98.5	98.5	98.5	98.5	62.6	98.5	98.5	98.5	80.6
Female	72.1	95.2	96.1	91.0	82.2	58.3	96.1	88.6	82.2	67.8
0	26.4	91.8	91.8	77.0	51.8	70.5	91.8	70.1	51.8	35.8
1	94.9	94.4	97.9	97.9	97.9	49.3	97.9	97.9	97.9	80.3
2	97.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	62.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.7
3	93.9	93.9	93.9	93.9	93.9	26.2	93.9	93.9	93.9	68.7
4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	57.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	86.4

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

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, 69 percent of the children participate in nutrition programs, 98 percent participate in weigh-in programs, and 88 percent in vaccination programs. In contrast, 1 percent is wasted and 22 percent is stunted.

Households in remote villages report a higher rate of stunted children than households in accessible villages, with rates of 26 and 17 percent respectively. As would have been expected, children from accessible villages report higher share of participation in all the three programs than children from remote villages. In turn, the latter report a higher share of stunted children than the former at 26 and 17 percent, respectively.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report a higher stunting rate than non-poor households at 26 and 19 percent, respectively. There are no wide differences in the wasting rate but non-poor households report a higher share of children participating in nutrition

programs than poor households at 72 and 61 percent respectively.

Regarding socio-economic status, households in the 'self-employed agriculture' category show the highest rate for stunted children, at 24 percent, whereas households from the 'self-employed other' and the 'employee' group show the lowest rate at 10 percent each.

The gender breakdown shows no difference in share of wasted children, but the rate of stunted females is higher than that of stunted males (26 against 17 percent, respectively).

A child is considered orphan if he/she is under 18 years old and has lost at least one parent. In turn, a child is considered fostered when at least one of his/her parents does not live at home. The breakdown by orphan status shows that the rate of stunting is higher among orphaned than non-orphaned children (at 43 and 21 percent, respectively). Regarding program participation, orphaned children are less likely to participate in all the programs than non-orphaned children.

In turn, the breakdown by foster status shows that non-fostered children report a higher rate of stunting (21 percent) than fostered children (5 percent). Similarly, non-fostered children report higher rates of participation in all the three programs than fostered children.

Table 4.10 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by type of vaccination received. Overall, 77 percent of children under 5 years have been vaccinated against measles, 96 percent against BCG and roughly between 88 and 97 percent received vaccination against DPT and OPV (except for OPV0, at 60 percent). Finally, 71 percent of the children in the district received vitamin A supplements.

There are no differences by cluster location or poverty status. The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that vaccination rates in most cases are highest for children from the "employee"

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

	Health Card	Other	Total
Total	97.9	2.1	100.0
Cluster Location			
Accessible	99.1	0.9	100.0
Remote	96.1	3.9	100.0
Poverty Status			
Poor	97.9	2.1	100.0
Non-poor	97.9	2.1	100.0
Socio-economic group			
Employed	100.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	97.7	2.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	97.6	2.4	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	100.0
Gender and age in completed years			
Male	98.3	1.7	100.0
0	90.9	9.1	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	97.5	2.5	100.0
0	92.3	7.7	100.0
1	100.0	0.0	100.0
2	100.0	0.0	100.0
3	100.0	0.0	100.0
4	100.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

category, and lowest for children from the "self-employed other" category.

74 percent of children from accessible villages received vitamin A supplements compared to 67 percent of children from remote villages. Similarly, the former report a higher share of children vaccinated with OPV0 than the latter at 76 and 39 percent respectively. There are no sharp differences between poor and non-poor households in the distribution of vaccinated children by type of vaccination received, except for OPV0 and vitamin A supplements with non-poor households reporting a higher share than poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that boys have higher vaccination rates against measles (82 against 72 percent), but similar shares to girls for the rest of vaccines. The age breakdown shows a trend in children receiving vaccinations among girls but not among boys. The rate of vaccinated girls increases with age to 100 percent at the age of 4 years except for OPV0 which shows an increase to a peak at age 2 years and decrease again. The trend is not clear for boys.

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

There appears to be no strong correlation between cluster location, poverty status or socio-economic categories with the vaccinated children by source of information.

Furthermore, virtually all children aged 1 and above had vaccination cards. Children between 0 and 11 months had vaccination cards in 92 and 91 percent of the cases, for girls and boys, respectively.

5 EMPLOYMENT

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

5.1 Employment Status of Total Adult Population

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

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

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	62.8	34.4	97.2	0.0	2.8	2.8	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	63.6	33.4	97.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	100.0
Remote	61.4	36.2	97.6	0.0	2.4	2.4	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	66.3	30.2	96.5	0.0	3.5	3.5	100.0
Non-poor	61.6	35.8	97.4	0.0	2.6	2.6	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	49.6	47.2	96.7	0.0	3.3	3.3	100.0
15-29	60.2	36.7	96.9	0.0	3.1	3.1	100.0
30-49	39.4	59.6	99.1	0.0	0.9	0.9	100.0
50-64	44.2	53.6	97.9	0.0	2.1	2.1	100.0
65+	55.4	26.0	81.4	0.0	18.6	18.6	100.0
Female	75.1	22.6	97.6	0.0	2.4	2.4	100.0
15-29	81.7	16.1	97.8	0.0	2.2	2.2	100.0
30-49	65.9	33.3	99.2	0.0	0.8	0.8	100.0
50-64	72.8	27.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	83.1	1.7	84.8	0.0	15.2	15.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

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

	Total population			Heads of household		
	Active population	Unemployment rate	Underemploy-ment rate	Active population	Unemploy-ment rate	Underemploy-ment rate
Total	97.2	0.0	35.4	97.6	0.0	53.7
Cluster Location						
Accessible	97.0	0.0	34.4	97.7	0.0	54.2
Remote	97.6	0.0	37.1	97.5	0.0	52.9
Poverty Status						
Poor	96.5	0.0	31.3	94.1	0.0	46.2
Non-poor	97.4	0.0	36.7	98.5	0.0	55.6
Gender and age						
Male	96.7	0.0	48.8	97.9	0.0	59.7
15-29	96.9	0.0	37.9	100.0	0.0	66.9
30-49	99.1	0.0	60.2	100.0	0.0	62.4
50-64	97.9	0.0	54.8	98.9	0.0	54.2
65+	81.4	0.0	31.9	80.3	0.0	34.2
Female	97.6	0.0	23.1	96.5	0.0	29.8
15-29	97.8	0.0	16.5	100.0	0.0	24.3
30-49	99.2	0.0	33.5	97.3	0.0	32.8
50-64	100.0	0.0	27.2	100.0	0.0	43.7
65+	84.8	0.0	2.1	85.4	0.0	5.1

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

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

	Active population				Active		
	Employed	Under emp.	Working	Unemployed	Total	Inactive	Total
Total	76.3	20.0	96.3	0.0	96.3	3.7	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	78.4	17.2	95.6	0.0	95.6	4.4	100.0
Remote	72.8	24.6	97.4	0.0	97.4	2.6	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	74.8	22.6	97.4	0.0	97.4	2.6	100.0
Non-poor	76.9	19.0	95.9	0.0	95.9	4.1	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	69.1	26.5	95.6	0.0	95.6	4.4	100.0
15-16	81.3	9.5	90.8	0.0	90.8	9.2	100.0
17-19	77.5	18.8	96.3	0.0	96.3	3.7	100.0
20-21	51.4	48.6	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
22-23	50.2	49.8	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	82.4	14.4	96.9	0.0	96.9	3.1	100.0
15-16	93.7	2.9	96.6	0.0	96.6	3.4	100.0
17-19	73.1	18.3	91.4	0.0	91.4	8.6	100.0
20-21	77.5	22.5	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
22-23	86.2	13.8	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

5.1.1 Work Status

Table 5.1 shows that 63 percent of the adult population is employed and 34 percent underemployed. Unemployment is virtually 0 percent and the inactivity rate is 3 percent. There are no clear differences by cluster location. In turn, poor households show a higher employment rate than non-poor households. For both genders, underemployment peaks for the cohort aged between 30 and 49. Around 60 percent of the males in this group are underemployed, whereas the share for females is 33 percent

The adult population that was not working in the 4 weeks preceding the survey was mostly inactive, rather than unemployed. This means that most of them were students, sick people, etc. rather than people looking for work and ready for it. As would be expected, the share of inactive population is higher in the 65+ cohort.

5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads

Table 5.2 shows the principal labour force indicators for the adult population compared to the household heads. Activity rates are similar for total population and household heads, but underemployment is higher among the latter. The rate of underemployment is higher in remote villages and non-poor households, for the total population as well as for household heads.

The gender breakdown shows that in the general population males are more likely to be underemployed than females, with rates of 49 and 23 percent, respectively. A similar difference is observed for the general population.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that underemployment decreases with age of the household head. A similar difference is observed for the household heads.

5.1.3 Youth Employment

Table 5.3 shows the distribution of the youth (ages 15 to 24) by work status. The activity rate of this group is similar to the overall population, at 96 percent. However, underemployment is lower: 20 percent of workers is underemployed, as opposed to 35 percent of workers for the whole adult population. The youth from remote villages has higher underemployment rate than their counterparts.

The breakdown by poverty status shows no strong correlation with population

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	4.4	38.9	12.0	44.7	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	6.2	34.3	16.2	43.3	100.0
Remote	1.2	47.0	4.6	47.2	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.0	41.1	6.6	52.3	100.0
Non-poor	5.8	38.2	13.8	42.2	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	6.8	54.6	16.5	22.1	100.0
15-29	4.7	26.5	17.5	51.2	100.0
30-49	9.4	68.0	21.1	1.5	100.0
50-64	8.7	87.2	1.4	2.7	100.0
65+	0.0	90.5	4.0	5.5	100.0
Female	2.1	24.6	7.9	65.5	100.0
15-29	0.3	12.0	7.3	80.5	100.0
30-49	4.7	23.7	11.6	60.0	100.0
50-64	1.9	52.6	1.9	43.6	100.0
65+	0.0	64.1	2.3	33.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

Table 5.5 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employer

	State/NGO/ Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	4.1	51.4	44.6	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	6.1	50.8	43.2	100.0
Remote	0.6	52.4	47.0	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.0	47.7	52.3	100.0
Non-poor	5.4	52.6	42.0	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	6.1	72.0	21.9	100.0
15-29	3.7	45.6	50.8	100.0
30-49	8.8	89.9	1.4	100.0
50-64	8.7	88.6	2.7	100.0
65+	0.0	94.5	5.5	100.0
Female	2.2	32.5	65.3	100.0
15-29	0.6	19.5	79.9	100.0
30-49	4.5	35.8	59.7	100.0
50-64	1.9	52.6	45.4	100.0
65+	0.0	66.5	33.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

Table 5.6 - Percentage distribution of the working population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	Pub & priv services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	72.4	1.9	9.5	10.8	5.4	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	64.4	2.7	13.5	12.7	6.8	100.0
Remote	86.3	0.6	2.7	7.6	2.8	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	83.9	0.5	0.7	9.5	5.3	100.0
Non-poor	68.6	2.4	12.4	11.2	5.4	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	69.3	4.0	12.3	7.3	7.1	100.0
15-29	59.6	3.8	13.0	17.7	5.9	100.0
30-49	69.6	5.8	14.3	0.1	10.1	100.0
50-64	89.9	0.0	8.7	0.0	1.4	100.0
65+	95.1	0.0	0.0	0.9	4.0	100.0
Female	75.2	0.0	7.0	14.0	3.8	100.0
15-29	67.7	0.0	4.9	24.1	3.3	100.0
30-49	76.7	0.0	12.2	5.5	5.7	100.0
50-64	91.4	0.0	3.0	4.8	0.8	100.0
65+	88.3	0.0	0.0	9.3	2.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

distribution by work status.

The gender breakdown shows that the underemployment rate among the male youth is higher than that for the female youth at 27 and 14 percent respectively. It can be seen that, for males, underemployment is remarkably higher in the 22-23 age-group at 50 percent, whereas for females the highest share is found in the 20-21 age-group at 23 percent.

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	2.5	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	65.0	76.3	69.1	74.6
Mining & non-primary	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
Services	75.6	90.3	0.0	0.0	41.8	56.5	1.0	1.0	12.1	6.9
Domestic duties	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.0	22.5	7.9	14.8
Other	16.4	9.7	0.0	0.0	36.1	43.5	0.0	0.3	7.0	3.8

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

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

	Government		Private		Household		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture	0.0	10.0	76.8	80.1	67.7	76.3	70.0	75.7
Mining & non-primary	3.7	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0
Services	79.5	79.9	10.7	10.8	0.0	2.7	12.6	6.7
Domestic duties	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.5	32.3	19.4	7.4	14.2
Other	16.8	10.1	7.3	7.6	0.0	1.7	6.3	3.4

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

5.2 Working population

Table 5.4 shows that the vast majority of the working population is formed by the self-employed in agriculture at 39 percent, or in other activities (inactive, unemployed, unpaid workers, domestic workers) at 45 percent. 12 percent is self-employed in non-agricultural activities and employees account 4 percent of the working population. The population self-employed in agriculture is higher in remote villages, whereas the 'self-employed other' group is bigger in accessible villages. Poor households report a lower share of self-employed workers in non-agricultural activities and a higher share in other activities than non-poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that a higher share of males is self-employed in agriculture or in non-agricultural activities, while females report a higher share in 'other' activities. The cut down by age-groups shows that the share of employees peaks for males in the 30-39 cohort (9 percent), the self-employed in agriculture for the 65+ cohort (91 percent), the 'self-employed other' for the 30-49 cohort (21 percent) and the 'other' for females in the 15-29 age-group (51 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 51 percent of the working population, which combined with individuals who work for their own households represent up to 96 percent of the working population.

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

Males report a higher share working for a private employer, while females report a higher share working for the household. Most males work for a private employer, except in the 15-29 cohort, where 51 percent of them work in the household. The share of females working in the private sector increases gradually with age, but is always lower than the respective shares of males. At the same time, the share of females working for the household decreases with age.

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	5.4	53.7	18.8	22.1	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	7.5	47.0	27.4	18.1	100.0
Remote	2.1	64.5	4.7	28.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.0	58.7	5.5	35.7	100.0
Non-poor	6.9	52.3	22.5	18.3	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	6.4	66.0	22.8	4.8	100.0
15-29	7.5	46.9	32.2	13.3	100.0
30-49	5.4	70.4	24.2	0.0	100.0
50-64	9.9	85.2	0.0	4.9	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	3.5	30.0	10.9	55.6	100.0
15-29	0.8	25.4	0.0	73.8	100.0
30-49	5.3	22.3	20.0	52.4	100.0
50-64	3.2	64.0	2.9	29.9	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

Table 5.10 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer

	State/NGO/Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	5.0	72.8	22.2	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	7.4	74.1	18.5	100.0
Remote	1.1	70.8	28.1	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.0	64.3	35.7	100.0
Non-poor	6.4	75.3	18.3	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	5.8	89.7	4.5	100.0
15-29	6.8	81.0	12.2	100.0
30-49	4.7	95.3	0.0	100.0
50-64	9.9	85.2	4.9	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	3.4	40.3	56.3	100.0
15-29	1.5	22.3	76.2	100.0
30-49	4.6	43.0	52.4	100.0
50-64	3.2	66.9	29.9	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

Table 5.6 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by main activity. The categories are agriculture; mining, manufacturing, energy and construction; services (transport, trade, private and public services); domestic duties; and other. Overall, agriculture and domestic duties together account for 83 percent of the working population. 72 percent of the population is engaged in agriculture, and 11 percent in domestic duties.

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

The gender breakdown shows that the most common activities for females are agriculture and household duties, accounting for 89 percent of the working population. These are the main activities for men as well, but they are less concentrated, with 24 percent in other activities.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that, for both genders, younger cohorts have higher shares dedicated to household duties. The share of males dedicated to agriculture tends to increase with age from 60 percent for the 15-29 cohort to 95 percent for the 65+ cohort. The trend is less clear for females.

Table 5.7 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by employment status, gender and activity. Overall, around 69 percent of the male labour force is in agriculture, whereas the share for females is 75 percent. Domestic duties have the second highest share for females at 15 percent, whereas in males services rank the second at 12 percent. Each of the remaining activities occupies less than 10 percent of the labour force for each gender, but with the shares for males higher than or equal to those for females.

For both genders, most of the employees work in services with 76 percent of males and 90 percent females. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities work also mostly in services, with shares of 42 percent for males and 57 percent for females. In the 'other' group, females report a higher share working in agriculture than males at 76 and 65 percent respectively. In turn, the latter report a higher share working in domestic duties than the former at 34 and 23 percent respectively.

The percentage distribution of the working population by employer, gender, and activity is shown in Table 5.8. The working population employed by the

Table 5.11 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	Public & private services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	73.4	3.5	14.1	2.0	7.1	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	63.3	5.3	19.5	1.7	10.2	100.0
Remote	89.7	0.6	5.3	2.4	2.0	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	94.5	1.6	2.4	0.0	1.6	100.0
Non-poor	67.5	4.0	17.4	2.5	8.6	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	70.8	5.3	16.5	0.0	7.5	100.0
15-29	59.2	4.8	25.6	0.0	10.4	100.0
30-49	71.1	7.2	13.7	0.0	8.0	100.0
50-64	90.1	0.0	9.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	78.4	0.0	9.5	5.7	6.3	100.0
15-29	88.1	0.0	0.8	10.4	0.8	100.0
30-49	67.9	0.0	16.6	4.6	10.8	100.0
50-64	93.9	0.0	3.2	0.0	2.9	100.0
65+	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

government is mostly dedicated to services. The labour force working for private employers (whether formal or informal) is concentrated in agriculture. Among the individuals who were employed by the household, the main activity was agriculture (68 percent of males, 76 percent of females), but domestic duties also reports important shares (32 percent of males, 19 percent of females in this category).

5.3 Underemployed Population

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status is shown in Table 5.9. Overall, 54 percent of the underemployed population is self-employed in agriculture, 18 percent self-employed in non-agricultural activities, 22 percent in 'other' activities and 5 percent is formed by employees. Even though self-employed in agriculture are 39 percent of the working population, they represent 54 percent of the underemployed.

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

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

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

For males, the employees peak at 10 percent in the 50-64 cohort. The share self-employed in agriculture tends to increase with age peaking at 100 percent for the 65+ cohort. The share self-employed in non-agricultural activities decreases with age showing practically null shares in the older cohorts. The 'other' group shows positive rates only in the 15-29 age-group. In the case of females, the share self-employed in agriculture tends to increase with age, and the share in 'other' activities decreases.

Table 5.10 shows the percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer. Overall, the

Table 5.12 - Percentage distribution of the unemployed population by reason

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

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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	40.8	0.0	33.0	0.0	20.8	0.0	5.4	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	0.0	0.0	43.7	0.0	34.2	0.0	14.2	0.0	7.9	100.0
Remote	0.0	0.0	34.4	0.0	30.3	0.0	35.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	0.0	0.0	26.3	0.0	57.0	0.0	16.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	0.0	47.3	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.6	0.0	7.9	100.0
Gender and age										
Male	0.0	0.0	39.3	0.0	30.3	0.0	20.7	0.0	9.6	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.5	0.0	80.5	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	72.9	0.0	27.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	0.0	42.7	0.0	36.4	0.0	20.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	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	80.1	0.0	19.9	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is inactive population aged 15+

underemployed population mostly works for a private employer at 73 percent and in second place for the household at 22 percent. The State, NGOs, and other types of employer only account for 5 percent of the underemployed population.

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

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

	Fetching water	Fetching firewood	Cleaning toilet	Cooking	Care of children	Care or elderly/sick
Total	67.2	47.1	55.6	60.3	67.7	96.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	68.8	38.7	60.6	61.5	68.5	96.6
Remote	64.4	61.8	46.9	58.2	66.2	95.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	62.9	56.7	45.7	58.6	73.6	97.9
Non-poor	68.7	43.9	59.0	60.9	65.7	95.4
Gender and age						
Male	40.4	26.3	26.3	20.8	52.7	95.2
15-29	61.4	35.6	32.1	26.5	41.7	97.9
30-49	29.4	20.3	22.7	19.0	67.1	97.6
50-64	21.5	23.8	26.8	11.7	59.4	92.8
65+	13.3	11.5	13.1	13.2	22.1	70.6
Female	92.0	66.3	82.8	96.8	81.5	96.7
15-29	97.7	66.2	83.6	99.5	82.5	98.2
30-49	94.4	63.6	88.7	97.4	87.2	98.6
50-64	80.9	84.9	71.2	95.3	72.1	92.8
65+	63.7	48.3	68.8	79.2	63.4	85.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed males are strongly concentrated in private employers at 90 percent. In turn, underemployed females are almost evenly split between private employers and household, with shares of 40 and 56 percent respectively.

The age breakdown shows that underemployed males report positive shares working for the household only in the 15-29 cohort. The share of underemployed females working for the households tends to decrease with age but they are always higher than the respective shares of males.

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by main economic activity is presented in Table 5.11. Overall, 73 percent of the underemployed workers are dedicated to agriculture, and 14 percent to services, with the remaining activities reporting shares less than 5 percent each.

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

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed women have a higher share dedicated to agriculture than underemployed males, who have a higher share in services. The age breakdown shows that for both genders the shares dedicated to agriculture decreases with age. A similar trend is observed in services.

5.4 Unemployed and Inactive Population

Unemployment refers to a person who is actively looking for a job and is ready to work. If the individual is not working but is not looking for a job or is not ready to work, he or she is part of the inactive population. For instance, a full-time student, an ill individual or a retired person are not unemployed, because they either are not looking for a job (the student and the retired), or are not able to work (the ill person). Table 5.12 shows the main causes for unemployment. None of the respondents in the district was classified as unemployed.

Table 5.13 shows the main causes of economic inactivity. Overall, being a student is the main cause for inactivity (41 percent), followed by being too old (33 percent) and infirmity (21 percent each).

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	75.5	29.2	24.0	28.5	46.0	81.3
Cluster Location						
Accessible	77.4	18.7	24.4	28.0	43.7	79.5
Remote	72.6	46.2	23.5	29.3	49.8	84.2
Poverty Status						
Poor	65.8	38.3	15.4	23.0	60.2	84.2
Non-poor	80.6	24.4	28.6	31.4	38.5	79.8
Gender and age						
Male	63.3	23.6	16.6	13.3	45.6	76.2
5-9	48.8	10.4	5.0	1.8	48.4	57.1
10-14	74.8	34.0	25.7	22.4	43.3	91.2
Female	88.0	34.9	31.7	44.0	46.5	86.5
5-9	74.4	14.3	5.9	9.9	38.6	69.9
10-14	98.4	50.6	51.3	70.0	52.5	99.2
Orphan status						
Orphaned	74.1	39.3	36.5	44.3	49.5	86.5
Not-orphaned	76.0	27.4	22.1	25.7	45.7	80.3
Foster status						
Fostered	75.7	41.9	20.5	30.4	27.4	85.1
Not-fostered	75.5	27.5	23.6	27.0	48.9	80.1

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

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

The gender breakdown shows that females report being a student or being too old more frequently than males. 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 concentrated in the 30-49 cohort for females, but is relatively more widespread among males.

5.5 Household Tasks

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

Remote villages report higher shares of population fetching firewood than accessible villages. In turn, the latter report higher shares cleaning the toilet than the former. Both clusters report similar shares for the remaining household activities.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households report higher shares of population fetching water and cleaning toilets, whereas poor households report remarkably higher shares for the remaining household activities than the former.

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 66 and 97 percent. The shares for males range from 21 to 53 percent, except for taking care of the sick and elderly (95 percent).

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

Table 5.16 - Child labour (age 5 to 14)

		Main activity			Employer	
	Working	Agriculture	Household	Other	Private	Household
Total	58.0	19.4	79.8	0.8	1.2	98.8
Cluster Location						
Accessible	58.6	13.5	86.1	0.5	0.5	99.5
Remote	57.1	29.0	69.6	1.4	2.5	97.5
Poverty Status						
Poor	60.5	21.1	78.0	0.9	1.2	98.8
Non-poor	56.7	18.5	80.7	0.8	1.3	98.7
Gender and age						
Male	57.9	20.2	79.0	0.8	1.4	98.6
5-9	37.6	4.3	93.9	1.8	1.8	98.2
10-14	97.7	32.3	67.7	0.0	1.0	99.0
Female	58.2	18.6	80.6	0.9	1.1	98.9
5-9	37.7	4.7	93.3	2.0	2.0	98.0
10-14	99.0	29.1	70.9	0.0	0.4	99.6
Orphan status						
Orphaned	82.8	18.6	80.4	1.0	1.0	99.0
Not-orphaned	55.0	19.4	79.8	0.8	1.3	98.7
Foster status						
Fostered	75.7	24.8	71.9	3.3	3.3	96.7
Not-fostered	54.7	18.4	81.0	0.6	1.1	98.9

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

5.6 Child Labour

Table 5.15 shows that the most common activity for children between 5 and 14 years old is taking care of the elderly or the sick and fetching water. Children from remote villages report higher shares in most activities than children from accessible villages. Children from non-poor households report higher shares fetching water, cleaning toilets and taking care of children, whereas children from poor households report higher shares in the remaining household activities.

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

The breakdown by orphan status shows that orphaned children are more likely to undertake most of the activities under analysis than non-orphaned children. Similarly, fostered children are more likely to undertake most of the household tasks under analysis than non-fostered children.

The main descriptive statistics for child labour are presented in Table 5.16. The most important result of the table is that 58 percent of the children are economically active. Their main economic activity is mostly household duties at 80 percent.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that children from remote villages report a higher share working in agriculture and a lower share working in household activities than children from accessible villages. Similar observations are evident when analysing by poverty status with children from poor households resembling children from remote villages.

The gender breakdown shows no strong correlation with child labour. However, the main difference is given by the age breakdown. Roughly one third of the children in the 5-9 cohort were part of the working population, whereas virtually all the children in the 10-14 cohort were working at the time of the survey. Virtually all the children were working in the household by 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 83 and 55 percent, respectively. Similarly, fostered children are more likely to be working than non-fostered children, at rates of 76 and 55 percent, respectively. Fostered children are more likely to work in agriculture than non-fostered children,

who in turn report a higher share working in household activities.

6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES

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

6.1 Economic Situation

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

6.1.1 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Community

Table 6.1 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of the economic situation of the community compared to the year before the survey. Results show that 26 percent of all households in the district reported a positive change in the economic situation of their community. 33 percent of the population reported observing no changes in their community's economic situation. 36 percent of all households reported community economic condition to have deteriorated and a further 6 percent responded 'I don't know'.

Looking at the overall community economic situation by household characteristics, it is observed that cluster location does not show correlation with the perceived economic change. However, 19 percent of poor households reported deterioration in their community's economic situation compared to 12 percent of non-poor households.

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported worsening of their community's economic situation is lower than that of households with one or two members at 27 and 44 percent respectively. Furthermore, there is a difference of 11 percentage points between households owning no land and those owning six or more hectares of land who reported deterioration in their community's economic situation at 40 and 29 percent respectively. In addition, the percentage of households owning small livestock who reported worsening conditions in their community's economic situation is higher than that of households owning both small and large livestock at 48 and 30 percent respectively.

While 34 percent of households whose main income earner is self-employed in agriculture reported deterioration in their community's economic situation, the share for households whose main income earner belongs to the 'other' category is only 7 percent. Furthermore, 17 percent of households where the household head is widowed, separated or divorced reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their communities compared to 32 percent of households where the head has a loose union.

It is also observed that the percentage of households where the head has no education and reported deterioration in their community's economic conditions is 19 percentage points lower than that of households where the head has secondary education or more, at 24 and 43 percent respectively. Finally, while 26 percent of male-headed households report

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

	Much Worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better	Don't Know	Total
Total	13.2	22.6	32.9	24.8	0.5	6.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	13.9	21.5	32.9	25.7	0.7	5.1	100.0
Remote	12.1	24.4	32.7	23.2	0.0	7.6	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	18.7	19.5	36.2	21.1	0.0	4.5	100.0
Non-poor	11.8	23.4	32.0	25.8	0.6	6.4	100.0
Household size							
1-2	15.0	28.7	33.1	18.0	1.7	3.4	100.0
3-4	10.1	23.6	30.0	25.3	0.0	11.0	100.0
5-6	19.3	19.4	30.4	28.3	0.5	2.0	100.0
7+	9.1	17.7	44.3	26.1	0.0	2.8	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	10.5	28.8	30.4	26.0	0.2	4.2	100.0
< 1 ha	44.4	11.0	8.1	19.3	0.0	17.2	100.0
1-1.99 ha	15.1	33.4	35.3	11.1	0.6	4.4	100.0
2-3.99 ha	11.5	15.7	40.8	24.1	1.3	6.6	100.0
4-5.99 ha	15.0	19.6	28.3	26.6	0.0	10.5	100.0
6+ ha	9.8	19.4	34.3	33.5	0.0	2.9	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	13.0	22.5	33.4	24.5	0.4	6.1	100.0
Small only	28.7	18.9	37.9	8.7	1.2	4.7	100.0
Large only	5.4	26.3	24.4	33.3	0.0	10.7	100.0
Both	2.9	26.7	19.7	45.9	1.5	3.3	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	21.9	8.5	29.6	32.8	1.6	5.6	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	13.3	20.9	35.0	24.6	0.5	5.7	100.0
Self-employed - other	10.3	37.1	24.6	23.4	0.0	4.6	100.0
Other	0.0	6.6	50.1	11.7	0.0	31.6	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	14.5	22.1	31.1	26.4	0.6	5.3	100.0
Female	8.1	24.8	39.6	18.5	0.0	9.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	26.6	28.9	16.7	25.9	0.0	2.0	100.0
Monogamous	12.2	21.6	34.1	27.7	0.2	4.3	100.0
Polygamous	22.5	27.3	16.0	20.0	0.0	14.3	100.0
Loose union	22.7	3.4	29.0	32.3	0.0	12.7	100.0
Widow/div/sep	5.5	28.2	42.1	14.9	1.7	7.7	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	8.1	15.8	42.3	25.4	0.0	8.4	100.0
Primary	11.5	27.0	29.5	25.6	0.5	5.9	100.0
Secondary +	27.2	16.0	32.1	20.9	0.9	3.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

improvement in the economic conditions of their communities, the share for female-headed households is 19 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

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	18.8	26.2	31.3	23.3	0.4	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	20.1	24.7	31.6	23.2	0.5	0.0	100.0
Remote	16.6	28.7	30.9	23.4	0.4	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	29.3	28.4	28.1	13.6	0.7	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	16.1	25.6	32.2	25.8	0.4	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	20.6	28.1	24.1	27.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	14.5	27.0	34.2	24.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	26.4	22.9	29.7	20.2	0.8	0.0	100.0
7+	15.1	27.1	35.5	20.8	1.4	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	17.1	28.8	34.6	19.2	0.3	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	37.0	6.7	45.7	10.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	17.8	40.3	24.5	16.8	0.6	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	21.2	22.8	28.2	27.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	24.2	23.0	35.8	15.1	1.9	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	8.9	24.6	26.5	40.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	18.1	26.5	32.6	22.6	0.3	0.0	100.0
Small only	39.9	28.6	15.3	15.0	1.2	0.0	100.0
Large only	11.7	14.4	43.3	30.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	8.8	23.5	22.2	42.5	3.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	26.2	6.1	37.3	28.5	1.9	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	21.8	24.3	29.6	24.1	0.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	3.4	45.0	31.1	19.8	0.7	0.0	100.0
Other	25.6	0.0	69.9	4.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	18.1	25.1	29.6	26.7	0.5	0.0	100.0
Female	21.4	30.6	38.1	9.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	16.8	26.1	29.2	27.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	17.7	24.9	28.1	28.7	0.5	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	26.1	27.4	36.1	9.1	1.3	0.0	100.0
Loose union	20.6	12.3	52.8	14.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	19.6	34.3	33.3	12.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	25.7	24.0	31.0	19.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	13.9	29.5	31.8	24.6	0.2	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	27.5	16.8	30.1	23.8	1.9	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

before the survey. Nearly a quarter (24 percent) of the households reported an improvement in their economic conditions, while 31 percent reported same conditions compared to the year preceding the survey.

29 percent of poor households reported much worse condition of the household's economic situation compared to 16 percent of non-poor households. Cluster location of the household does not show correlation with the perceived household economic situation.

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their households is lower than that of households with one or two members at 22

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	37.2	29.4	28.9	4.5	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	39.8	29.2	26.4	4.6	100.0
Remote	32.7	29.6	33.3	4.4	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	23.0	27.4	44.9	4.7	100.0
Non-poor	40.8	29.9	24.8	4.5	100.0
Household size					
1-2	33.8	30.9	28.2	7.0	100.0
3-4	33.6	30.9	28.4	7.0	100.0
5-6	43.8	26.6	28.7	0.9	100.0
7+	39.6	28.0	31.5	0.8	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	45.2	23.1	30.3	1.4	100.0
< 1 ha	64.8	9.3	17.9	8.1	100.0
1-1.99 ha	21.1	43.9	26.1	9.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	34.3	32.9	28.4	4.4	100.0
4-5.99 ha	21.8	30.5	40.2	7.5	100.0
6+ ha	43.2	30.8	21.9	4.1	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	35.9	30.4	29.6	4.1	100.0
Small only	44.5	19.4	24.0	12.2	100.0
Large only	29.5	33.6	31.2	5.8	100.0
Both	55.2	21.5	20.4	2.9	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	90.7	7.1	2.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	29.7	31.2	34.0	5.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	43.8	33.2	19.8	3.2	100.0
Other	10.1	25.8	49.3	14.7	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	39.5	28.9	28.6	3.1	100.0
Female	28.2	31.4	30.1	10.3	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	27.8	34.1	33.2	5.0	100.0
Monogamous	40.6	27.7	28.5	3.2	100.0
Polygamous	30.1	37.6	25.7	6.6	100.0
Loose union	55.2	25.0	19.8	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	26.6	31.3	32.8	9.3	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	25.1	35.2	33.4	6.2	100.0
Primary	35.8	31.5	29.4	3.3	100.0
Secondary +	59.5	13.1	20.6	6.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

and 27 percent respectively. Furthermore, while 17 percent of households owning no land report much worse economic conditions of their households, the share for households owning six or more hectares of land is 9 percent. Disaggregation of the data further shows that, while 46 percent of households owning both small and large livestock reported improvement of their households' economic condition the share for households owning small livestock only is 16 percent.

The percentage of households in the employee category who reported an improvement in their households' economic conditions is higher than that of households whose main income earner is in the 'other' category at 31 and 5 percent respectively. Furthermore, while 54 percent of households where the head is widowed, separated or divorced reported deterioration in their household's economic conditions, the share for the households where the head has a loose union is 33 percent. 52 percent of female-headed households report deterioration of their economic conditions compared to 43 percent of male-headed households. Finally, the percentage of households reporting worsening economic conditions is higher for households where the head has no education than households where the head has secondary education or more at 50 and 45 percent respectively.

6.2 Self-reported Difficulties in Satisfying Household Needs

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

6.2.1 Food Needs

Table 6.3 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in satisfying the food needs of the household during the year before the survey. Overall, 66 percent of the district's households never/seldom experienced food shortages while the remaining population experienced food shortages frequently (often/always). While 40 percent of households in accessible villages had never experienced food shortages, the share for households in remote villages is 33 percent. Similarly, 41 percent of non-poor households never experienced food shortages compared to 23 percent of poor households.

74 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land never/seldom experienced problems satisfying food needs compared to 68 percent of landless household. Furthermore, while 34 percent of households with one or two members never experienced food shortages, the share for households with seven or more members is 40 percent. There is also some correlation between livestock ownership and satisfying food needs. While 34 percent of households owning no livestock frequently experienced food shortages, the share for households owning both small and large livestock is 23 percent.

The socio-economic group of the household also shows some correlation with the household's ability to satisfy its food needs. While 64 percent of households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group reported frequent problems satisfying food needs, the share for households whose main income earner is an employee is only 2 percent. Furthermore, 55 percent of households where the head has a loose union never experienced food shortages compared to 27 percent of households where the head is widowed, divorced or separated.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households reported having food shortages more frequently than male-headed households as 40 percent of female-headed households experienced frequent food shortages compared to 32 percent of male-headed households. Likewise, while 39 percent of households where the head has no education experienced food shortages frequently, the share for households where the head has secondary education or more is 28 percent.

6.2.2 Paying School Fees

Table 6.4 shows the percentage distribution of households by the difficulty in paying school fees during the year before the survey. At the time of the survey, 95 percent of the households in the district reported that they never had problems paying school fees and only 4 percent of the households reported that they seldom 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).

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	95.4	3.9	0.7	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	93.9	5.3	0.8	0.0	100.0
Remote	98.0	1.7	0.3	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	94.9	3.6	1.5	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	95.5	4.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	88.9	10.1	1.0	0.0	100.0
7+	89.4	7.9	2.7	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	92.3	7.2	0.4	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	97.1	0.0	2.9	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	99.4	0.0	0.6	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	98.0	1.3	0.7	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	98.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	95.4	4.0	0.7	0.0	100.0
Small only	98.8	0.0	1.2	0.0	100.0
Large only	89.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	95.2	4.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	81.4	16.0	2.6	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	96.7	3.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	97.4	1.7	0.9	0.0	100.0
Other	91.8	8.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	94.8	4.6	0.7	0.0	100.0
Female	97.9	1.4	0.6	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	98.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	95.0	4.3	0.7	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	89.4	10.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	97.6	2.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	97.2	2.2	0.7	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	97.4	2.2	0.4	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	81.3	16.2	2.5	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

Poverty status and cluster location do not show strong correlation with the ability to pay school fees. However, smaller households find problems paying school fees less frequently than larger households. Virtually all (100 percent) households with one or two members never had problems paying school fees

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	96.7	2.5	0.8	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	95.5	3.7	0.8	0.0	100.0
Remote	98.7	0.4	0.9	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	98.4	0.0	1.6	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	96.2	3.2	0.6	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	98.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	95.3	3.5	1.2	0.0	100.0
5-6	96.5	2.3	1.3	0.0	100.0
7+	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	91.5	6.4	2.1	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	96.6	3.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	98.8	0.6	0.6	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	96.2	2.9	0.9	0.0	100.0
Small only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	96.8	2.1	1.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	94.5	5.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	96.3	2.7	1.0	0.0	100.0
Female	98.2	1.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	94.4	5.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	98.1	0.5	1.3	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	87.9	12.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	98.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	94.5	4.8	0.6	0.0	100.0
Primary	97.4	2.0	0.5	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	97.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

compared to 89 percent of households with seven or more members.

Furthermore, 9 percent of households with six or more hectares of land seldom experienced problems paying school fees, whereas the share for households with less than two hectares of land were virtually null. In addition, while 11 percent of households owning large livestock reported seldom experiencing problems paying school fees, the share for households owning small livestock is virtually null.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that 97 percent of households whose main income earner is self-employed either in agriculture or in non-agricultural activities never had problems paying school fees compared to 81 percent of households whose main income earner is an employee.

98 percent of households where the head is single never had problems paying school fees, compared to 89 percent of the polygamous household head. Virtually all households where the head had no education never had problems paying school fees, whereas the share for households where the head has secondary education or more is 81 percent.

There appears to be no strong correlation between gender of the household and the ability to pay school fees.

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. Almost all (97 percent) households in the district reported that they never had problems paying house rent. However, it is noticeable that while 12 percent of households where the head is 'polygamous' had problems paying house rent seldom, the share for 'monogamous' household heads is virtually null. Similarly, 6 percent of households whose main income earner is self-employed in agriculture and 5 percent of households where the head has no education reported that they seldom had problems paying house rent. It is also observed that 6 percent of households owning no land reported that they seldom had problems paying house rent. Other household characteristics such as cluster location, poverty status, household size, livestock ownership and gender of the household head do not show strong correlation with the ability to pay house rent.

6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills

Table 6.6 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying

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

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	97.9	1.1	1.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	96.6	1.7	1.7	0.0	100.0
Remote	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	97.3	1.3	1.3	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	96.4	2.8	0.8	0.0	100.0
3-4	99.3	0.5	0.2	0.0	100.0
5-6	96.5	1.0	2.5	0.0	100.0
7+	98.3	0.6	1.1	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	95.4	3.4	1.1	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	96.6	0.0	3.4	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	99.4	0.0	0.6	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	98.8	0.0	1.2	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	97.7	1.1	1.2	0.0	100.0
Small only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	96.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	93.3	4.5	2.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	99.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	93.8	1.7	4.5	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	97.4	1.3	1.3	0.0	100.0
Female	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	97.1	1.3	1.6	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	98.7	1.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	96.0	2.5	1.5	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	97.7	1.3	1.0	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	95.7	1.8	2.6	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

utility bills during the year before the survey. The outcome on household's ability to pay utility bills is almost similar to those of paying house rent. Nearly all (98 percent) households in the district do not face problems paying utility bills. However, it is observed that 5 percent of household whose head is an employee claim having problems paying utility bills seldom, whereas the shares for the remaining socio-economic categories were virtually null. Other selected household characteristics such as cluster location, poverty status, household size, livestock and land ownership, marital status, education level and gender of the household head do not show strong correlation with the ability to pay utility bills.

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

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	47.8	27.3	17.4	7.5	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	53.5	26.0	15.5	5.1	100.0
Remote	38.3	29.5	20.5	11.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	41.1	21.6	27.8	9.5	100.0
Non-poor	49.6	28.7	14.7	7.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	42.2	27.4	24.1	6.4	100.0
3-4	48.5	25.1	16.7	9.6	100.0
5-6	49.3	33.3	12.9	4.6	100.0
7+	50.7	22.8	18.3	8.3	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	57.3	24.9	16.5	1.4	100.0
< 1 ha	57.1	35.4	7.4	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	40.0	31.5	15.5	13.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	49.9	23.8	19.7	6.7	100.0
4-5.99 ha	33.9	28.4	19.9	17.8	100.0
6+ ha	40.9	31.5	17.3	10.3	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	47.7	28.1	17.1	7.1	100.0
Small only	53.2	16.3	14.7	15.8	100.0
Large only	29.5	45.8	24.7	0.0	100.0
Both	53.0	17.0	21.5	8.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	88.5	11.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	44.6	27.5	19.2	8.7	100.0
Self-employed - other	45.0	32.7	16.7	5.6	100.0
Other	16.2	36.9	32.2	14.7	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	52.0	25.9	15.2	6.9	100.0
Female	31.6	32.6	25.8	10.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	57.2	19.9	15.9	7.0	100.0
Monogamous	53.9	23.5	15.1	7.4	100.0
Polygamous	37.0	36.2	18.2	8.5	100.0
Loose union	34.1	49.9	9.6	6.5	100.0
Widow/div/sep	34.2	30.8	26.9	8.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	39.2	27.7	18.9	14.2	100.0
Primary	46.0	30.3	18.1	5.7	100.0
Secondary +	67.1	15.5	12.4	4.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare

Table 6.7 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying for healthcare during the year before the survey. 66 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 while 80 percent of households located in accessible villages never/seldom experienced problems paying for healthcare, the share for households located in remote villages is 68 percent. Similarly, 79 percent of non-poor households never/seldom experienced problems paying for healthcare compared to 63 percent of poor households.

51 percent of households with seven or more members reported that they never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 42 percent of households with one or two members. In addition, while 27 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land often/always experienced problems paying for healthcare, the share for households owning no land is only 11 percent.

Furthermore, 48 percent of households owning no livestock never had problems paying for health care compared to 53 percent of those owning both small and large livestock. Similarly, while the majority (88 percent) of households whose main income earner is an employee never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group is 16 percent. Likewise 57 percent of households where the household head is single never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 34 percent of households where the household head has a loose union or is widowed, divorced or separated.

32 percent of female-headed households never had problems paying for healthcare, while the share for male-headed households is 52 percent. On the other hand, 32 percent of household heads with no education often/always had problems paying for healthcare compared to 17 percent of household heads with secondary education or more.

6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status

This section discusses ownership of selected assets and household occupancy status such as houses, land, livestock, vehicles, motorcycles, bicycles and wheelbarrows. This section will also provide detailed information on asset ownership by household characteristics. Household occupancy status describes the

Table 6.8: Percentage of households owning certain assets

			Livestock				Motor-		Wheel
	Home	Land	Small	Large	Both	Vehicle	cycle	Bicycle	barrow
Total	69.4	69.0	5.9	2.4	4.6	0.6	2.6	56.8	3.2
Cluster Location									
Accessible	60.3	59.6	4.1	1.6	1.2	0.9	3.5	60.0	3.3
Remote	84.8	84.9	8.8	3.7	10.5	0.0	1.2	51.3	3.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	85.2	75.8	9.8	2.4	7.0	0.0	0.0	48.5	1.3
Non-poor	65.3	67.2	4.8	2.4	4.0	0.7	3.3	58.9	3.6
Household size									
1-2	56.8	61.4	1.3	0.4	0.0	0.4	5.3	30.6	0.0
3-4	63.5	64.4	4.1	2.9	3.4	0.8	0.4	55.8	4.0
5-6	74.7	73.2	10.5	2.1	7.1	0.0	3.4	67.3	3.5
7+	92.0	83.5	8.6	4.2	9.6	1.0	3.8	74.5	4.3
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	26.8	30.1	7.0	3.7	1.6	3.6	0.0	44.1	1.8
Self-employed - agric	75.9	77.5	6.2	2.3	5.8	0.0	2.9	57.5	1.9
Self-employed - other	64.2	52.5	4.2	2.3	2.2	0.9	2.5	64.0	7.9
Other	71.2	88.3	4.5	0.0	0.0	3.5	8.2	18.3	8.2
Gender of the head of household									
Male	71.9	70.3	6.9	2.8	5.8	0.5	2.9	66.6	3.8
Female	59.6	63.6	1.8	1.0	0.0	0.9	1.7	18.0	0.8

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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, 69 percent of the district's households own their dwellings and a further 69 percent own some land. While 57 percent of all households own a bicycle, the share for households owning a motorcycle or a wheel barrow is 3 percent.

Table 6.9 shows the percent distribution of households by occupancy status. 85 percent of households located in remote villages own their dwellings compared to 60 percent of households located in accessible villages. Similarly, 85 percent of poor households own their dwelling compared to 65 percent of non-poor households.

Disaggregation of the data shows that 92 percent of households with seven or more members own their dwellings compared to 57 percent of households with one or two members. Furthermore, while 76 percent of households whose main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' socio-economic group own their dwellings, the share for households whose main income earner is an employee is 27 percent. Disaggregation of the data further shows that while 72 percent of male-headed households own their dwellings, the share for female-headed households is 60 percent. It is also observed that 67 percent of male-headed households own a bicycle compared to only 18 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, 75 percent of households with seven or more members own a bicycle compared to only 32 percent of households with one or two members. In addition, while 58 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture own a bicycle, the share for households where the head belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group is 18 percent. Finally, 59 percent of non-poor households and 60 percent of households from accessible villages own a bicycle compared to 49 and 51 percent of poor households and households from remote villages respectively.

Table 6.9: Percent distribution of households by occupancy status

	Own	Rent	Free	Other	Total
Total	69.4	16.7	13.8	0.2	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	60.3	23.6	16.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	84.8	4.8	9.9	0.4	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	85.2	3.1	11.7	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	65.3	20.2	14.3	0.2	100.0
Household size					
1-2	56.8	25.4	16.9	0.9	100.0
3-4	63.5	21.6	14.9	0.0	100.0
5-6	74.7	11.2	14.1	0.0	100.0
7+	92.0	1.7	6.3	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	26.8	28.5	44.7	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	75.9	12.9	11.1	0.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	64.2	27.3	8.4	0.0	100.0
Other	71.2	0.0	28.8	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	71.9	16.4	11.5	0.2	100.0
Female	59.6	17.6	22.8	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

6.3.2 Occupancy Documentation

The percent distribution of households by type of occupancy documentation is shown in Table 6.10. Most residents in the district do not have any documentation to verify their occupancy status. Only 3 percent of the households possess formal occupancy documentation, which include a title deed, renting contract or payment receipt. 75 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. Data 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 complemented by Table 6.12, which shows the main source of agricultural inputs.

33 percent of all farmers apply agricultural inputs to their farms and the majority (74 percent) of those who use farm inputs use improved seedlings. The percentage of households located in accessible villages using agricultural inputs is higher than that of households located in remote villages, at 35 and 29 percent respectively. In addition, while 26 percent of poor households apply fertilizers, the share for non-poor households is 21 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that as the number of household members increases, the usage of agricultural inputs also increases from 27 percent for households with up to 2 members to 42 percent for households with 7 or more members. Furthermore, while 35 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture use agricultural inputs, the share for households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group is only 8 percent. Likewise, use of agricultural inputs in male-headed households is higher than in female-headed households at 38 and 11 percent respectively.

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

	Title deed	Renting contract	Payment receipt	Other document	No document	Total	Secure tenure
Total	1.3	1.5	0.4	21.4	75.3	100.0	3.3
Cluster Location							
Accessible	1.9	2.4	0.7	28.5	66.6	100.0	5.0
Remote	0.4	0.0	0.0	9.5	90.1	100.0	0.4
Poverty Status							
Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.8	79.2	100.0	0.0
Non-poor	1.7	1.9	0.6	21.6	74.3	100.0	4.1
Household size							
1-2	0.0	1.9	0.0	8.1	90.0	100.0	1.9
3-4	1.2	2.5	0.6	23.3	72.3	100.0	4.4
5-6	3.4	0.4	0.7	27.8	67.7	100.0	4.5
7+	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.6	77.4	100.0	0.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.0	1.1	5.2	18.5	75.1	100.0	6.3
Self-employed - agriculture	0.4	2.0	0.0	21.4	76.1	100.0	2.4
Self-employed - other	5.5	0.0	0.0	24.3	70.3	100.0	5.5
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	93.1	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	1.7	1.4	0.6	22.5	73.8	100.0	3.6
Female	0.0	1.8	0.0	17.2	81.0	100.0	1.8

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	% of hhs using	Fertilizer	Improved seedling	Fingerlings	Hooks and nets	Insecticides	Other
Total	32.6	22.3	74.2	0.0	2.7	27.6	0.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	34.5	15.7	80.9	0.0	2.7	28.9	0.0
Remote	29.3	35.4	60.6	0.0	2.8	24.9	0.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	30.2	26.0	80.4	0.0	12.2	19.1	0.0
Non-poor	33.2	21.4	72.7	0.0	0.5	29.6	0.0
Household size							
1-2	26.5	30.7	82.2	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0
3-4	28.6	20.2	66.1	0.0	0.0	25.8	0.0
5-6	37.8	18.8	82.8	0.0	0.0	25.3	0.0
7+	42.0	24.7	69.3	0.0	13.9	29.7	0.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	23.3	35.4	57.0	0.0	0.0	48.7	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	34.9	25.5	71.0	0.0	3.6	31.1	0.0
Self-employed - other	30.4	3.1	94.1	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0
Other	8.1	43.9	56.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	37.9	23.1	74.0	0.0	2.9	28.3	0.0
Female	11.4	11.0	76.6	0.0	0.0	17.9	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

Most households that use agricultural inputs purchase them from an open market (80 percent) and in second place they get them by preparing them themselves (10 percent). 9 percent of the households get their inputs from government and none reports cooperatives as their main source. Data also shows that the percentage of households located in accessible villages who purchase agricultural inputs at an

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	80.0	8.9	1.5	0.0	9.7	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	84.1	11.4	0.0	0.0	4.5	100.0
Remote	71.8	3.7	4.4	0.0	20.1	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	78.9	1.4	2.5	0.0	17.2	100.0
Non-poor	80.3	10.6	1.2	0.0	7.9	100.0
Household size						
1-2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	76.2	11.5	1.1	0.0	11.3	100.0
5-6	77.2	12.6	0.0	0.0	10.1	100.0
7+	75.4	5.4	5.4	0.0	13.7	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	75.5	8.0	0.0	0.0	16.5	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	78.3	8.3	1.9	0.0	11.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	89.9	10.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	43.9	56.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	78.5	9.5	1.6	0.0	10.4	100.0
Female	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

1. Base is households using agricultural inputs

open market is higher than that of households located in remote villages at 84 and 72 percent respectively. While 11 percent of non-poor households get agricultural inputs from the government the share for poor households is only 2 percent.

The percentage of households with one or two members who purchase agricultural inputs at an open market is 25 percentage points higher than that of households with seven or more members, at 100 and 75 percent respectively.

While 90 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities purchase their agricultural inputs at an open market, the share of households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group is 44 percent. Furthermore, virtually all female-headed households purchase their agricultural inputs at an open market, whereas the share for male-headed households is 79 percent.

6.4.2 Landholding

Table 6.13 shows the percent distribution of households by the area of land owned. Around 46 percent of households own less than two acres of land (including 31 percent of landless households). 25 percent own between two and four acres and 29 percent own four or more acres.

Landless households are more common in accessible villages and households owning large portions of land are more common in remote villages. Similar observations are evident when analysing by poverty status with non-poor households resembling households from accessible villages.

Regarding household size, while 39 percent of households with one or two members are landless, the share for households with seven or more members is 17 percent. In contrast, larger households seem to own larger landholdings more frequently than households with less members.

While households where the main income earner is an employee reported the highest share of landless households (70 percent), the share for households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group is only 12 percent. Finally, male-headed households have larger landholdings (4 or more acres)

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	31.0	4.3	10.9	24.8	13.8	15.1	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	40.4	4.3	11.9	22.8	11.2	9.3	100.0
Remote	15.1	4.3	9.3	28.0	18.2	25.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	24.2	2.5	9.3	26.3	16.7	21.0	100.0
Non-poor	32.8	4.8	11.4	24.3	13.0	13.6	100.0
Household size							
1-2	38.6	2.3	19.8	18.4	10.7	10.2	100.0
3-4	35.6	2.6	7.4	29.3	13.9	11.2	100.0
5-6	26.8	9.5	10.5	25.4	15.4	12.5	100.0
7+	16.5	3.0	9.9	19.6	14.6	36.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	69.9	3.6	2.7	10.9	9.4	3.6	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	22.5	3.5	11.0	27.3	17.2	18.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	47.5	7.5	13.3	22.6	2.6	6.6	100.0
Other	11.7	6.9	20.0	14.7	16.9	29.8	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	29.7	4.2	9.5	24.7	14.9	17.0	100.0
Female	36.4	4.7	16.5	25.2	9.4	7.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	None	1	2-10	11-20	21-50	50+	Total
Total	93.0	1.5	3.3	0.9	0.9	0.6	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	97.2	0.9	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.5	100.0
Remote	85.8	2.4	6.5	2.3	2.3	0.7	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	90.6	2.4	2.7	1.3	1.3	1.6	100.0
Non-poor	93.6	1.2	3.4	0.7	0.7	0.3	100.0
Household size							
1-2	99.6	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	93.7	2.1	2.5	0.4	0.7	0.6	100.0
5-6	90.8	1.1	3.5	1.7	1.7	1.3	100.0
7+	86.2	2.3	8.7	1.8	1.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	94.7	1.8	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	91.9	1.6	3.6	1.2	0.8	0.8	100.0
Self-employed - other	95.5	0.7	2.3	0.0	1.5	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	91.4	1.7	4.0	1.1	1.1	0.7	100.0
Female	99.0	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

compared to female-headed households at 32 and 17 percent respectively.

6.4.3 Cattle Ownership

Table 6.14 shows the percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned. The majority (93 percent) of households own no cattle at all, and only 3 percent own between 2 and 10 heads of cattle. Households in accessible villages are more likely to own no cattle as well as households with one or two members. In contrast, households with seven or more members are more likely to have some cattle (between 2 and 10 heads) compared to households with one or two members,

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	9.7	19.5	30.5	32.2	5.8	2.3	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	10.3	20.8	25.2	35.5	5.3	3.0	100.0
Remote	8.6	17.3	39.6	26.5	6.8	1.1	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	7.8	21.4	33.8	32.0	5.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	10.1	19.0	29.7	32.2	6.0	2.9	100.0
Household size							
1-2	14.3	20.0	34.2	22.8	6.5	2.2	100.0
3-4	9.2	18.6	35.2	26.1	6.4	4.5	100.0
5-6	9.9	23.7	23.1	37.1	6.0	0.3	100.0
7+	4.6	14.3	26.1	51.7	3.3	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	9.9	24.1	21.0	32.8	9.4	2.8	100.0
< 1 ha	0.0	11.4	30.1	54.7	0.0	3.7	100.0
1-1.99 ha	4.3	26.9	30.4	26.2	5.6	6.6	100.0
2-3.99 ha	14.6	15.1	33.0	31.4	4.3	1.6	100.0
4-5.99 ha	14.0	7.5	45.5	27.5	4.5	1.1	100.0
6+ ha	4.0	25.4	32.6	34.0	4.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	9.2	19.7	29.2	33.1	6.2	2.6	100.0
Small only	13.5	23.2	27.3	31.3	4.8	0.0	100.0
Large only	0.0	16.8	42.1	34.8	6.3	0.0	100.0
Both	19.0	13.7	53.6	13.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	1.1	16.6	22.0	30.3	18.1	12.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	11.8	18.9	32.9	30.7	3.8	1.8	100.0
Self-employed - other	4.7	21.9	24.2	40.9	8.3	0.0	100.0
Other	18.3	32.2	41.4	8.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	9.5	19.8	28.4	34.7	6.4	1.2	100.0
Female	10.1	18.5	39.1	22.2	3.4	6.7	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	8.5	24.0	24.5	36.7	6.2	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	8.7	20.9	29.2	34.0	5.9	1.3	100.0
Polygamous	15.6	22.5	29.7	16.2	16.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	5.2	4.0	24.2	50.8	2.1	13.7	100.0
Widow/div/sep	12.2	17.6	39.2	24.8	3.0	3.2	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	9.8	20.4	36.1	28.9	2.4	2.4	100.0
Primary	8.7	19.6	30.2	33.2	5.6	2.6	100.0
Secondary +	13.0	17.9	23.7	33.1	11.3	0.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

at 9 and 0 percent respectively. Finally, while 99 percent of female-headed households own no cattle, the share of male-headed households is 91 percent. Poverty status is not strongly correlated to households cattle ownership.

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

	Principal contributor of income				
	Head	Spouse	Child	Other	Total
Total	89.5	3.1	2.5	4.8	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	87.3	4.1	2.8	5.8	100.0
Remote	93.3	1.4	2.1	3.2	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	83.8	3.1	6.1	7.0	100.0
Non-poor	91.0	3.1	1.6	4.2	100.0
Household size					
1-2	85.3	5.3	3.4	6.0	100.0
3-4	88.7	3.0	1.2	7.1	100.0
5-6	93.1	2.3	2.0	2.6	100.0
7+	91.1	2.0	6.1	0.8	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	91.6	1.5	1.8	5.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	93.5	2.7	3.8	0.0	100.0
Other	3.5	7.9	28.3	60.3	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	94.9	1.9	0.9	2.3	100.0
Female	68.6	7.8	9.1	14.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

38 percent the households reported it was improving, 31 percent said it was the same while 30 percent reported it was deteriorating. The percentage of households located in accessible villages who reported the current crime and security situation as worsening is higher than that of households located in remote villages at 31 and 26 percent respectively. Poverty status is not strongly correlated to household's perception of the current crime and security situation compared to the year before the survey.

While 55 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 30 percent. In contrast, 38 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 55 percent of households owning less than 1 hectares of land. While 33 percent of households owning both small and large livestock reported deterioration in the current crime and security situation, the share for households owning large livestock is 17 percent.

Furthermore, 41 percent of male-headed households reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 25 percent of female-headed households. Similarly, while 53 percent of households where the household head has a loose union reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households where the head is widowed, divorced or separated is 28 percent. On the other hand, while 18 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category reported a much worse crime and security situation, the share of households where the main income earner is an employee is only 1 percent. Lastly, the percentage of households where the head has secondary education or more and reported improvement of the current crime and security situation is higher than that of

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	28.8	3.5	6.1	9.2	91.3	44.6	65.0	5.5	0.5	26.1
Cluster Location										
Accessible	35.2	5.3	8.6	12.3	95.8	47.8	69.9	7.8	0.8	34.5
Remote	17.8	0.5	1.9	3.9	83.7	39.0	56.6	1.5	0.0	11.8
Poverty Status										
Poor	12.6	0.0	2.8	2.7	86.9	32.7	52.3	0.0	0.0	14.1
Non-poor	33.0	4.4	6.9	10.9	92.5	47.6	68.3	6.9	0.6	29.2
Household size										
1-2	14.1	2.4	1.6	1.7	79.9	33.5	50.3	4.0	0.7	12.4
3-4	32.7	3.7	6.9	16.0	93.5	39.9	61.0	5.8	0.4	25.8
5-6	31.9	2.5	6.3	6.5	94.1	56.0	75.1	4.7	0.3	33.3
7+	31.6	6.1	9.2	5.0	95.3	51.5	77.0	7.9	1.0	31.9
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	74.1	21.7	24.8	13.6	100.0	75.2	80.7	39.5	5.2	74.6
Self-employed - agriculture	21.5	1.5	2.7	7.6	91.0	38.4	62.9	1.3	0.0	15.6
Self-employed - other	34.9	2.6	9.9	13.4	89.7	57.4	68.8	6.1	0.0	45.2
Other	37.3	3.5	11.7	8.2	79.0	10.4	35.3	3.5	3.5	10.4
Gender of the head of household										
Male	29.0	3.7	5.1	9.9	92.3	51.0	74.0	6.3	0.6	29.8
Female	28.0	2.7	10.0	6.5	87.3	19.1	29.5	2.3	0.3	11.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

household heads with no education, at 44 and 31 percent respectively.

6.6 Household Income Contributions

Table 6.16 shows the percent distribution of households by main contributor to household income. The survey includes information on household income contributions by listing all the income contributors in the households and then identifying the household member who contributes the largest portion. For the great majority (90 percent) of households the head is the main contributor.

93 percent of households located in remote villages reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 73 percent of households located in remote villages. In contrast, 91 percent of non-poor households reported the head as the main income contributor, whereas the share for poor households is 84 percent.

While 91 percent of households with seven or more members reported the head as the main income contributor, the share for households with one or two members is 85 percent. Furthermore, only 4 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category reported the head as the main income contributor, whereas the shares for the remaining categories were above 83 percent each.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that up to 8 percent of female-headed households reported the spouse as the main income contributor compared to 2 percent of male-headed households.

6.7 Other Household Items

Table 6.17 shows the percentage distribution of households owning selected household items. 91 percent of households own at least one mattress or bed, 65 percent own a radio, 45 percent own a watch or clock and 29 percent own an electric iron. Although no household owns a fixed line phone, 26 percent own a mobile phone. Households in accessible villages and non-poor households have higher rates of ownership in almost every selected item than their respective counterparts.

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

ownership in most of the selected household items than the remaining socio-economic groups.

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

7 HOUSEHOLD AMENITIES

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

7.1 Housing Materials and Type of Housing Unit

Table 7.1 shows the distribution of households according to the main material used in the roof of the house. Overall, 61 percent of households have iron sheets as their main roof material and 37 percent have thatch.

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

The breakdown by household size shows that smaller households tend to use thatch, and that bigger households are more likely to use iron sheets for their roofs. The split-up by socio-economic group shows that the 'other' is the category with the highest share of households using thatch for the roof (at 70 percent), and that employees are the group with the lowest use of thatch (12 percent). In turn the employees report a higher share of households using iron sheets than the remaining socio-economic categories.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that male-headed households use iron sheets more often than female-headed households, at rates of 63 and 53 percent, respectively. In turn the latter report a higher share using thatch for roofing than the former at 46 and 35 percent respectively.

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	0.3	36.9	0.0	61.1	0.0	1.1	0.6	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	0.0	23.2	0.0	74.0	0.0	1.8	1.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	0.7	60.0	0.0	39.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	1.2	56.0	0.0	42.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	31.9	0.0	65.9	0.0	1.4	0.8	0.0	100.0
Household size									
1-2	0.0	46.6	0.0	50.8	0.0	1.0	1.6	0.0	100.0
3-4	0.0	35.3	0.0	63.0	0.0	0.9	0.8	0.0	100.0
5-6	0.0	31.0	0.0	67.2	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	1.7	38.7	0.0	58.9	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	0.0	2.2	0.0	77.2	0.0	13.4	7.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	0.4	45.5	0.0	54.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	16.6	0.0	83.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	69.6	0.0	30.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	0.3	34.6	0.0	63.1	0.0	1.4	0.6	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	46.0	0.0	53.3	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	Mud/ mud bricks	Stone	Burnt bricks	Cement/ sandcrete	Wood/ bamboo	Iron sheets	Cardboard	Total
Total	46.1	0.0	45.6	8.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	32.9	0.0	55.6	11.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	100.0
Remote	69.1	0.0	28.2	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	69.1	0.0	30.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	40.4	0.0	49.2	9.9	0.0	0.4	0.0	100.0
Household size								
1-2	54.5	0.0	40.3	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	44.6	0.0	43.5	11.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	100.0
5-6	37.5	0.0	55.1	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	54.0	0.0	41.7	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group								
Employee	11.3	0.0	46.6	42.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	51.8	0.0	45.1	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	39.6	0.0	49.4	9.2	0.0	1.8	0.0	100.0
Other	59.5	0.0	16.3	24.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household								
Male	44.3	0.0	47.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	53.1	0.0	40.2	5.1	0.0	1.6	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	Mud/ earth	Wood/ plank	Tiles	Concrete/ cement	Grass	Other	Total
Total	70.0	0.0	0.4	29.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	60.7	0.0	0.6	38.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	85.8	0.0	0.0	14.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	83.1	0.0	0.0	16.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	66.7	0.0	0.5	32.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	73.4	0.0	0.0	26.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	69.6	0.0	0.0	30.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	63.6	0.0	1.5	35.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	77.8	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	16.1	0.0	0.0	83.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	82.5	0.0	0.0	17.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	48.2	0.0	2.0	49.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	62.7	0.0	0.0	37.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	70.1	0.0	0.5	29.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	69.6	0.0	0.0	30.4	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

households by type of material used in the walls. Overall, 92 percent of houses are built with mud or mud bricks and burnt bricks at 46 percent each. Cement or sandcrete occupy the third place, with a share of 8 percent.

The analysis by cluster location reveals that households in remote villages have a higher share of households using mud and mud bricks for their walls than households in accessible villages. The rates are 69 and 33 percent, respectively. In turn, households in accessible villages tend to

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

	Single room	Flat	Two or more rooms	Whole building	Other	Total
Total	11.6	0.0	7.9	73.3	7.2	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	16.3	0.0	11.0	68.5	4.3	100.0
Remote	3.6	0.0	2.5	81.6	12.3	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	1.6	0.0	2.4	80.2	15.8	100.0
Non-poor	14.2	0.0	9.3	71.6	5.0	100.0
Household size						
1-2	26.9	0.0	4.2	67.9	1.0	100.0
3-4	14.5	0.0	9.2	72.7	3.5	100.0
5-6	2.3	0.0	11.5	78.8	7.4	100.0
7+	0.0	0.0	2.7	72.6	24.7	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	20.1	0.0	33.5	46.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	8.1	0.0	4.9	77.9	9.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	22.1	0.0	8.3	66.7	2.9	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.6	11.4	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	10.7	0.0	8.4	73.3	7.6	100.0
Female	14.9	0.0	5.9	73.4	5.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

use burnt bricks more often. Likewise, poor households use mud or mud bricks more often than non-poor households (69 and 40 percent, respectively).

The breakdown by household size shows that smaller households are more likely to use mud or mud bricks for the walls of their houses, whereas larger households report using burnt bricks more frequently.

'Self-employed agriculture' and 'other' are the categories with highest shares living in houses made of mud or mud bricks at 60 and 52 percent respectively, whereas employees report the lowest share at 11 percent. In addition, the 'self-employed other' category report a higher share using burnt bricks than the remaining socio-economic categories.

The gender breakdown shows that households headed by males use burnt bricks more often than female-headed households, at rates of 47 and 40 percent respectively. In turn the latter report a higher share using mud or mud bricks than the former.

The distribution of households by type of material used in the floor is shown in Table 7.3. Overall, the floor in 70 percent of households is made of mud or dirt and 30 percent of concrete or cement.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages, with a rate of 39 percent, have more houses with concrete floor than households in remote villages, with a rate of 14 percent. In contrast, the latter report a higher share with mud or dirt floors than the former at 86 and 61 percent respectively.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households have a higher share of houses with mud or dirt floor (83 percent, against 67 percent of the non-poor households). Up to 33 percent of non-poor households have concrete flooring against 17 percent of poor households.

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities have lower shares of mud or dirt floors and higher shares of concrete floors than the remaining groups.

There appears to be no strong correlation between gender and the materials used for floors of the house.

Table 7.4 shows the percent distribution of households by type of housing unit they occupy. Overall, 73 percent of households occupy the whole building where they live.

Table 7.5: Percent distribution of households by main source of drinking water

	Pipe borne treated	Pipe borne untreated	Bore hole/hand pump	Protected well	Unprotected well	Rain water	River, lake or pond	Vendor, truck	Other	Total	Safe source
Total	12.8	12.0	49.5	3.7	11.4	0.0	9.9	0.6	0.2	100.0	66.0
Cluster Location											
Accessible	15.2	16.4	50.5	5.5	1.2	0.0	10.5	0.4	0.2	100.0	71.2
Remote	8.7	4.5	47.8	0.7	28.7	0.0	8.9	0.9	0.0	100.0	57.1
Poverty Status											
Poor	11.5	8.5	48.9	3.7	21.2	0.0	4.7	1.6	0.0	100.0	64.1
Non-poor	13.1	12.9	49.7	3.7	8.9	0.0	11.2	0.3	0.2	100.0	66.5
Household size											
1-2	12.3	12.9	45.3	7.4	7.8	0.0	13.5	0.6	0.0	100.0	65.0
3-4	13.9	11.7	47.9	3.8	8.0	0.0	14.4	0.0	0.4	100.0	65.6
5-6	15.9	15.1	49.6	0.0	14.2	0.0	3.5	1.7	0.0	100.0	65.5
7+	5.2	6.4	58.9	5.0	20.4	0.0	4.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	69.1
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	21.9	47.9	27.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.8	100.0	48.9
Self-employed - agric	8.2	5.4	53.9	4.4	14.8	0.0	12.6	0.6	0.0	100.0	66.5
Self-employed - other	26.8	21.9	41.0	3.1	2.2	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	70.9
Other	3.5	0.0	70.9	0.0	25.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	74.5
Gender of the head of household											
Male	13.8	11.7	46.6	3.2	13.8	0.0	10.1	0.6	0.2	100.0	63.6
Female	8.8	13.1	60.9	5.7	1.8	0.0	9.0	0.6	0.0	100.0	75.4

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

Table 7.6: Percent distribution of households by main type of toilet

	None (bush)	Flush to sewer	Flush to septic tank	Pan/ bucket	Covered pit latrine	Uncovered pit latrine	Ventilated pit latrine	Other	Total	Safe sanitation
Total	14.3	0.0	10.0	0.0	72.5	2.1	1.2	0.0	100.0	82.5
Cluster Location										
Accessible	7.1	0.0	15.6	0.0	74.1	1.4	1.9	0.0	100.0	89.7
Remote	26.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	69.8	3.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	70.2
Poverty Status										
Poor	29.2	0.0	1.8	0.0	65.3	3.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	67.1
Non-poor	10.4	0.0	12.1	0.0	74.4	1.7	1.5	0.0	100.0	86.5
Household size										
1-2	21.1	0.0	7.3	0.0	65.6	4.0	1.9	0.0	100.0	72.9
3-4	12.6	0.0	11.3	0.0	71.4	2.8	1.9	0.0	100.0	82.7
5-6	12.5	0.0	8.5	0.0	78.7	0.0	0.3	0.0	100.0	87.2
7+	13.1	0.0	12.3	0.0	73.5	1.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	85.8
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	0.0	0.0	51.0	0.0	43.5	3.6	1.9	0.0	100.0	94.5
Self-employed - agric	16.6	0.0	4.1	0.0	76.3	1.6	1.4	0.0	100.0	80.4
Self-employed - other	12.8	0.0	14.2	0.0	71.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	85.2
Other	7.9	0.0	3.5	0.0	75.1	13.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	78.7
Gender of the head of household										
Male	14.6	0.0	10.4	0.0	72.6	1.5	0.9	0.0	100.0	83.0
Female	13.1	0.0	8.4	0.0	72.1	4.2	2.1	0.0	100.0	80.5

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

The breakdown by household size shows that small households are more likely to occupy single rooms, as 27 percent of

households with up to 2 members occupy single rooms compared to 0 percent of households with 7 or more members. While 79 percent of households with 5 or 6 members occupy the whole building where they live, the share for households with up to 2 members is 68 percent.

The analysis by socio-economic groups shows that the 'employee' and the 'self-employed other' category report the highest shares of households occupying one room, whereas the remaining categories report higher shares occupying the whole building than the former.

There appears to be no strong correlation between gender and the type of housing unit

The percentage distribution of households by source of drinking water is shown in

7.2 Water and Sanitation

Table 7.5. Overall, 66 percent of households have a safe source of water, whereas 11 percent of them get it from an unprotected well. Safe sources of drinking water are treated pipes, bore holes, hand pumps, and protected wells.

The analysis by cluster location shows that 71 percent of households in accessible villages have a safe source of drinking water, whereas the share of households in remote villages is just 57 percent. The shares of households with unprotected wells are 1 percent for accessible and 29 percent for households in remote villages. Poverty status of the household shows no important differences in access to safe water. 21 percent of poor households get their drinking water from unprotected wells, against 9 percent of non-poor households.

When analysing by household size, no strong trends emerge. The split-up by gender of the household shows that female-headed households report a higher access rate to safe source of drinking water than male-headed households at 75 and 64 percent respectively.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household reveals that the 'other' and the 'self-employed other' are the categories with the highest rate of access to safe sources of drinking water at 75 and 71 percent respectively and the employees report the lowest access rate at 49 percent. While 48 percent of employees get drinking water from untreated pipe borne, the share for the 'other' category is virtually null.

Table 7.7: Percent distribution of households by fuel used for cooking

	Firewood	Charcoal	Kerosene/oil	Gas	Electricity	Crop residue/ sawdust	Animal waste	Other	Total	Non-wood fuel for cooking
Total	68.7	29.9	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	100.0	0.6
Cluster Location										
Accessible	54.2	43.9	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	100.0	1.0
Remote	93.4	6.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	100.0	0.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	91.3	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	100.0	0.0
Non-poor	62.9	36.1	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	100.0	0.8
Household size										
1-2	67.7	30.5	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	100.0	0.8
3-4	67.4	31.8	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.8
5-6	66.8	33.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
7+	76.6	18.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	100.0	1.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	8.8	85.8	1.8	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	5.4
Self-employed - agric	85.4	14.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	30.4	64.7	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	100.0	0.8
Other	96.5	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	67.9	31.3	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	100.0	0.6
Female	71.8	24.5	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	100.0	0.8

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	Kerosene/ paraffin	Gas	Mains electricity	Solar panels/ generator	Battery	Candles	Firewood	Other	Total
Total	90.3	0.0	5.7	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.3	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	87.4	0.0	8.8	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	100.0
Remote	95.2	0.0	0.5	0.7	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	94.9	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	89.1	0.0	6.8	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.7	2.9	100.0
Household size									
1-2	91.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.6	100.0
3-4	89.5	0.0	4.1	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	3.4	100.0
5-6	92.1	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	100.0
7+	88.3	0.0	8.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	57.8	0.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.8	100.0
Self-employed - agric	95.2	0.0	2.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	86.7	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	88.6	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	89.1	0.0	6.4	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	2.5	100.0
Female	94.9	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

Table 7.6 shows the percentage distribution of households by main type of toilet. Overall 83 percent of households have safe sanitation, whereas up to 73 percent use a covered pit latrine.

The cluster breakdown shows that 90 percent of households in accessible villages have safe sanitation, while in remote villages the share is 70 percent. The analysis by poverty status shows that 74 percent of non-poor households use covered pit latrines compared to 65 percent of poor households. In addition, 29 percent of poor households have no toilets compared to 10 percent of non-poor households.

Households with 1 or 2 members have the lowest percentage of safe sanitation, at 73 percent. The rates for other groups fluctuate between 83 and 88 percent. The share of households using covered pit latrines tend to increase with household size from 66 percent for households with up to 2 members to 79 percent for households with 5 or 6 members. It stands out that up to 21 percent of households with up to 2 members have no toilet, whereas the shares for households with 3 or more members are around 12 percent each.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that the 'employee' category reports the highest rate of safe sanitation, at 95 percent. The rates for other socio-economic groups fluctuate between 79 and 85 percent respectively.

There appears to be no strong correlation between gender of the household head and the type of toilets.

7.3 Type of Fuel

Table 7.7 shows the distribution of households by fuel used for cooking. Overall, 69 percent of households use firewood and 30 percent use charcoal. Households in remote villages report using firewood for cooking more frequently than households from accessible villages at 93 and 54 percent respectively. In turn the latter report a higher share using charcoal than the former at 44 and 6 percent respectively. The breakdown by poverty status reveals similar differences with poor households resembling households from remote villages.

The breakdown by household size shows that the largest households (with 7 members or more) use firewood more often than the rest, at 77 percent.

Table 7.9: Percent distribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach nearest drinking water supply and health facility

	Drinking water supply					Health facility				
	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total
Total	76.7	15.4	5.0	2.8	100.0	40.2	20.2	17.3	22.3	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	83.3	12.2	3.6	0.8	100.0	52.5	24.2	17.1	6.3	100.0
Remote	65.5	20.9	7.5	6.2	100.0	19.3	13.5	17.8	49.4	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	61.5	22.3	8.9	7.3	100.0	26.1	17.9	23.3	32.7	100.0
Non-poor	80.6	13.7	4.0	1.7	100.0	43.8	20.8	15.8	19.6	100.0
Household size										
1-2	82.1	11.5	4.3	2.1	100.0	39.7	18.7	18.3	23.4	100.0
3-4	75.4	16.7	4.1	3.7	100.0	45.7	19.3	16.4	18.7	100.0
5-6	80.4	11.9	4.6	3.1	100.0	32.1	28.2	15.8	23.9	100.0
7+	67.2	23.0	9.0	0.8	100.0	39.7	10.9	21.2	28.2	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	95.4	3.8	0.8	0.0	100.0	34.3	54.8	10.9	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	71.6	18.8	6.0	3.6	100.0	40.5	13.1	17.4	29.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	87.2	8.1	3.2	1.5	100.0	40.7	33.3	20.0	6.1	100.0
Other	80.7	14.7	4.5	0.0	100.0	47.3	0.0	18.0	34.7	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	78.2	13.9	5.0	3.0	100.0	41.5	20.2	15.8	22.6	100.0
Female	70.8	21.7	5.2	2.3	100.0	35.0	20.3	23.4	21.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

Households with up to 6 members report shares around 67 percent each.

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that 86 percent of the employees and 65 percent of the self-employed in non agricultural activities use charcoal for cooking, whereas the other two categories use firewood in almost every case.

The gender breakdown shows that female-headed households report use of firewood for cooking more frequently than male-headed households who in turn report use of charcoal more often than the former.

Table 7.8 shows the distribution of households according to the fuel used for lightning. Overall, 90 percent of the households in the district use kerosene or paraffin, 5 percent use electricity and further 1 percent use firewood. Gas, solar panels, batteries, and candles are virtually not used for lighting in the district.

The analysis by cluster location shows that virtually all households using electricity are located in accessible villages, but still represent just 9 percent of households in accessible villages in the district. A similar trend is observed in the split-up by poverty status with non-poor households resembling households from accessible villages.

The breakdown by household size reveals no strong correlation with the type of fuel used for lighting.

The analysis by socio-economic group of the household shows that the employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the highest rates of use of electricity. On the other hand, the remaining categories report use for kerosene or paraffin for lighting more often than the former.

Finally, female-headed households are more likely to use kerosene of paraffin than male-headed households at 95 and 89 percent respectively.

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 minutesute threshold that was used to define access to a facility. It must be kept in minutesd 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

Table 7.10: Percent distribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach nearest primary and secondary school

	Primary school					Secondary school				
	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total
Total	55.2	23.2	10.9	10.7	100.0	6.7	23.6	21.9	47.8	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	64.6	25.8	6.8	2.8	100.0	7.3	32.6	27.3	32.8	100.0
Remote	39.4	18.7	17.8	24.2	100.0	5.7	8.3	12.7	73.3	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	38.3	24.6	12.6	24.5	100.0	9.7	25.2	8.5	56.6	100.0
Non-poor	59.6	22.8	10.4	7.2	100.0	5.9	23.2	25.3	45.5	100.0
Household size										
1-2	57.8	16.9	14.2	11.1	100.0	8.3	22.1	23.0	46.7	100.0
3-4	54.1	28.3	9.3	8.2	100.0	6.7	21.1	24.6	47.5	100.0
5-6	53.7	22.4	10.7	13.2	100.0	8.8	27.5	17.3	46.4	100.0
7+	57.6	18.5	11.2	12.7	100.0	1.0	25.6	20.9	52.5	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	59.2	40.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	3.6	23.8	48.9	23.7	100.0
Self-employed - agric	52.1	21.7	12.2	14.0	100.0	6.2	21.5	17.7	54.6	100.0
Self-employed - other	62.5	22.4	11.3	3.9	100.0	10.8	32.4	25.4	31.4	100.0
Other	81.0	6.6	7.9	4.5	100.0	0.0	14.7	20.4	64.8	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	56.7	20.1	11.1	12.0	100.0	8.4	23.4	21.7	46.4	100.0
Female	49.4	35.2	9.9	5.5	100.0	0.0	24.3	22.5	53.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	Food market					Public transportation				
	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total
Total	41.0	23.9	18.2	17.0	100.0	39.9	23.1	18.0	19.0	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	50.3	28.4	17.2	4.1	100.0	51.3	27.5	16.6	4.6	100.0
Remote	25.2	16.3	19.8	38.7	100.0	20.6	15.6	20.4	43.4	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	22.3	24.7	27.7	25.2	100.0	27.7	16.6	28.3	27.4	100.0
Non-poor	45.8	23.7	15.7	14.8	100.0	43.1	24.7	15.4	16.8	100.0
Household size										
1-2	43.7	20.9	13.0	22.4	100.0	36.2	22.9	19.6	21.3	100.0
3-4	48.9	19.1	19.6	12.4	100.0	46.5	21.2	15.1	17.2	100.0
5-6	32.5	30.4	19.3	17.8	100.0	33.4	31.6	17.0	18.1	100.0
7+	30.6	29.6	19.1	20.7	100.0	37.9	13.9	25.7	22.5	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	26.9	55.3	17.9	0.0	100.0	48.6	30.5	14.4	6.5	100.0
Self-employed - agric	38.4	22.9	16.0	22.7	100.0	35.7	21.9	18.1	24.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	56.7	14.6	25.2	3.6	100.0	51.4	24.9	18.8	4.9	100.0
Other	43.7	13.5	29.7	13.1	100.0	43.4	15.0	21.8	19.7	100.0
Gender of head of household										
Male	40.6	22.9	18.8	17.7	100.0	40.1	22.6	17.8	19.4	100.0
Female	42.6	27.9	15.6	13.8	100.0	39.2	24.8	18.7	17.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

the variables, despite not being used to define cluster location, also show strong correlations.

Overall, 92 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 95 percent of households in accessible villages have access to a drinking water source and 77 percent to a health facility,

whereas the shares for households in remote villages are 87 and 33 percent respectively. Similar differences are observed by poverty status, with non-poor households having higher access rates than poor households.

The breakdown by household size shows that the largest households (7 or more members) have the lowest rates of access to both source of drinking water and to a health facility at 90 and 51 percent respectively. Households with 3 or 4 members report a higher access rate to a health facility than the remaining socio-economic categories.

Households where the main income earner is an employee or self-employed in non-agricultural activities report higher rates of access to both drinking water and to a health facility at 99 and 89 percent respectively. The self-employed in agriculture report the lowest access rate to drinking water source at 91 percent, whereas the 'other' category reports the lowest access rate to a health facility at 47 percent.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no strong differences in access to water sources, but households headed by males have a higher access rate to health facilities, with 62 percent living less than 30 minutes of health facilities, 7 percent points above female-headed households.

Table 7.10 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest primary and secondary school. Overall, 78 percent of households are located within 30 minutes of a primary school, but just 31 percent of households live within 30 minutes of a secondary school. Moreover, 49 percent of households are located 61 minutes or more away from the nearest secondary school. Access to school was also analysed in chapter 3 but with a different focus. In chapter 3, access to school was analysed at child level, i.e. the access rate of each child. In this section the focus is the distance of the house to the nearest school.

The analysis by cluster location shows that 91 percent of households in accessible villages have access to primary school, against 58 percent of remote villages. For secondary school, the rates go down to 40 and 14 percent, respectively.

83 percent of non-poor households are located within 30 minutes from a primary school, 20 percentage points above poor households. Similarly, non-poor households have higher rates of access to secondary school than poor households,

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

	Share taking measures	Use bed net	Insect-icide	Anti-malaria drug	Fumi-gation	Insecticide treated net	Maintain good drainage	Maintain good sanitation	Herbs	Burn leaves	Window/ door net
Total	83.4	26.0	3.9	2.6	0.2	67.3	1.9	19.1	0.1	0.9	6.3
Cluster Location											
Accessible	91.6	24.9	5.2	3.1	0.0	70.9	1.7	18.1	0.0	0.4	8.1
Remote	69.5	28.3	1.3	1.6	0.5	59.3	2.4	21.3	0.3	2.1	2.2
Poverty Status											
Poor	73.2	46.0	5.8	3.2	0.0	45.7	0.0	13.1	0.6	1.0	1.1
Non-poor	86.1	21.6	3.5	2.5	0.2	72.1	2.3	20.4	0.0	0.9	7.4
Household size											
1-2	78.2	26.7	4.4	2.5	0.0	54.7	0.0	22.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
3-4	82.0	27.3	1.7	3.5	0.4	69.3	1.8	17.3	0.0	0.2	10.9
5-6	84.7	15.4	2.7	2.3	0.0	82.5	2.4	13.7	0.0	2.6	4.1
7+	91.6	38.8	10.7	1.1	0.0	52.3	3.5	28.6	0.6	1.1	5.4
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	100.0	8.2	7.7	0.8	0.0	91.8	0.8	21.9	0.0	4.6	4.2
Self-employed - agric	79.2	31.0	3.1	1.7	0.2	60.9	1.4	17.6	0.2	0.7	5.6
Self-employed - other	94.6	18.0	5.1	6.6	0.0	76.1	3.3	21.6	0.0	0.0	9.7
Other	55.3	39.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.9	12.4	33.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household											
Male	84.3	21.8	4.6	2.0	0.2	70.9	2.3	20.7	0.1	0.9	7.6
Female	80.1	43.2	1.4	5.4	0.0	52.2	0.0	12.6	0.0	1.0	0.9

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

with shares of 35 and 29 percent, respectively.

The size of the household does not appear to be strongly correlated with access to school, either primary or secondary. However, households with 3 or 4 members have the highest rate of access to primary school and households with 5 or 6 members have the highest rate to secondary school.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that virtually all households in the category 'employee' have access to primary school. The shares for the remaining categories fluctuate between 85 and 93 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities report the highest access rate to secondary schools at 43 percent, whereas the 'other' category report the lowest access rate at 15 percent.

Households headed by females report a higher access rate to primary school than male-headed households, at 84 percent, against 77 percent of males. In turn the latter report a higher access rate to secondary school than the former at 31 and 24 percent respectively.

Table 7.11 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest food market and public transportation. Overall, 65 percent of households have access to a food market, and 63 percent to public transportation.

The analysis by cluster location shows that 78 percent of households in accessible villages live within 30 minutes of a food market against 41 percent of households in remote villages. The shares for public transportation are 79 percent for accessible and 37 percent for households in remote villages.

Poverty status is also strongly correlated with distance to food markets and public transportation. Poor households have a lower rate of access to food markets, with a rate of 47 percent, against 70 percent of non-poor. There is a similar difference regarding access to public transportation. While 68 percent of non-poor have access to public transportation, the share for poor households is 45 percent.

The breakdown by size of the household shows that households with 3 or 4 members have the highest rates of access to these facilities, and that households with 7 or more members have the lowest access rates.

The employees have the highest rates of access to food markets and public transportation, with rates of 82 and 80 percent respectively. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities are in second place, with rates of 72 and 75 percent, to each facility. The 'self-employed agriculture' and the 'other' category come report the lowest access rates to each facility.

There does not appear to be a difference according to the gender of the household head in access to public transportation, but there is a strong difference in access to food markets. Female-headed households have an access rate of 71 percent and male-headed households have a rate of 64 percent.

7.5 Anti-Malaria Measures

The percentage of households taking anti-malaria measures and the specific measures they take are shown in Table 7.12. Overall, 83 percent of households take measures against malaria. The most commonly taken measures are insecticide treated nets (67 percent), bed nets (26 percent), maintenance of good sanitation (19 percent) and use of window or door nets (6 percent).

The analysis by cluster location shows that 70 percent of households in remote villages take measures against malaria, compared to 92 percent of households in accessible villages. In addition households from accessible villages report use of insecticide treated nets more frequently than their counterparts. Similar differences are observed by poverty status with non-poor households resembling households from accessible villages.

The share of households taking measures increases with the size of the household from 78 percent for households with up to 2 members to 92 percent for households with 7 or more members, but there are no clear trends by measure taken. The analysis by socio-economic status shows that virtually all households in the employee category take measures against malaria whereas the share for households in the category 'other' is 55 percent. Female-headed households use bed-nets more frequently than male-headed households at 43 and 22 percent

respectively. In turn, higher shares of the latter use insecticide treated nets and maintain good sanitation than the former.

7 Household amenities

8 GOVERNANCE

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

8.1 Attendance at Meetings

Table 8.1 summarises responses to the following question "Did you or anyone in your household attend a meeting at [...] level in the past 12 months". This question was repeated 4 times with the dots replaced by kitongoji, village, ward and district. The results show that 68 percent of households had at least one member attending at least one kitongoji or village meetings in the past 12 months. Ward and district level meetings did not attain attendance of the majority of households at 19 and 3 percent respectively.

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

8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders

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

The results, displayed in Table 8.2, show a clear trend of satisfaction with leaders going up as the level of government goes

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

	Kitongoji Meeting	Village Meeting	Ward Meeting	District Meeting
Total	65.3	68.6	19.2	2.7
Cluster Location				
Accessible	66.2	70.4	24.0	3.1
Remote	63.7	65.4	11.1	1.9
Poverty Status				
Poor	63.5	69.2	25.2	1.1
Non-poor	65.7	68.4	17.7	3.1
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	42.0	53.5	20.1	8.6
Self-employed - agriculture	68.7	71.7	18.5	2.5
Self-employed - other	63.8	66.2	22.8	0.8
Other	56.4	43.3	6.9	0.0
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

	Kitongoji Leaders	Village Leaders	Ward Leaders	District Leaders	District Councillor
Total					
Satisfied	78.5	72.9	67.2	63.1	54.5
Not Satisfied	20.3	23.9	20.7	10.0	41.8
Don't Know	1.2	3.2	12.1	26.9	3.7
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location					
Accessible	75.7	74.2	72.0	69.5	54.3
Remote	83.2	70.8	59.0	52.1	54.8
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status					
Poor	75.4	70.2	63.5	61.6	50.3
Non-poor	79.2	73.6	68.1	63.5	55.6
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group					
Employee	87.7	86.1	82.5	89.4	57.1
Self-employed - agriculture	78.4	71.5	63.4	59.0	51.9
Self-employed - other	78.9	76.1	77.0	68.6	64.4
Other	36.6	36.6	43.4	43.4	39.9
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)					
Political differences	3.4	4.1	2.2	0.0	2.4
Embezzlement/corruption	23.0	29.6	23.0	2.6	21.2
They do not listen to people	43.0	37.5	24.6	4.0	31.5
Favouritism	26.6	24.2	16.3	3.9	21.5
Lazy/inexperienced	28.0	32.2	13.6	3.3	32.5
Personal Reasons	2.0	2.8	1.5	0.0	5.8
I see no results	23.6	27.6	27.9	20.6	64.7
They never visit us	4.4	7.3	44.7	85.2	46.6
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

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

down. While, respectively, 79 percent and 73 percent of respondents say they are satisfied with kitongoji and village leaders, only 63 percent say the same of district leaders. This does not, however, mean that respondents specifically reported dissatisfaction with leaders at higher levels of government. In fact, the percentage of people claiming they are dissatisfied with leaders does not differ much between kitongoji, village, ward and district leaders. Rather, the number of people responding 'I don't know' increases for higher levels of government. 42 percent of respondents were not satisfied with the work of their district councillor, while 55 percent was satisfied and 4 percent answered 'I don't know'.

Disaggregating data by cluster location exposed that satisfaction was high among members of households in accessible villages except for kitongoji leaders, where satisfaction rate among households in remote villages is 7 percentage points higher than the share for accessible villages.

Further disaggregating the data by poverty status shows that non-poor households report higher satisfaction ratings than poor households across all government levels.

Disaggregating the ratings by socio-economic group suggests that the 'employee' category reports the highest satisfaction rates for all government levels, whereas the 'other' category reports lower satisfaction rates for all government levels than the remaining socio-economic categories.

Finally, all respondents who did not report that they were satisfied with the leaders at a certain level of government where asked why this was so. The bottom part of Table

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

	Kitongoji Finances	Village Finances	Ward Finances	District Finances
Total	9.1	17.9	7.6	2.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	9.5	17.2	8.3	1.3
Remote	8.4	19.2	6.5	3.2
Poverty Status				
Poor	6.2	16.8	7.7	3.4
Non-poor	9.8	18.2	7.6	1.6
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	5.3	12.0	6.7	4.0
Self-employed - agriculture	8.2	17.5	8.4	1.5
Self-employed - other	13.7	22.0	5.1	2.7
Other	12.7	19.6	8.2	4.5
Source				
Letter	12.7	6.9	0.0	0.0
Notice board	0.0	0.0	1.4	26.8
Meeting	76.3	76.9	46.5	25.0
Rumours/hear-say	11.3	15.4	51.8	16.6
Radio/newspapers	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.7
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

8.2 summarises the responses. Note that the base for the percentages here is the number of people who answered 'don't know' or 'no' to the question of whether they were satisfied with their leaders at the specified level.

The reasons for dissatisfaction are very different across the different levels of government. While at kitongoji level only 4 percent of dissatisfied respondents complain that leaders never visit them, this figure goes up to 85 percent for district leaders. Favouritism and failure to listen to people is a commonly cited reason for dissatisfaction with kitongoji and village leaders, but is less important for ward and district leaders. The most common reason for dissatisfaction with district councillors is the complaint that no results of their work can be seen and their failure to pay visits. A very low percentage complains about embezzlement and corruption by the district leaders, while this complaint is more common for ward, village and kitongoji leaders.

8.3. Public Spending

This section discusses the results of questions on the extent to which financial information reached the sample of respondent, as well as their satisfaction with public spending. Table 8.3 shows the distribution of the percentage of respondents that reported having received financial information from four different levels of government. Information on village finances seems to reach the largest share of households at 18 percent. Information on kitongoji, ward and district finances reaches 9, 8 and 2 percent of the household's respectively. The breakdown by cluster location and poverty status do not yield important differences.

There are no major differences across socio-economic groups, although the 'self-employed other' category seems to receive more information on ward finances than the remaining socio-economic groups.

For those that received financial information, the source of this information was probed for.

The results in Table 8.3 show that at all levels of government the most important method of acquiring information was attendance of meetings. Rumours or hear say are the second most widely used source of financial information at all levels of government.

Table 8.4: Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction

	Kitongoji Spending	Village Spending	Ward Spending	District Spending
Total				
Satisfied	39.4	33.6	29.9	30.3
Not Satisfied	26.1	38.6	30.1	13.7
Don' Know	34.6	27.8	40.0	56.0
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location				
Accessible	38.1	33.4	30.6	32.0
Remote	41.6	33.7	28.8	27.5
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status				
Poor	30.9	25.8	29.7	32.1
Non-poor	41.6	35.6	30.0	29.8
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group				
Employee	51.4	41.1	36.3	36.7
Self-employed - agriculture	40.3	34.2	30.6	30.4
Self-employed - other	33.0	29.1	26.0	28.9
Other	14.7	18.3	12.7	12.7
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)				
I see no results	26.1	37.5	28.6	15.4
Embezzlement/corruption	24.1	34.2	26.6	11.3
Favouritism	1.9	4.0	2.6	1.7
This is what I hear	3.5	11.3	10.4	1.6
They give no information	65.4	68.3	79.7	91.6
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2007 Kilosa DC

Respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with spending at different levels of government and were requested to respond with either ‘yes’, ‘no’ or ‘don’t know’. Table 8.4 shows the results. Satisfaction with spending is higher for lower levels of government. While around 39 percent of respondents were satisfied with kitongoji spending, only 30 percent, reported the same for ward and district spending. This does not, however, mean that respondents specifically report dissatisfaction with spending for higher levels of government, rather the share of respondents reporting ‘I don’t know’ increases.

In line with the results on satisfaction with leaders, respondents living in non-poor households consistently show higher satisfaction rates than respondents living in poor households. The breakdown by poverty status shows no strong correlation with household’s satisfaction on public spending.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the ‘employee’ and the ‘self-employed agriculture’ groups report higher satisfaction rates, for all government levels than the remaining categories

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